

## Evidence for InTASC Standard 6

**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.

**Coursework:** Teacher candidates gain knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to assessing student learning. Assessment is discussed in many courses and emphasized in EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues and the methods courses. The primary example of assessment application occurs in the teacher candidates' Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit completed during student teaching.

### Examples of data providing evidence that teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in relation to InTASC Standard 6

- 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 rubric for assessing student teacher performance is tagged to InTASC Standard 6.

**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 6	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
<b>Uses multiple methods of assessment</b>	designs and modifies multiple formative and summative assessments that align with learning targets and assessments are differentiated to meet student needs		uses multiple assessments that align with the learning targets		uses multiple assessments, but not all are aligned with the learning targets		uses limited assessment methods and items that are not aligned with learning targets		<i>Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher</i>
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	26.1% N=129	19.6% N=97	44.6% N=221	7.3% N=36	1.8% N=9	0.4% N=2	0.2% N=1	<b>3.29</b>	<b>90.3%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	25.8% N=34	22.7% N=30	43.2% N=57	5.3% N=7	3.0% N=4			<b>3.31</b>	<b>91.7%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	24.1% N=47	17.9% N=35	48.2% N=94	8.2% N=16	0.5% N=1	1.0% N=2		<b>3.27</b>	<b>90.3%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	28.6% N=48	19.0% N=32	41.7% N=70	7.7% N=13	2.4% N=4		0.6% N=1	<b>3.31</b>	<b>89.3%</b>

<b>InTASC Standard 6</b>	<b>Distinguished (4)</b>	<b>(3.5)</b>	<b>Proficient (3)</b>	<b>(2.5)</b>	<b>Emerging (2)</b>	<b>(1.5)</b>	<b>Underdeveloped (1)</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>3 or &gt;</b>
<b>Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning</b>	provides descriptive success and next-step feedback to individual learners and involves them in self-assessment to improve their own work		provides effective feedback to learners that aids in the improvement of the quality of their work		feedback provided to learners is actionable but does not necessarily improve the quality of the work		feedback provided to students is not actionable		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	29.3% N=145	24.4% N=121	36.4% N=180	7.1% N=35	2.4% N=12	0.4% N=2	0.2% N=1	<b>3.35</b>	<b>90.1%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	31.1% N=41	27.3% N=36	31.8% N=42	6.8% N=9	3.0% N=4			<b>3.38</b>	<b>90.2%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	28.7% N=56	21.5% N=42	41.0% N=80	6.7% N=13	2.1% N=4			<b>3.34</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	28.6% N=48	25.6% N=43	34.5% N=58	7.7% N=13	2.4% N=4	1.2% N=2		<b>3.33</b>	<b>88.7%</b>
<b>Uses appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs</b>	documents, analyzes, and interprets student assessment data gathered from multiple methods to identify student learning needs, achievement trends, and patterns among groups of learners to inform instruction		documents, analyzes, and interprets student assessment data gathered using multiple methods to identify student learning needs		uses assessment data to guide planning and identify student learning needs		uses assessments solely to determine a grade		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	22.8% N=113	21.0% N=104	42.2% N=209	9.5% N=47	3.0% N=15	0.6% N=3	0.8% N=4	<b>3.23</b>	<b>86.1%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	25.8% N=34	20.5% N=27	44.7% N=59	4.5% N=6	4.5% N=6			<b>3.29</b>	<b>90.9%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	22.1% N=43	17.4% N=34	43.1% N=84	13.3% N=26	2.1% N=4	1.0% N=2	1.0% N=2	<b>3.17</b>	<b>82.6%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	21.4% N=36	25.6% N=43	39.3% N=66	8.9% N=15	3.0% N=5	0.6% N=1	1.2% N=2	<b>3.24</b>	<b>85.3%</b>
<b>Engages students in self-assessment strategies</b>	engages learners in understanding and identifying quality work. Infuses opportunities for student reflection, self-assessment, and monitoring of learning goals		engages learners in understanding and identifying quality work (models, examples, etc.). Provides opportunities for reflection and self-assessment		engages learners in understanding and identifying quality work		learners are not engaged in understanding and identifying quality work		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	21.6% N=107	21.6% N=107	42.2% N=209	10.1% N=50	3.2% N=16	1.0% N=5	0.2% N=1	<b>3.22</b>	<b>85.5%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	27.3% N=36	16.7% N=22	47.0% N=62	6.1% N=8	2.3% N=3	0.8% N=1		<b>3.29</b>	<b>90.9%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	19.0% N=37	21.0% N=41	42.1% N=82	13.3% N=26	4.1% N=8		0.5% N=1	<b>3.18</b>	<b>82.1%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	20.2% N=34	26.2% N=44	38.7% N=65	9.5% N=16	3.0% N=5	2.4% N=4		<b>3.22</b>	<b>85.1%</b>

**Analysis:** The Fall 2019-Spring 2020 mean score ratings are higher than the ratings in 2017-2018. The data related to providing students with meaningful feedback are fairly consistent with student teacher self-assessment ratings at 3.34 compared to cooperating teacher ratings of 3.35. The items “Uses appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs” and “Engages students in self-assessment strategies” increased from 85% to 90.9% proficient and the mean scores rose from 3.24 to 3.29 and 3.22 to 3.29 respectively. The increases in proficiency ratings are encouraging.

**Action:** The data are shared on an annual basis. Discussions with K-12 administrators and educators after the annual data sharing sessions have encouraged the EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues instructors to spend more time addressing these topics. Examples include a local K-12 teacher providing a rubric and work samples from her classroom to give to an EDUC 450 instructor. The resources were used so teacher candidates could practice authentic assessment of student learning and provide feedback. A K-12 administrator offered an EDUC 450 instructor de-identified data for candidates to utilize appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs. EDUC 450 instructors and the EPP have increased their efforts to encourage teacher candidates to experience self-assessments. An example involves the expectation for teacher candidates to complete self-assessments related to their student teaching experience. Candidates are also being asked to share how they will use rubrics and strategies to teach their students about using self-assessments. The mean scores in the table below indicate that teacher candidates are gaining experience in assessing their own performance. The EPP is working for continuous improvement in each of these areas.

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
InTASC Standard 6								
Uses multiple methods of assessment.	3.33	91%	9%	334	3.29	90%	10%	489
Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	3.34	88%	12%	333	3.35	90%	10%	489
Uses appropriate data sources to identify student learning needs.	3.24	85%	15%	332	3.23	86%	14%	489
Engages students in self-assessment strategies.	3.16	82%	18%	331	3.22	86%	14%	489
Standard #6: Assessment. (Average Calculated)	3.27	87%	13%	1330	3.27	88%	12%	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
Design and modify assessments to accommodate students with diverse learning needs.	57.05 %	36.95 %	5.24 %	0.57 %	0.2 %	1050
Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	66.24 %	30.12 %	3.35 %	0.30 %	0 %	1016
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	57.83 %	36.06 %	5.62 %	0.49 %	0 %	1015
Use formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice.	73.71 %	24.49 %	1.68 %	0.12 %	0 %	833
Understand issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	56.90 %	38.06 %	4.68 %	0.36 %	0 %	833
Analyze appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	60.02 %	35.53 %	4.20 %	0.24 %	0 %	833
Differentiate assessment for all learners.	54.80 %	38.80 %	5.60 %	0.80 %	0 %	500

**Analysis:** Each area has an “Agree” + “Tend to Agree” percentage of 93.6% or higher. The use of formative and summative assessments to inform instructional practice is extremely high with 98.2% of the graduating seniors marking “Agree” or “Tend to Agree”. The item related to providing students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning is also highly rated with over 96% of the teacher candidates selecting “Agree” or “Tend to Agree”. The similar ratings for the items “Differentiate assessment for all learners” and “Design and modify assessments to accommodate students with diverse learning needs” speak well for the reliability of the assessment instrument.

**Action:** While a high percentage of teacher candidates agree that they were well prepared, these areas of assessment will continue to be emphasized. The EPP has used its data to make an informed decision to develop a specific course to address assessment in 2010. Area K-12 educators helped the EPP design the course to help teacher candidates be prepared to use assessments for learning as they enter the profession. In 2016, the EPP asked an additional set of K-12 educators to help update the content and expectations for EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues. The EPP also pursues communication with guest speakers representing the State Longitudinal Data System and the Data Literacy content available to teacher candidates and ND educators.

### 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 6

<i>InTASC Standard 6 Learner and Learning</i>	<b>Exceeds Expectations (3)</b>	<b>(2.5)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (2)</b>	<b>(1.5)</b>	<b>Needs Improvement (1)</b>	<b>Not Observed</b>
<i>The teacher candidate...</i>						
<b>Commits to making accommodations in assessments for all learners</b> (InTASC 6.t, 6.u, 6.v) (Danielson 3d) (MCEE I.C.5; II.C.1-3; III.A.1; IV.A.2)	makes accommodations in multiple assessments to promote growth and guide instructional decision making by considering individual student needs.	In addition to score of “2” performance, partial success at score of “3”	makes accommodations in assessments to promote growth by considering individual student needs.	In addition to score of “1” performance, partial success at score of “2”	makes limited accommodations in assessments for learners.	

#### 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	<b>Disposition Item</b> - Rated by cooperating teachers <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
6	<b>Commits to making accommodations in assessments for all learners</b> (InTASC 6.t, 6.u, 6.v) (Danielson 3d) (MCEE I.C.5; II.C.1-3; III.A.1; IV.A.2)	7	18	28	2	1	2.25	94.6%

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

InTASC	<b>Disposition Item</b> - Rated by cooperating teachers <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
6	<b>Commits to making accommodations in assessments for all learners</b> (InTASC 6.t, 6.u, 6.v) (Danielson 3d) (MCEE I.C.5; II.C.1-3; III.A.1; IV.A.2)	28	17	23	2	1	2.49	96%

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

InTASC	<b>Disposition Item</b> – SELF ASSESSMENT – rated by teacher candidates <i>The teacher candidate...</i>	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
6	<b>Commits to making accommodations in assessments for all learners</b> (InTASC 6.t, 6.u, 6.v) (Danielson 3d) (MCEE I.C.5; II.C.1-3; III.A.1; IV.A.2)	58	13	26	4	1	2.60	95%

**Analysis:** The 2019-2020 data are stronger than the Spring 2019 pilot data. Cooperating teachers found the 2019-2020 teacher candidates to be meeting or exceeding the expectations in 96% of the 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 with 95% believing their performance warranted a rating of 2 (Meets Expectations) or higher.

**Action:** The data will continue to be analyzed as more cycles of data are obtained. Faculty and university supervisors can be aware that teacher candidates are doing well in this disposition area, but the more conversations and experiences the candidates can have the better.

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 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning</b> <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>	Aligns pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets and provides multiple forms of evidence for monitoring student learning progress toward the learning targets.	In addition to rating “3” performance, partial success at rating of “4”	Aligns pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets and provides evidence for monitoring student learning progress toward the learning targets.	In addition to rating “2” performance, partial success at rating of “3”	Administers assessments with partial alignment toward the learning targets and some evidence of monitoring student learning during the unit.	With assistance, partial success at rating of “2”	Administers assessments that provided little or no connection or evidence of students’ learning during 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
<b>Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning</b> <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>	<b>3.20</b>	3.17	3.18	<b>3.24</b>

**Analysis:** The positive upward trend is encouraging. The primary improvement faculty have noticed is that the teacher candidates are becoming better at aligning their pre-, post-, and formative assessments with 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 EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues professional education sequence course 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 understanding of content, as well as planning formative and summative assessments. For the Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit taught during the student teaching experience, candidates are asked to consider the standards and learning targets their students need to learn and then create a summative post-assessment that ensures the learning targets will be measured. The next step for teacher candidates is to plan a pre-assessment that has enough alignment to the post-assessment that candidates are able to discern if the students displayed growth and evidence of learning over the course of the unit. The candidates then decide on formative assessment strategies and provide descriptive feedback to monitor and support the students’ learning.

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

**InTASC Standard 6. *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)

Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	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	13	56.5%	9	39.1%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	3.52	23
2013	24	68.6%	11	31.4%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.69	35
2014	23	53.5%	20	46.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.53	43
2015	38	61.3%	19	30.6%	4	6.5%	1	1.6%	3.52	62
2016	36	72.0%	13	26.0%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	3.70	50
2017	37	62.7%	21	35.6%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.61	59
2018	37	71.2%	11	21.2%	1	1.9%	3	5.8%	3.58	52
2019	31	56.4%	20	36.4%	4	7.3%	0	0.0%	3.49	55
2020	44	77.2%	11	19.3%	2	3.5%	0	0.0%	3.74	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>64.9%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>31.0%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>3.2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>436</b>
Engage students in self-assessment strategies.	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	63.6%	6	27.3%	1	4.5%	1	4.5%	3.50	22
2013	14	40.0%	19	54.3%	2	5.7%	0	0.0%	3.34	35
2014	19	44.2%	21	48.8%	3	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.37	43
2015	30	48.4%	23	37.1%	8	12.9%	1	1.6%	3.32	62
2016	27	54.0%	20	40.0%	3	6.0%	0	0.0%	3.48	50
2017	30	50.8%	24	40.7%	5	8.5%	0	0.0%	3.42	59
2018	25	48.1%	20	38.5%	5	9.6%	2	3.8%	3.31	52
2019	29	52.7%	20	36.4%	4	7.3%	2	3.6%	3.38	55
2020	34	59.7%	18	31.6%	4	7.0%	1	1.8%	3.49	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>51.0%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>39.3%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>435</b>
Design and modify assessments to match learning objectives.	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	23	53.5%	19	44.2%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	3.51	43
2015	36	58.1%	23	37.1%	2	3.2%	1	1.6%	3.52	62
2016	34	68.0%	12	24.0%	4	8.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	50
2017	31	52.5%	26	44.1%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	3.49	59
2018	38	73.1%	10	19.2%	4	7.7%	0	0.0%	3.65	52
2019	34	60.7%	18	32.1%	4	7.1%	0	0.0%	3.54	56
2020	38	66.7%	15	26.3%	4	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>234</b>	<b>61.7%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>32.5%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>379</b>

**InTASC Standard 6. *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)

Use formative and summative assessments to support student learning.	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	30	69.8%	12	27.9%	1	2.3%	0	0.0%	3.67	43
2015	40	64.5%	19	30.6%	2	3.2%	1	1.6%	3.58	62
2016	38	76.0%	12	24.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.76	50
2017	47	79.7%	11	18.6%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.78	59
2018	41	78.8%	9	17.3%	2	3.8%	0	0.0%	3.75	52
2019	39	70.9%	15	27.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.69	55
2020	44	77.2%	12	21.1%	0	0.0%	1	1.8%	3.74	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>73.8%</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>23.8%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>378</b>
Analyze multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	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	28	65.1%	13	30.2%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	3.60	43
2015	37	60.7%	18	29.5%	5	8.2%	1	1.6%	3.49	61
2016	32	64.0%	16	32.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	50
2017	29	49.2%	26	44.1%	3	5.1%	1	1.7%	3.41	59
2018	33	63.5%	14	26.9%	5	9.6%	0	0.0%	3.54	52
2019	30	54.5%	19	34.5%	6	10.9%	0	0.0%	3.44	55
2020	35	61.4%	18	31.6%	3	5.26%	1	1.8%	3.53	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>377</b>
Differentiate assessments for all learners.	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	36	60.0%	17	28.3%	6	10.0%	1	1.7%	3.47	60
2018	27	51.9%	19	36.5%	5	9.6%	1	1.9%	3.38	52
2019	31	56.4%	14	25.5%	7	12.7%	3	5.5%	3.33	55
2020	31	54.4%	21	36.8%	3	5.3%	2	3.5%	3.42	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>55.8%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>31.7%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9.4%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3.1%</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>224</b>



Identify issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	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	28	65.1%	13	30.2%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	3.60	43
2015	37	60.7%	18	29.5%	5	8.2%	1	1.6%	3.49	61
2016	32	64.0%	16	32.0%	2	4.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	50
2017	29	49.2%	26	44.1%	3	5.1%	1	1.7%	3.41	59
2018	33	63.5%	14	26.9%	5	9.6%	0	0.0%	3.54	52
2019	30	54.5%	19	34.5%	6	10.9%	0	0.0%	3.44	55
2020	35	61.4%	18	31.6%	3	5.26%	1	1.8%	3.53	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>59.4%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>32.9%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>6.9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0.8%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>377</b>

**Analysis:** The cumulative mean score ratings related to Standard 6 are well over the 3.00 (tend to agree) on a 4-point scale. It is extremely positive to see the overall mean score ratings were higher in 2020 than in 2019 for each area. The lowest rating was differentiating assessments for all learners. The encouraging news is that the mean score went up from 3.33 in 2019 to 3.42 in 2020. The overall mean scores display satisfaction from the completers. The EPP reviews data from multiple assessments and perspectives each year and uses the assessment data to inform its decisions for the improvement of teacher preparation.

The assessment item “Provide students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning” has a mean score rating that is up from 3.49 in 2019 to 3.74 in 2020. “Engage students in self-assessment strategies” increased from 3.38 to 3.49 from 2019 to 2020. The mean score for “Designing and modifying assessments to match learning objectives” improved from 3.54 to 3.60. Ratings for “Uses formative and summative assessments to support student learning” went up from 3.69 to 3.74. “Analyze multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs” changed from 3.44 to 3.53 and the item related to identifying issues of reliability and validity in assessment improved from 3.44 in 2019 to 3.53 in 2020.

**Action:** The EDUC 450 Trends and Assessment and Educational Issues course addresses these assessment topics and the data has provided guidance as to which areas need the most attention. Teacher candidates gain important opportunities to apply these assessment strategies while writing lesson and unit plans during their methods courses and teaching lessons in practicum field experiences and during student teaching. The teacher candidates apply their learning while completing their Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit during their student teaching experience. The EPP uses its assessment data gathered from multiple sources to make improvements in teacher preparation. Modeling the use of assessment data for teacher candidates is important. The EPP shares data with a large variety of stakeholders each year, including student teachers. The assessment coordinator shares the rubrics and the most recent student teaching data with all the student teachers at the start of each semester. The intent is to create awareness of expectations, student teacher strengths and weaknesses from the past, and also to encourage self-assessment practices for the student teachers.

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

**InTASC Standard 6. *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)

Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning.	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%	4	20.0%	1	5.0%	0	0.0%	3.70	20
2013	9	81.8%	1	9.1%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	3.73	11
2014	15	57.7%	10	38.5%	1	3.8%	0	0.0%	3.54	26
2015	38	64.4%	19	32.2%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	3.61	59
2016	27	56.3%	19	39.6%	2	4.2%	0	0.0%	3.52	48
2017	30	66.7%	14	31.1%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	3.64	45
2018	20	74.1%	3	11.1%	2	7.4%	2	7.4%	3.52	27
2019	22	56.4%	14	35.9%	3	7.7%	0	0.0%	3.49	39
2020	23	60.5%	10	26.3%	5	13.2%	0	0.0%	3.47	38
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>63.6%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>30.0%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5.8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.6%</b>	<b>3.57</b>	<b>313</b>
Engages students in self-assessment strategies.	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	10	58.8%	5	29.4%	2	11.8%	0	0.0%	3.47	17
2013	6	75.0%	2	25.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.75	8
2014	13	50.0%	7	26.9%	6	23.1%	0	0.0%	3.27	26
2015	30	54.5%	21	38.2%	3	5.5%	1	1.8%	3.45	55
2016	27	57.4%	18	38.3%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	3.53	47
2017	22	48.9%	20	44.4%	2	4.4%	1	2.2%	3.40	45
2018	14	50.0%	10	35.7%	3	10.7%	1	3.6%	3.32	28
2019	13	37.1%	17	48.6%	5	14.3%	0	0.0%	3.23	35
2020	15	44.1%	17	50.0%	2	5.9%	0	0.0%	3.38	34
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>150</b>	<b>50.8%</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>39.7%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>8.5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.0%</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>295</b>
Designs and modifies assessments to match learning objectives.	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	35	60.3%	22	37.9%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.59	58
2016	26	55.3%	19	40.4%	2	4.3%	0	0.0%	3.51	47
2017	29	64.4%	15	33.3%	1	2.2%	0	0.0%	3.62	45
2018	16	57.1%	11	39.3%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	3.50	28
2019	20	50.0%	18	45.0%	2	5.0%	0	0.0%	3.45	40
2020	22	59.5%	14	37.8%	1	2.7%	0	0.0%	3.57	37
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>57.4%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>38.7%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.4%</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>282</b>

**InTASC Standard 6. *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)

Uses formative and summative assessments to support student learning.	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	39	67.2%	17	29.3%	1	1.7%	1	1.7%	3.62	58
2016	31	66.0%	13	27.7%	3	6.4%	0	0.0%	3.60	47
2017	30	66.7%	13	28.9%	2	4.4%	0	0.0%	3.62	45
2018	19	67.9%	8	28.6%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	3.61	28
2019	24	58.5%	14	34.1%	3	7.3%	0	0.0%	3.51	41
2020	24	64.9%	11	29.7%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	3.59	37
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>65.0%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>30.4%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3.9%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.7%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>283</b>
Analyzes multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs.	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%	11	40.7%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	3.44	27
2015	34	58.6%	21	36.2%	2	3.4%	1	1.7%	3.52	58
2016	27	57.4%	17	36.2%	2	4.3%	1	2.1%	3.49	47
2017	25	55.6%	17	37.8%	3	6.7%	0	0.0%	3.49	45
2018	16	57.1%	10	35.7%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	3.46	28
2019	20	55.6%	10	27.8%	6	16.7%	0	0.0%	3.39	36
2020	17	50.0%	13	38.2%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	3.38	34
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>55.6%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>36.0%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7.3%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1.1%</b>	<b>3.46</b>	<b>275</b>
Differentiates assessments for all learners.	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	24	55.8%	15	34.9%	3	7.0%	1	2.3%	3.44	43
2018	12	44.4%	9	33.3%	4	14.8%	2	7.4%	3.15	27
2019	15	37.5%	22	55.0%	3	7.5%	0	0.0%	3.30	40
2020	17	48.6%	14	40.0%	4	11.4%	0	0.0%	3.37	35
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>46.9%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>41.4%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2.1%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>145</b>

Identifies issues of reliability and validity in assessment.	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	11	47.8%	10	43.5%	2	8.7%	0	0.0%	3.39	23
2015	25	47.2%	23	43.4%	3	5.7%	2	3.8%	3.34	53
2016	19	44.2%	20	46.5%	1	2.3%	3	7.0%	3.28	43
2017	21	51.2%	18	43.9%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	3.46	41
2018	13	52.0%	8	32.0%	2	8.0%	2	8.0%	3.28	25
2019	15	45.5%	11	33.3%	7	21.2%	0	0.0%	3.24	33
2020	14	42.4%	17	51.5%	2	6.1%	0	0.0%	3.36	33
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>47.0%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>42.6%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>3.34</b>	<b>251</b>

**Analysis:** The cumulative mean score ratings related to Standard 6 are well over the 3.00 (tend to agree) on a 4-point scale. The overall mean score ratings were higher in 2020 than in 2019 for four of the six areas. The mean score for “Analyzes multiple and appropriate types of assessment data to identify student learning needs” stayed steady with a mean score rating change from 3.39 to 3.38, and assessment item “Provides students with meaningful feedback to guide next steps in learning” also had a consistent rating with a change from 3.49 to 3.47.

The assessment item “Engages students in self-assessment strategies” increased from 3.23 to 3.38 from 2019 to 2020. That is an area the EPP has been working on, so that was encouraging data to see. The mean score for “Designs and modifies assessments to match learning objectives” improved from 3.45 to 3.57. Ratings for “Uses formative and summative assessments to support student learning” went up from 3.51 to 3.59. The item “Identifies issues of reliability and validity in assessment” improved from 3.24 in 2019 to 3.36 in 2020. The overall mean scores display satisfaction from the employers who hired the EPP’s completers.

**Action:** The professional education courses, especially the assessment course and the methods courses address these assessment topics to help prepare teacher candidates for field experience applications. The data has provided guidance as to which areas need the most attention. The EPP uses its assessment data gathered from multiple sources to make improvements in teacher preparation. The positive feedback from employers is encouraging the progress for continuous improvement is being made by the EPP.