

## Evidence for InTASC Standard 8

**Standard #8: Instructional Strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

**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 completed during student teaching.

### Examples of data providing evidence that teacher candidates develop knowledge, skills, and dispositions in relation to InTASC Standard 8

- 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 is for assessing student teacher performance and is tagged to InTASC Standard 8.

**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 8	Distinguished (4)	(3.5)	Proficient (3)	(2.5)	Emerging (2)	(1.5)	Underdeveloped (1)	Mean	3 or >
<b>Varies instructional strategies to engage learners</b>	integrates a variety of instructional approaches for all members of the classroom; considers learners' needs, interests, and goals in determining instructional strategies to engage students as both learners and teachers		varies role between instructor, facilitator, guide, and audience; considers learners' needs, interests, and goals in determining instructional strategies to engage learners		uses a variety of instructional approaches but approaches are not matched to learner needs, interests, and goals		utilizes only one instructional approach		<i>Percent of Ratings at Proficient level of 3 or higher</i>
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	32.9% N=163	22.2% N=110	35.2% N=174	6.5% N=32	2.6% N=13	0.6% N=3		<b>3.37</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	35.6% N=47	19.7% N=26	37.9% N=50	3.8% N=5	3.0% N=4			<b>3.41</b>	<b>93.2%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	30.3% N=59	21.5% N=42	38.5% N=75	8.7% N=17	0.5% N=1	0.5% N=1		<b>3.34</b>	<b>90.3%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	33.9% N=57	25.0% N=42	29.2% N=49	6.0% N=10	4.8% N=8	1.2% N=2		<b>3.37</b>	<b>88.0%</b>

<b>InTASC Standard 8</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>Uses technology appropriately to enhance instruction</b>	engages learners in evaluation and selection of media and technology resources; uses technology appropriately to engage learners and enhance instruction		uses technology effectively to enhance instruction		uses limited instructional strategies that involve technology		identifies instructional strategies without involving technology		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	31.1% N=154	25.1% N=124	35.8% N=177	6.3% N=31	1.6% N=8		0.2% N=1	<b>3.38</b>	<b>91.9%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	43.2% N=57	23.5% N=31	28.8% N=38	2.3% N=3	2.3% N=3			<b>3.52</b>	<b>95.5%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	27.2% N=53	23.6% N=46	41.0% N=80	6.7% N=13	1.5% N=3			<b>3.34</b>	<b>91.8%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	26.2% N=44	28.0% N=47	35.1% N=59	8.9% N=15	1.2% N=2	1.2% N=2		<b>3.33</b>	<b>88.7%</b>
<b>Differentiates instruction for a variety of learning needs</b>	differentiates instruction in the areas of content, process, product, or learning environment in the best interests of the students		varies instruction for individuals or small groups to create learning experiences that are well matched to student needs		varies teaching of individual or small group learning experiences, but variations are not well-matched to student needs		teaches individual or small group learning experiences without differentiating instruction		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=495 placements</b>	27.9% N=138	23.8% N=118	37.6% N=186	8.1% N=40	2.2% N=11	0.2% N=1	0.2% N=1	<b>3.33</b>	<b>89.3%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=132	33.3% N=44	21.2% N=28	34.8% N=46	7.6% N=10	3.0% N=4			<b>3.37</b>	<b>89.4%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	25.1% N=49	24.6% N=48	39.0% N=76	10.3% N=20	0.5% N=1		0.5% N=1	<b>3.31</b>	<b>88.7%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	26.8% N=45	25.0% N=42	38.1% N=64	6.0% N=10	3.6% N=6	0.6% N=1		<b>3.32</b>	<b>89.8%</b>
<b>Instructional practices reflect effective communication skills</b>	articulates thoughts and ideas effectively using oral, written and nonverbal communication skills in a variety of forms and contexts to inform, instruct, and motivate during instruction; uses multiple media and technologies; listens respectfully to decipher meaning		listens and respectfully articulates thoughts and ideas using technology as well as oral, written and nonverbal communication to connect with students during instruction		articulates thoughts and ideas using oral, written and nonverbal communication skills but over-relies on the same forms of communication during instruction; uses technology for communication in some instances; listens to others		makes frequent errors during instruction when articulating thoughts and ideas using oral, written, and nonverbal communication skills; does not use technology for communication; seldom listens		
<b>Fall 2017-Spring 2020 N=494 placements</b>	33.2% N=164	21.3% N=105	36.0% N=178	5.3% N=26	4.0% N=20	0.2% N=1		<b>3.37</b>	<b>90.5%</b>
Fall 2019-Spring 2020 N=131	38.2% N=50	18.2% N=24	36.4% N=48	3.8% N=5	3.0% N=4			<b>3.42</b>	<b>90.4%</b>
Fall 2018-Spring 2019 N=195	29.7% N=58	22.6% N=44	39.0% N=76	6.2% N=12	2.6% N=5			<b>3.35</b>	<b>91.3%</b>
Fall 2017-Spring 2018 N=168	33.3% N=56	22.0% N=37	31.1% N=54	5.4% N=9	6.5% N=11	0.6% N=1		<b>3.34</b>	<b>87.5%</b>

**Analysis:** The overall mean score ratings from cooperating teachers over a three-year time frame for the four assessment items were between 3.33 and 3.38. The self-assessment ratings are similar with a range between 3.30 and 3.43. The mean score ratings are all solid for the 4-point scale. Each instructional strategy item had a higher mean score rating in 2019-2020 than in 2018-2019.

**Action:** The EPP uses data from multiple assessments to gain insight from multiple perspectives. The faculty spend time teaching candidates about implementing their lessons and engaging students in their learning. The EPP teaches candidates many methods and instructional strategies for implementing lesson plans. The Technology section of the InTASC report has more information about the use of technology to engage students and enhance student learning.

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 8	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count	Mean	% 3 or >	% < 3	Count
Varies instructional strategies to engage learners.	3.40	94%	6%	333	3.37	90%	10%	489
Uses technology appropriately to enhance instruction.	3.43	92%	8%	332	3.39	92%	8%	489
Differentiates instruction for a variety of learning needs.	3.30	90%	10%	332	3.33	89%	11%	489
Instructional practices reflect effective communication skills.	3.43	93%	7%	333	3.37	91%	9%	489
Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. (Average Calculated)	3.39	92%	8%	1330	3.36	91%	9%	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
Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.	65.27 %	32.64 %	1.71 %	0.29 %	0.1 %	1051

**Analysis:** The “Agree” + “Tend to Agree” percentage of 97.91% or higher are extremely high. The items related to the use of technology are shared in the Technology section of the InTASC report.

**Action:** The data are favorable. Methods teachers work hard to prepare teacher candidates to utilize instructional strategies that align with learning goals and standards. Courses like EDUC 240 Educating Exceptional Students and EDUC 283 Understanding Cultural Diversity increase teacher candidate awareness for applying strategies to meet the needs of all their learners. Teacher candidates have opportunities to practice teaching to peers and P-12 students in field experiences like the EDUC 350/EDUC 351 practicum prior to student teaching.

## 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 8

<b>InTASC Standard 8 Learner and Learning</b>	<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>Values the exploration of how to use new and emerging technologies to promote student learning</b> (InTASC 8.q, 8.r) (Danielson 1d) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	seeks out opportunities to learn and apply new and emerging technologies that are engaging and result in learning.	In addition to score of "2" performance, partial success at score of "3"	explores ideas for using new and emerging technologies that are engaging and support learning.	In addition to score of "1" performance, partial success at score of "2"	lacks initiative for exploring new and emerging technologies that support learning.	

## 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
8	<b>Values the exploration of how to use new and emerging technologies to promote student learning</b> (InTASC 8.q, 8.r) (Danielson 1d) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	17	7	24	8	1	2.27	84.2%

## 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
8	<b>Values the exploration of how to use new and emerging technologies to promote student learning</b> (InTASC 8.q, 8.r) (Danielson 1d) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	44	10	16	1	1	2.66	97%

## 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
8	<b>Values the exploration of how to use new and emerging technologies to promote student learning</b> (InTASC 8.q, 8.r) (Danielson 1d) (MCEE II.A.1, II.A.3, C.1-2; III.A.1, B.3; IV.B.4)	51	17	29	4	0	2.57	96%

**Analysis:** The 2019-2020 data are stronger than the Spring 2019 pilot data. The cooperating teachers rated 97% of the teacher candidates at an acceptable level of 2 or higher and 96% of the teacher candidates rated themselves at a level of a 2 (meets expectations) or higher.

**Action:** The use of technology to enhance learning and engage learners has been important in the past. Valuing the need for continuous growth in the use of technology to promote student learning has increased in midst of the nation's 2020 pandemic. The EPP's faculty are utilizing technology and encouraging candidates to use technology even more than ever before.

#### 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)	Rating
<i>Implement - Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning – includes video and written narrative in Implement section of TLC template</i>								
<b>Rubric 5: Scaffolding Language</b> <i>How does the candidate support language development? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	Utilizes academic language and engages all students in the use of the targeted language to support language development and content learning.	In addition to rating “ 4” performance, partial success at rating of “ 3”	Utilizes academic language and engages students in the use of the targeted language to support language development and content learning.	In addition to rating “ 2” performance, partial success at rating of “ 3”	Utilizes academic language, but provides little evidence of student engagement.	With assistance, partial success at rating of “ 2”	Utilizes academic language, but does not engage students in using the language.	
<b>Rubric 6: Classroom Management</b> <i>How does the candidate utilize routines and procedures to manage the classroom? (InTASC 3 and 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	Leads a caring, fair and respectful learning environment in which routines and procedures are clear so students are engaged with minimal transition time.		Uses routines and procedures to manages classroom in an efficient manner to heighten learning opportunities.		Attempts to use routines and procedures to manage classroom activities.		Shows little use of classroom management routines or procedures; students are disengaged or disruptive to others	
<b>Rubric 7: Engagement in Standards-Based Instruction</b> <i>How does the candidate engage students in discussion to deepen their understanding? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)</i>	Engages students in discussions, tasks or activities at various levels of thinking that develop understandings of the standards-based content through both teacher-student and student-student interaction.		Engages students in discussions, tasks or activities that develop understandings of the standards-based content through teacher-student or student-student interaction.		Student engagement is teacher driven with some participation in discussions or activities that develop understandings of the standards-based content.		Lectures or assigns student work with limited or no student engagement.	

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
<b>Rubric 5: Scaffolding Language</b> <i>How does the candidate support language development? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	<b>3.09</b>	3.05	3.09	<b>3.11</b>
<b>Rubric 6: Classroom Management</b> <i>How does the candidate manage the classroom and actively engage students? (InTASC 3 and 8, CAEP 1.4)</i>	<b>3.02</b>	2.88	3.07	<b>3.05</b>
<b>Rubric 7: Engagement in Standards-Based Instruction</b> <i>How does the candidate elicit and monitor students’ responses to deepen their understanding? (InTASC 8, CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4)</i>	<b>3.08</b>	3.10	3.08	<b>3.07</b>

**Analysis:** The mean score ratings of 3.09, 3.02, and 3.08 are all respectable on a 4-point scale where 3.00 represents the proficient level. The data are not low enough to demand special attention and not high enough to draw praise. The 2018-2019 scores were very similar to the 2019-2020 scores.

**Action:** The EPP teaches candidates about the process of planning, implementing, evaluating, and reflecting on lessons for learning. The videos display teacher candidates engaging students in the implementation phase of the process. Teacher candidate efforts to scaffold academic language associated with their TLC unit, manage their classroom, and engage their students in standards-based instruction are displayed through videos of the student teacher working in a classroom with their students.

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

**InTASC Standard 8. 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)

Select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards	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	78.3%	5	21.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.78	23
2013	24	70.6%	9	26.5%	1	2.9%	0	0.0%	3.68	34
2014	28	65.1%	13	30.2%	2	4.7%	0	0.0%	3.60	43
2015	45	72.6%	16	25.8%	1	1.6%	0	0.0%	3.71	62
2016	34	69.4%	15	30.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.69	49
2017	37	61.7%	20	33.3%	1	1.7%	2	3.3%	3.53	60
2018	33	64.7%	17	33.3%	1	2.0%	0	0.0%	3.63	51
2019	35	62.5%	16	28.6%	5	8.9%	0	0.0%	3.54	56
2020	42	73.7%	14	24.6%	1	1.8%	0	0.0%	3.72	57
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>68.0%</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>28.7%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2.8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5%</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>435</b>

**Analysis:** The cumulative mean score rating of 3.64 is well over the 3.00 (tend to agree level) on a 4-point scale. It is encouraging to see the 2020 mean score ratings (3.72) were higher than the 2019 ratings (3.54). The data are extremely positive from 96.7% of the 435 completers who contributed to this data set.

**Action:** Faculty should recognize that completers believe they were well prepared to select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards.

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

**InTASC Standard 8. *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)

Selects instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards	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	70.4%	6	22.2%	2	7.4%	0	0.0%	3.63	27
2015	43	72.9%	15	25.4%	1	1.7%	0	0.0%	3.71	59
2016	33	68.8%	14	29.2%	1	2.1%	0	0.0%	3.67	48
2017	33	73.3%	12	26.7%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.73	45
2018	21	75.0%	6	21.4%	0	0.0%	1	3.6%	3.68	28
2019	25	61.0%	15	36.6%	1	2.4%	0	0.0%	3.59	41
2020	25	65.8%	13	34.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3.66	38
<b>Overall Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>69.6%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>28.3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1.7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>286</b>

**Analysis:** The cumulative mean score rating of 3.67 is well over the 3.00 (tend to agree level) on a 4-point scale. It is encouraging to see the 2020 mean score rating (3.66) was higher than the 2019 rating (3.59). The data are extremely positive from 97.9% of the 286 employers who contributed to this data set. The ratings of the employers 3.67 mean score and 97.9% “Agree” + “Tend to Agree” are extremely close to the completer mean score (3.64) and 96.7% agreement ratings.

**Action:** Faculty should recognize that teacher candidates, cooperating teachers, employers, and completers believe the EPP’s candidates are well prepared to select instructional strategies to align with learning goals and standards. The pursuit of continuous improvement lives on, but it is encouraging to know that completers and employers agree on the preparation level of teacher candidates at such a high level.