Evidence for InTASC Standard 7

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Coursework: Teacher candidates gain knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to planning in many courses. Planning is emphasized in the EDUC 350 Practicum and Classroom Management for Elementary course, EDUC 351 Practicum and Classroom Management for Secondary, and the methods courses. The primary example of planning application occurs in the teacher candidates' Teaching for Learning Capstone (TLC) unit that is completed during student teaching.

Examples of data providing evidence that teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in relation to InTASC Standard 7
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.   <mark>Student Teacher Final Evaluation Data</mark> – this section displays the rubric and data gathered from cooperating teachers and self-assessment data from student teachers.

This section of the rubric is used for assessing student teacher performance and is tagged to InTASC Standard 7.

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 7	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
Connects lesson goals with school curriculum and state standards	plans demonstrate an understanding of prerequisite relationships between goals and standards and structure and sequence; proactively anticipates misconceptions and prepares to address them		plans a variety of learning experiences that are aligned with learning goals and standards in a structure and sequence designed to meet student needs		plans for learning experiences that are aligned with learning goals		lesson plans are not aligned with learning goals		*Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher*
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	34.5% N=171	22.8% N=113	35.8% N=177	4.6% N=23	1.6% N=8	0.6% N=3		**3.41**	**93.1%**
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	39.4% N=52	19.7% N=26	34.8% N=46	4.5% N=6	0.8% N=1	0.8% N=1		**3.45**	**93.9%**
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	29.2% N=57	23.6% N=46	39.5% N=77	6.2% N=12	1.0% N=2	0.5% N=1		**3.36**	**92.3%**
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	36.9% N=62	24.4% N=41	32.1% N=54	3.0% N=5	3.0% N=5	0.6% N=1		**3.44**	**93.4%**

InTASC Standard 7	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction	assessments are strategically designed to inform planning and to provide multiple forms of evidence for monitoring students' progress relative to learning targets		uses pre-assessment and formative assessment strategies that align with learning targets and data are used to inform planning		pre-assessment and formative assessment strategies are not aligned adequately with learning targets, so data does not effectively inform planning		pre-assessment and/or formative assessment data are not utilized to inform planning		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	24.8% N=123	22.0% N=109	40.2% N=199	9.5% N=47	2.4% N=12	0.4% N=2	0.6% N=3	3.27	87.1%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	28.8% N=38	19.7% N=26	42.4% N=56	6.1% N=8	3.0% N=4			3.33	90.9%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	23.1% N=45	19.0% N=37	45.1% N=88	10.8% N=21	1.0% N=2	0.5% N=1	0.5% N=1	3.24	87.2%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	23.8% N=40	27.4% N=46	32.7% N=55	10.7% N=18	3.6% N=6	0.6% N-1	1.2% N=2	3.25	83.9%
Adjusts instructional plans to meet students' needs	uses information gained from assessment findings and becomes more capable of predicting, and planning ahead to customize instructional plans to meet students' needs		uses information gained from assessment findings to customize instructional plans to meet students' needs		uses assessment findings to modify instructional plans to meet students' needs		plans are not adjusted to meet student learning differences or needs		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	30.7% N=152	25.3% N=125	33.1% N=164	7.3% N=36	3.0% N=15		0.6% N=3	3.35	89.1%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	36.4% N=48	22.0% N=29	30.3% N=40	7.6% N=10	3.8% N=5			3.40	88.6%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	26.2% N=51	27.2% N=53	36.4% N=71	7.2% N=14	2.6% N=5		0.5% N=1	3.33	89.7%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	31.5% N=53	25.6% N=43	31.5% N=53	7.1% N=12	3.0% N=5		1.2% N=2	3.35	88.7%
Collaboratively designs instruction	proactively addresses student learning needs through ongoing collaboration with the cooperating teacher, other teachers, and/or specialists		plans with the cooperating teacher and/or specialists to design instruction that addresses and supports individual student learning		plans with the cooperating teacher, other teachers, or specialists but is confined to exchanging information		plans instruction individually		
Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements	43.0% N=213	28.1% N=139	24.6% N=122	2.8% N=14	1.0% N=5	0.4% N=2		3.54	95.8%
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	45.5% N=60	23.5% N=31	26.5% N=35	3.0% N=4	1.5% N=2			3.54	95.5%
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	37.4% N=73	32.8% N=64	26.7% N=52	2.1% N=4	0.5% N=1	0.5% N=1		3.52	96.9%
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	47.6% N=80	26.2% N=44	20.8% N=35	9.5% N=6	1.2% N=2	0.6% N=1		3.57	88.7%

Analysis: Cooperating teachers rated 93.9% of teacher candidates at the proficient level or higher for the item "Connects lesson goals with school curriculum and state standards" in 2019-2020. The mean score rating was the highest it has been at 3.45 on the 4-point scale. The mean score ratings and percentage of ratings at 3.00 (the proficient level) or higher for the item "Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction" increased from 3.24 in 2018-2019 to 3.33 in 2019-2020. Each planning item rated by cooperating teachers were higher in 2019-2020 than in 2017-2018. As part of the EPPs efforts for continuous improvement, seeing increases in mean scores ratings can be encouraging. The mean score ratings for "Adjusts instructional plans to meet students' needs" mean scores rose from 3.33 to 3.40 in 2019-2020 and the scores for "Collaboratively designs instruction" increased from 3.52 to 3.54.

Action: The EPP uses data from multiple assessments to gain insight from multiple perspectives. The faculty spend time teaching candidates about planning, getting to know their learners, using assessment data, realizing that not every plan flows smoothly as the instructional strategies are implemented, and the EPP definitely promotes co-teaching and collaborative projects. Using assessment data to inform planning is also addressed in Standard 6, and the faculty are addressing that item. The data set gathered from the cooperating teachers is favorable and doesn't raise any new concerns for program change.

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 7	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count
Connects lesson goals with school curriculum and state standards.	**3.53**	95%	5%	332	**3.41**	93%	7%	489
Uses assessment data to inform planning for instruction.	**3.34**	91%	9%	333	**3.27**	87%	13%	489
Adjusts instructional plans to meet students' needs	**3.46**	95%	5%	332	**3.35**	89%	11%	489
Collaboratively designs instruction.	**3.48**	97%	3%	333	**3.54**	96%	4%	489
Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. (Average Calculated)	**3.45**	94%	6%	1330	**3.39**	91%	9%	1956

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 activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives.	67.19 %	29.17 %	3.24 %	0.29 %	0.1 %	1018
Account for students' prior knowledge or experiences in instructional planning.	60.18 %	35.69 %	3.74 %	0.39 %	0 %	1017
Design long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals.	55.36 %	38.45 %	5.01 %	0.98 %	0.2 %	1017
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs.	63.84 %	32.12 %	3.25 %	0.69 %	0.1 %	1015
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	78.86 %	18.68 %	1.97 %	0.39 %	0.1 %	1017

Analysis: Each area has an "Agree" + "Tend to Agree" percentage of 93.81% or higher. "Plans lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind" is extremely high with over 97% of the graduating seniors marking "Agree" or "Tend to Agree". "Design activities where students engage with subject matter from a variety of perspectives" is also very strong with over 96% of the seniors agreeing they have the basic skills to engage students in learning. The area with the greatest room for growth is "Designing long-range instructional plans that meet curricular goals." While 93.81% of the candidates feel they have the basic skills to design long-range plans, the data indicates this is the lowest in this section.

Action: Annual data sharing discussions were held with K-12 educators, administrators, and EPP faculty members who viewed the data and had conversations about long term planning. Each participant shared feedback in email with the assessment coordinator at the end of the session. The following comments are examples related to long-range planning that emerged from the annual data sharing session in August of 2020.
- "If there is a challenge that I see across the board as I mentor new teachers, it is the difficulty in planning for an entire year - seeing how a daily or weekly goal fits into a large picture. I think this is something that experienced teachers struggle with as well, and I know that most teachers are never asked to create a curriculum map or do scope and sequence work. There are certainly other areas that are more crucial for your students and staff to focus on, so this may not be something that can really be addressed in a teacher preparation course."
- "Preparation for Teaching – students could use more long-range instructional planning (curriculum map for a year)."
- "Make sure all methods classes look at standards and discuss long-range planning."

These comments are based on viewing data and will be shared with faculty, especially methods instructors. The unit will watch the data to check for continuous improvement in this area.

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 7

InTASC Standard 7 *Learner and Learning*	Exceeds Expectations (3)	(2.5)	Meets Expectations (2)	(1.5)	Needs Improvement (1)	Not Observed
The teacher candidate…						
Is committed to planning learning opportunities that promote student growth (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 4.r, 9.l)(Danielson 1a)(Marzano 3) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	takes responsibility for planning learning opportunities that result in student growth, contributing to a culture of growth mindset.	In addition to score of " 2" performance, partial success at score of " 3"	takes responsibility for planning learning opportunities that result in student growth.	In addition to score of " 1" performance, partial success at score of " 2"	attempts to plan learning opportunities that occasionally result in student growth.	

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 *The teacher candidate…*	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
7	**Is committed to planning learning opportunities that promote student growth** (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 4.r, 9.l)(Danielson 1a)(Marzano 3) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	14	16	21	6	0	2.33	89.5%

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

InTASC	**Disposition Item** - Rated by cooperating teachers *The teacher candidate…*	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
7	**Is committed to planning learning opportunities that promote student growth** (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 4.r, 9.l)(Danielson 1a)(Marzano 3) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	49	8	13	3	0	2.71	96%

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

InTASC	**Disposition Item** – SELF ASSESSMENT – rated by teacher candidates *The teacher candidate…*	3	2.5	2	1.5	1	Mean Score	% at 2 or Higher
7	**Is committed to planning learning opportunities that promote student growth** (InTASC 7.n, 7.p, 4.r, 9.l)(Danielson 1a)(Marzano 3) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	67	13	21	0	1	2.71	99%

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 at the same rate as the cooperating teachers. The identical mean scores are interesting. The outcome is positive whether the data implies that the cooperating teacher to teacher candidate communication was solid in the area of planning, the rubric descriptors are extremely clear for the expectations, or both parties have a mutual feeling that planning is a strength for the candidate.

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 from a dispositional perspective in being committed to planning opportunities that promote student growth.

IV. – 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)	Rating
Plan - Planning Instruction and Assessment								
Rubric 1: Planning for Understanding of Content *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)	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.	
Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning *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)	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.	
Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning *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)	Aligns pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets and provides multiple forms of evidence for monitoring student learning progress toward the learning targets.		Aligns pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets and provides evidence for monitoring student learning progress toward the learning targets.		Administers assessments with partial alignment toward the learning targets and some evidence of monitoring student learning during the unit.		Administers assessments that provided little or no connection or evidence of students' learning during the unit.	
Rubric 4: Planning for Language Development *How does the candidate plan to support the students' academic language associated with content learning?* (InTASC 7, CAEP 1.4)	Utilizes academic language and plans multiple strategies for students to practice using the language to express and demonstrate content understanding.		Utilizes academic language and provides opportunities for practice so students can use language to express and demonstrate content understanding.		Plans opportunities for students to use academic language to express and demonstrate content understanding.		Utilizes appropriate academic language, but does not plan opportunities for student practice and development.	

Mean Score for Each Rubric Item	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
Rubric 1: Planning for Understanding of Content *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)	**3.21**	3.02	3.23	**3.30**
Rubric 2: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning *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)	**3.17**	3.07	3.11	**3.27**
Rubric 3: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support to Student Learning *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)	**3.20**	3.17	3.18	**3.24**
Rubric 4: Planning for Language Development *How does the candidate plan to support the students' academic language associated with content learning?* (InTASC 7, CAEP 1.4)	**2.95**	3.05	2.58	**3.21**

Analysis: The positive upward trend is encouraging. The planning items ensure that content standards are met, that teacher candidates have knowledge of their students to inform their teaching and students' learning, that candidates plan assessments, and plan for language development. The primary areas faculty have observed, discussed, and made data informed decisions for improvement involve planning for language development (the mean score ratings are up from 2.58 in 2018-2019 to 3.21 in 2019-2020) and the alignment of their pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets to ensure the content standards and learning objectives are being met (the mean score ratings are up from 3.02 in 2017-2018 to 3.30 in 2019-2020).

Action: The TLC data are shared annually with the SEGS faculty, staff, and methods teachers during Welcome Week in August. The summer of 2018 TLC comments suggested the need for improving the alignment of teacher candidates' pre-, post-, and formative assessments with learning targets to ensure the content standards and learning objectives are being met. The EDUC 450 Trends in Assessment and Educational Issues professional education sequence course increased its efforts to help teacher candidates gain practice planning assessments that measure the content learned by students. The methods instructors also emphasized the importance of planning for understanding of content as well as planning formative and summative assessments. The mean score ratings have increased from 3.02 to 3.30 over the past two years. The Planning for Language Development mean score ratings were respectable at 3.05 in 2017-2018. An Elementary Education faculty member who was assessing TLC units in the summer of 2019 noticed the teacher candidates' language development section met the expectations, but that the lesson plans for each day didn't support the students' language development as much as the overall plan suggested. The mean score rating of 3.05 for Planning for Language Development fell to 2.58. The faculty member who noticed to flaw taught candidates about preparing TLC units and she was able to speak directly to teacher candidates in her methods course and the EDUC 491 senior portfolio instructor was also able to address the concern directly to student teachers. The weakness was addressed. Teacher candidates in 2019-2020 met the expectations with a much higher mean score rating of 3.21. Overall, the teacher candidates knew the language they wanted their students to learn, but the candidates needed to provide better evidence that they were putting what they knew into practice.

InTASC Standard 7. *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 long-range instructional plans that meet curricular 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
2012	12	52.2%	10	43.5%	1	4.3%	0	0.0%	3.48	23
2013	20	58.8%	10	29.4%	4	11.8%	0	0.0%	3.47	34
2014	26	60.5%	14	32.6%	3	7.0%	0	0.0%	3.53	43
2015	38	61.3%	16	25.8%	6	9.7%	2	3.2%	3.45	62
2016	20	40.8%	27	55.1%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%	3.37	49
2017	28	46.7%	25	41.7%	6	10.0%	1	1.7%	3.33	60
2018	28	53.8%	17	32.7%	5	9.6%	2	3.8%	3.37	52
2019	26	46.4%	22	39.3%	6	10.7%	2	3.6%	3.29	56
2020	26	45.6%	24	42.1%	6	10.5%	1	1.8%	3.32	57
Overall Total	**224**	**51.4%**	**165**	**37.8%**	**39**	**8.9%**	**8**	**1.8%**	**3.39**	**436**
Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' 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
2012	18	75.0%	5	20.8%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	3.71	24
2013	32	91.4%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.91	35
2014	31	72.1%	12	27.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.72	43
2015	47	75.8%	13	21.0%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	3.73	62
2016	41	83.7%	6	12.2%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%	3.80	49
2017	44	73.3%	15	25.0%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.72	60
2018	43	82.7%	9	17.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.83	52
2019	41	73.2%	13	23.2%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	3.70	56
2020	45	79.0%	11	19.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.77	57
Overall Total	**342**	**78.1%**	**87**	**19.9%**	**9**	**2.1%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**3.76**	**438**
Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	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	18	75.0%	5	20.8%	1	4.2%	0	0.0%	3.71	24
2013	32	91.4%	3	8.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.91	35
2014	31	72.1%	12	27.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.72	43
2015	47	75.8%	13	21.0%	2	3.2%	0	0.0%	3.73	62
2016	41	83.7%	6	12.2%	2	4.1%	0	0.0%	3.80	49
2017	44	73.3%	15	25.0%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.72	60
2018	43	82.7%	9	17.3%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.83	52
2019	41	73.2%	13	23.2%	2	3.6%	0	0.0%	3.70	56
2020	45	79.0%	11	19.3%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.77	57
Overall Total	**342**	**78.1%**	**87**	**19.9%**	**9**	**2.1%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**3.76**	**438**

Analysis: The cumulative mean score ratings related to Standard 7 are well over the 3.00 (tend to agree level) on a 4-point scale. It is encouraging to see the 2020 mean score ratings were higher than the 2019 ratings for each area. The data are extremely favorable for these two items, "Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind" and "Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs". Both these two areas have mean score ratings of 3.76 on a 4-point scale. The lowest rating was in long term planning. The encouraging news is that the mean score went up from 3.29 in 2019 to 3.32 in 2020. 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 data also indicated that long-term planning was as an area with lower mean score ratings in the Exit Survey.

Action: The plan for action will be the same as what is written under the Exit Survey for the planning section. Long-range planning data and comments will be shared with faculty, especially methods instructors. The unit will watch the data to check for continuous improvement in this area. Faculty should recognize that teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, employers, and completers believe the EPP's candidates are well prepared to plan engaging lessons for learning to their students. The area for improvement mentioned by graduating seniors and first-year teachers is for more practice with long-range planning.

– data gathered from the supervisors of first-year teachers (typically principals)

InTASC Standard 7. *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)

Designs long-range instructional plans that meet curricular 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
2012	12	63.2%	5	26.3%	2	10.5%	0	0.0%	3.53	19
2013	5	62.5%	3	37.5%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	8
2014	12	46.2%	11	42.3%	2	7.7%	1	3.8%	3.31	26
2015	32	55.2%	23	39.7%	2	3.4%	1	1.7%	3.48	58
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	19	67.9%	6	21.4%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	3.54	28
2019	24	64.9%	11	29.7%	2	5.4%	0	0.0%	3.59	37
2020	20	52.6%	14	36.8%	2	5.3%	2	5.3%	3.37	38
Overall Total	**181**	**59.0%**	**106**	**34.5%**	**15**	**4.9%**	**5**	**1.6%**	**3.51**	**307**

Regularly adjusts instructional plans to meet students' 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
2012	16	80.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	3.70	20
2013	8	72.7%	2	18.2%	1	9.1%	0	0.0%	3.64	11
2014	18	66.7%	8	29.6%	1	3.7%	0	0.0%	3.63	27
2015	38	64.4%	19	32.2%	2	3.4%	0	0.0%	3.61	59
2016	33	70.2%	13	27.7%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.68	47
2017	36	80.0%	9	20.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.80	45
2018	21	75.0%	5	17.9%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	3.64	28
2019	23	56.1%	16	39.0%	2	4.9%	0	0.0%	3.51	41
2020	28	73.7%	9	23.7%	0	0.0%	1	2.6%	3.68	38
Overall Total	**221**	**69.9%**	**83**	**26.3%**	**10**	**3.2%**	**2**	**0.6%**	**3.66**	**316**

Plans lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind.	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	16	80.0%	2	10.0%	2	10.0%	0	0.0%	3.70	20
2013	6	60.0%	4	40.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.60	10
2014	14	51.9%	10	37.0%	1	3.7%	2	7.4%	3.33	27
2015	41	69.5%	15	25.4%	3	5.1%	0	0.0%	3.64	59
2016	34	70.8%	13	27.1%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.69	48
2017	32	71.1%	13	28.9%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.71	45
2018	21	75.0%	5	17.9%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%	3.64	28
2019	26	63.4%	14	34.1%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	3.61	41
2020	29	76.3%	7	18.4%	2	5.3%	0	0.0%	3.71	38
Overall Total	**219**	**69.3%**	**83**	**26.3%**	**11**	**3.5%**	**3**	**0.9%**	**3.64**	**316**

Analysis: The cumulative mean score ratings for Standard 7 are 3.51 or higher. On a 4-point scale, those ratings are encouraging. The data are especially favorable for these two items, "Plan lessons with clear learning objectives/goals in mind" at 3.64 and "Regularly adjust instructional plans to meet students' needs" at 3.66. The cumulative mean score rating of 3.51 for long-range planning is solid as well.

Action: Employers are communicating positive news related to the planning skills of the EPP's first-year teachers. The overall summary for the InTASC Standard 7 data is encouraging for the EPP. The faculty work hard at helping teacher candidates learn to be well prepared to teach their lessons and units. The overall data from multiple assessments and perspectives indicate that long-range planning is an area that can be stronger in the future.