

Retreat
Review of data
Dec. 20, 2012

Hanover College
Fall 2012-13
Jonathan Dee

Pre and Post Test Assessment Summary

2.3.e

Observations and items to highlight:

1. Some adhered to the one page requirement, others did not. It would appear that several found difficulty staying to one page.
2. A large majority met the target range of a (3) or better, in terms of total indicators
3. The met/not met percentage is very different comparing elementary and secondary
 - a. Secondary had 100% target met.
4. Alignment to student objectives appears to be the weaker area. Upon looking at the procedure, meeting objectives is not clearly stated. It only appears in the rubric.
5. A student teaching seminar was added, which specifically addressed the pre/post-test. This could help explain the large improvement across the board.

Addressing last year's changes for improvement

1. Sync language in the rubric to language in the procedure, and make it clearer.
 - a. From looking at the narrative of each assessment, it is clear that the language is understandable and translates well from the rubric to the assessment.
2. Help students understand procedure #8
 - a. There is definite progression with this improvement from last term, more notably in the elementary data.

Suggestions for improvement:

1. Better training and guidance with this assessment to adjunct instructors or outside EDU faculty who mentor student teachers.
2. We were unable to get to this during our summer retreat. It would be helpful to determine what is met target as an entire assessment. Do candidates need a (3) on all categories, only 4?
 - a. Under certain programs, such as P.E., Health, and Social Studies, it is a requirement to get at least a 3 in every category.
3. Determine how strict the Department will be on the "one page" rule. There were definitely two students who went over one page, which then helped their scores increase.

Elementary Student Teaching Totals				
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated	
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives 2	Implicit alignment with student objectives 2	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 3	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met	
	Adds patterns and differences between pre and post results	Adds strengths and weaknesses in student learning 5	Adds patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 2	
	Adds validity of pre and post test results 1	Adds validity of the pre-post test 1	Adds adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 5	
		Adds ways to adjust test, instruction, or curriculum for poor performers 3	Adds new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 3	

Elementary Totals: 2 = 7%

4 = 14%

12 = 43%

10 = 36%

Total indicators = Met/Not Met

Total Elementary Fall 2012
 Total Elementary Winter 2012
 Total Elementary Fall 2011

Met Target: 79%
 Met Target: 69.2%
 Met Target: 94%

Target Not Met: 21%
 Target Not Met: 30.8%
 Target Not Met: 6%

Secondary Student Teaching Totals			
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives	Implicit alignment with student objectives	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 3	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met
	Addresses patterns and differences between pre and post results	Addresses strengths and weaknesses in student learning 1	Addresses patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 2
	Addresses validity of pre and post test results	Addresses validity of the pre-post test 2	Addresses adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 1
		Addresses ways to adjust test, instruction, or curriculum for poor performers 1	Addresses new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 2

Secondary Totals: 7 = 58.33% 5 = 41.67%

Total indicators = Met/Not Met	
Total Secondary Fall 2012	Met Target: 100% Target Not Met: 0%
Total Secondary Winter 2012	Met Target: 66.66% Target Not Met: 33.34%
Total Secondary Fall 2011	Met Target: 100% Target Not Met: 0%

Combined Secondary and Elementary Student Teaching Totals:			
Score of 1 or Incomplete	Score of 2 or Descriptive and Limited	Score of 3 or Plausible and Insightful	Score of 4 or In-depth and Sophisticated
No alignment with 5-12 student objectives 2	Implicit alignment with student objectives 2	Evidence of alignment with student objectives 6	Explicit explanation of student objectives met or not met
	Addresses patterns and differences between pre and post results	Addresses strengths and weaknesses in student learning 6	Addresses patterns in individual results and for students with special needs or cultural differences 4
	Addresses validity of pre and post test results 1	Addresses validity of the pre-post test 3	Addresses adjustments to be made in the pre-post assessments 6
	1	4	Addresses new strategies for improving student learning for individuals, subgroups, or whole class 5

Overall Totals: 2=5%

4=10%

19=47.5%

15 = 37.5%

Overall Total Fall 2012	Met Target: 85%	Target Not Met: 15%
Overall Total Winter 2012	Met Target: 68%	Target Not Met: 32%

PassPort Conversation

December 20, 2012

- A. Can we pay in advance for subscription for 60 candidates through our 2013 budget @ \$2200?
- B. Can we get a curriculum proposal for EDU 230 approved before graduation?
- C. Can we arrange for all candidates and Fall, EDU 230 be assessed \$38 subscription in Fall, 2013?
- D. What are other questions that we have about PassPort?
- E. Can we standardize SPA assessment rubrics for scores of 1, 2, 3, or 4?

Assignments Candidates Would Submit into PassPort

Example for English Language Arts Candidate:

Decision Point 1

- Copy of unofficial transcript at time of candidacy
- Copy of teacher placement exam results
- ELL paper from EDU 230
- Kidwatching paper from EDU 230

Decision Point 2

- Practice teaching rubric from mentor
- Practice teaching rubric from methods course instructor
- Interview rubric (does not exist yet)
- Survey from teacher mentor(s)
- Cross-cultural paper (rubric does not exist yet)
- COM 240 oral presentation rubric
- ENG 220 assignment (not designated yet)
- Copy of unofficial transcript

Decision Point 3

- Urban experience paper (rubric does not exist yet)
- Interdisciplinary unit and analysis of teaching and learning (rubric does not exist yet)
- Pre/post assignment
- Final student teaching evaluation

Decision Point 4

- Copy of teacher placement exam results
- Copy of teacher license??

PORTFOLIO SCORING GUIDE

TEA EDUCATION PROGRAM - HANOVER COLLEGE

January 2010 Abbreviated

I. Competence: Critical Thinking (INTASC Principle 4, 6 & 8)

Criteria	Notes from Scorer	Level 2	Notes from Scorers	Level 3
Type of Thinking	✓✓✓✓	<p>* Uses a variety of instructional strategies ✓✓✓</p> <p>* Provides some support for student self-evaluation to help them become aware of their strengths and needs ✓✓✓✓✓</p>	81%	<p>* Uses a variety of instructional strategies which promote higher level thinking and problem solving ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Supports student self-evaluation to help them become aware of their strengths and needs and encourages learners to set educational goals ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Diverse Perspectives	✓✓	<p>* Encourages critical thinking or problem-solving by generating more than one solution or response ✓✓✓</p> <p>* Encourages student discussion ✓✓</p>	77%	<p>* Encourages critical thinking and problem solving by presenting diverse perspectives and representations (authors, genres, posters, languages, models, media sources, countries, etc.) ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Encourages student discussion about the discipline and respect for student ideas and opinions. ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Role of Teacher	•	<p>* Conducts mostly teacher-directed lessons with some role variation ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>	64%	<p>* Varies the role of teacher to include instructor, coach, audience member, participant, etc. ✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓✓</p>

Criteria	Notes from Scorer	Level 2	Notes from Scorers	Level 3
Analysis of Learning	<p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p> <p>✓</p>	<p>*Assessments are used to assess learning and student strengths and weaknesses ✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Describes some resources other than classroom assessment that could be used to understand learner needs and behavior ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Identifies criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks are evaluated and graded ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Has provided instructional and assessment opportunities that allow some students to demonstrate that they have met the learning goals ✓✓✓✓✓</p>	<p>88%</p> <p>50%</p> <p>33%</p> <p>77%</p>	<p>*Varied assessments are used to assess learning and modify instruction or learning goals (present or future) ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Uses multiple sources of information in order to understand learner needs and behavior ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Communicates criteria for assignments and assessment tasks; tasks are accurately evaluated and graded; students receive helpful feedback ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Has provided instructional and assessment opportunities that allow most students to demonstrate that they have met the learning goals ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Assessments are evaluated with an understanding of validity, reliability, and bias ✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Analysis of Assessment	<p>✓✓✓</p>	<p>* Provides some discussion or analysis related to measurement issues ✓✓✓✓✓</p>	<p>36%</p>	<p>* Uses problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning adjustments ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Documents direct and/or indirect relationships between teaching decisions and student learning ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Participates and documents professional development ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Consistently uses feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers ✓✓✓✓✓</p>
Analysis of Teaching	<p>✓✓</p> <p>✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>✓✓</p>	<p>* Attempts problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning ✓✓</p> <p>*Suggests possible direct and/or indirect relationship between teaching decisions and student learning ✓✓</p> <p>*Identifies professional resources as a teacher and learner ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Accepts feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers ✓✓</p>	<p>91%</p> <p>95%</p> <p>45%</p> <p>59%</p>	<p>* Uses problem-solving strategies to improve teaching practice and student learning adjustments ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Documents direct and/or indirect relationships between teaching decisions and student learning ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>* Participates and documents professional development ✓✓✓✓✓</p> <p>*Consistently uses feedback from supervisors and mentor teachers ✓✓✓✓✓</p>

Portfolio Scoring Guide Categories

Categories in Bold are department goals (see ALT Report)
August, 2011

KD	Knowledge of the discipline
TD	Teaching of the discipline
DD	Discourse about the discipline
PS	Planning based on student
PA	Planning based on assessment
PD	Planning based on discipline
IG	Instructional groups
TS	Use of time and space
C	Communication
HOTS	Type of thinking
DP	Diverse perspectives
ROLE	Roles of teacher and student
ID	Individual differences
CD	Cultural differences
CMT	Commitment to positive interaction, involvement, laws and safety
AL	Analysis of learning
AA	Analysis of assessment
AT	Analysis of teaching

Goals as reported in ALT:

Title II #1: Recruit teacher candidates interested in teaching mathematics.

Title II #2: Recruit teacher candidates interested in teaching science.

Title II #3: Increase opportunities for teacher candidates interested in special education.

Title II #4: Increase professional development in teaching English language learners.

Goal #4: EDU candidates will design learning activities and use instructional materials that extend learning related to issues of diversity. Related to Title II #3 and 4 above!

Tools for assessing: final portfolio, student teaching evaluation, lesson series or practice teaching at junior or mid-level in each program

Goal # 7: EDU candidates will use varied assessment tools, support K-12 students' self-evaluation and set high expectations for all learners.

Tools for assessing: final portfolio, student teaching evaluation, lesson series or practice teaching at junior or mid-level in each program

Han No 2 Scores Summary

2010-11 Portfolio Scores

Levels 1-3	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average
Met Target	91%	78%	82%	82%	84%	74%	82%	91%	73%	77%	64%	82%	53%	77%	80%	73%	91%	70%	53%	74%

2008-09 Portfolio Scores

Levels 1-4	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average
Met Target	34%	41%	55%	47%	60%	50%	58%	47%	40%	55%	72%	63%	62%	48%	47%	52%	84%	56%	75%	56%
Exceeded Target	66%	59%	28%	53%	23%	50%	38%	53%	47%	36%	22%	21%	27%	11%	27%	36%	16%	14%	5%	33%
Total Met or Exceeded Target	100%	100%	83%	100%	83%	100%	96%	100%	87%	91%	94%	84%	89%	59%	92%	88%	100%	70%	80%	88%

2007-08 Portfolio Scores

Candidate	Level	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average
1	Elementar	4.00	4.00	3.13	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	3.75	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.00	3.00	3.75	4.00	3.13	3.63		
2	Elementar	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.25	2.88	2.88	4.00	2.88	2.88	3.00	2.50	3.00	3.75	3.33	
3	Elementar	3.50	3.25	3.25	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	3.25	2.88	3.00	2.88	3.25	2.88	2.75	3.50	3.25	3.20	3.20	
4	Elementar	3.88	3.25	4.00	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.25	2.88	3.50	3.00	3.50	3.10	2.88	2.50	3.50	3.25	3.25	3.31	3.31	
5	Elementar	3.88	3.00	3.88	3.00	3.63	3.00	3.75	3.88	3.88	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.75	3.00	3.25	3.00	3.38	
6	Elementar	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.50	2.50	3.50	3.25	3.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.50	3.50	2.25	3.50	3.00	2.94	2.94	
7	Elementar	3.88	2.88	2.88	2.25	2.25	2.88	3.00	3.00	3.25	2.75	2.75	2.75	2.88	2.75	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.75	2.89	
8	Elementar	1.50	3.00	2.50	3.25	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.25	3.00	2.25	2.00	3.00	2.75	2.86	
9	Elementar	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.25	2.88	3.00	3.75	2.88	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.67	
10	Elementar	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.50	3.00	2.88	3.25	3.25	2.75	3.88	3.50	2.00	3.00	2.88	3.50	2.75	2.50	3.15	3.15	
11	Elementar	3.50	3.88	3.50	3.88	3.50	3.50	3.75	3.50	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.88	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.78	3.78	
12	Secondar	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.83	3.83	
13	Secondar	4.00	2.75	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	3.25	2.25	3.88	2.50	2.88	3.00	2.50	2.88	3.00	1.88	3.50	3.88	2.97	
14	Secondar	3.50	3.75	3.88	3.75	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.88	4.00	4.00	3.88	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.00	3.13	3.70	3.70	
15	Secondar	4.00	3.25	3.00	3.88	3.88	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.88	4.00	3.88	3.50	3.50	3.25	2.75	2.88	3.55	3.55	
16	Secondar	3.75	3.50	3.38	3.25	3.25	3.00	3.25	4.00	3.50	3.00	3.88	3.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	3.00	2.63	3.22	3.22	

Category	Average	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average	
Overall	3.52	3.48	3.35	3.56	3.24	3.42	3.52	3.45	3.45	3.45	3.33	3.35	3.13	3.31	3.19	3.23	3.24	3.44	3.24	3.44	3.44	3.34

2006-07 Portfolio Scores

Candidate	Level	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average	
1	Elementar	3.17	4.00	3.17	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.00	2.50	3.50	2.84	2.50	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.29	3.29		
2	Elementar	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.67	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.67	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.82	3.82	
3	Elementar	3.30	3.30	3.56	4.00	3.22	3.67	3.78	3.67	3.67	3.67	3.22	3.78	4.00	3.57	3.33	3.44	2.67	4.00	3.55	3.55	
4	Elementar	3.67	3.84	3.34	3.67	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.67	3.33	3.84	3.67	3.84	3.84	3.11	4.00	3.84	3.50	3.84	3.70	3.70	
5	Elementar	3.33	3.17	3.50	3.34	3.67	3.34	3.50	3.50	3.11	2.84	3.00	3.50	4.00	2.50	3.11	3.50	3.50	3.67	3.34	3.34	
6	Elementar	3.50	3.67	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.84	3.50	3.50	3.67	4.00	3.11	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.69	3.69	
7	Secondar	3.50	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.50	3.17	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.11	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.50	4.00	3.63	3.63	3.63	
8	Secondar	4.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.17	3.84	3.50	4.00	3.84	3.50	3.00	3.67	3.50	3.00	3.84	3.84	3.00	4.00	3.65	3.65	
9	Secondar	3.50	3.50	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.84	3.67	3.00	3.50	3.50	3.00	4.00	3.50	2.50	3.00	2.50	4.00	3.45	3.45	3.45	
10	Secondar	2.67	3.67	4.00	3.67	3.00	3.34	3.17	3.34	3.84	3.50	3.67	3.11	3.67	2.84	3.34	3.00	2.67	3.11	3.31	3.31	
11	Secondar	3.34	3.50	3.50	3.84	2.50	3.50	3.67	3.00	3.34	3.84	3.67	3.00	3.67	2.50	2.84	2.50	3.00	3.26	3.26	3.26	
12	Secondar	3.84	3.50	4.00	4.00	3.50	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.00	3.50	3.84	4.00	3.67	3.84	4.00	3.84	4.00	3.82	3.82	3.82	
13	Secondar	4.00	2.50	2.84	2.67	3.50	2.67	1.84	2.34	3.50	3.11	3.00	3.00	2.84	2.50	2.67	3.50	3.50	3.67	2.95	2.95	

Category	Average	KD	TD	DD	PS	PA	PD	IG	TS	C	HOTS	DP	ROLE	ID	CD	AA	AT	CI	CIV	CLS	Average	
Overall	3.52	3.55	3.57	3.78	3.51	3.44	3.41	3.50	3.50	3.66	3.46	3.36	3.46	3.68	3.18	3.39	3.24	3.71	3.71	3.71	3.50	3.50

Title II Report – Priority #1

KAY

1. The Title II report is mainly about reporting numbers and program requirements. It is very important that the correct number (in every sense; by major, gender, program, ethnicity) of program completers is accurately reported.
2. The report instructions have yet to be handed out. You will receive an email from Director Jeff Botteron, IDOE, hopefully by the second week in January. There is no longer a specific position at the IDOE as point person for Title II. Therefore it is extremely important to get questions to Jeff as soon as possible.
3. It was the inaccurate and late reporting of the Title II report, which got us into trouble 2 years ago. Inaccurate reporting carries a fine of \$2000 or so dollars if it is noticed and fixed by a certain date (usually in mid-March). If it is still inaccurate by April, this carries a \$27,500.00 fine. (25 Program Completers for 2012)
4. It is important to have the most updated IHE user manual, which can be obtained off of the Title II website (same one that data is housed in). KAY has reports
5. Please see Title II folder for more information.

PEDs and IDOE Annual - Priority #2

1. Parts A and B of the PEDS report, essentially is the organizing of data into a prescribed form.
 - a. Be advised that the reporting form for PEDs operates differently than Title II. Title II asks for data from September 1, 2011- August 31, 2012. PEDS DOES NOT.
2. Part C (also referred to as the NCATE/IDOE Annual report). This report will be uploaded via the AIMS website. In the past the IDOE has also required it emailed to them. However, this may not be the case. Be sure to inquire with Jeff Botteron.

SPA Program Reports – Priority #3

1. It is important that data for each program report is gathered and uploaded by September 1st, 2013.

Licensing – Priority #4

1. Licensing is fairly straight forward as there are only a handful of licenses we have, and only at two development levels.

Database – Priority #5

1. It is important that transfer to passport begin soon.

Student Teacher Placement – Priority #6

1. Superintendent forms need to be signed for each corporation used for placement. *yearly*
2. Principals must also sign off on the teacher through another form.
3. It is wise to plan the summer and fall orientation dates in the winter term. This way a mailing can be sent out to future cooperating mentors before school lets out. Some let out by late May, so having such a mailing complete by early May is best. A suggest a mailing in addition to emails, as our email tends to go right into spam with several institutions.

Technology – Priority #7

1. With the purchase of the second Promethean Board, there should be about \$12,503.75 left in the Mount Gift Fund.
2. Alex Whitely is the representative from Promethean, and I emailed you all his number.
3. When looking at our original budget 4 days were budgeted for training and 4 for consulting. As of today, we have only used 2 of those days (from Lisa Cutstall, as the PD from Alex was free with our purchase), and only used .5 days for consulting from Lisa. Of course, the Department may not need any more training at this point.
4. From my opinion, it would be logical to continue PD with Lisa, as Madison is far ahead of most corporations. I would also encourage you all to attend ISTE's national conference.

Spicer Phillips – Priority #8

1. We have 4 student teachers in Urban Areas and 3 who are in rural. Thus far I have only received forms from Brandon Doub, Mary West, and Lauren Clark. As Mary is the only one living in an apartment, that I am aware of, her lease is included.
2. The scholarship must not be processed until we know that the student's account with paid. Otherwise, it will go towards whatever is on there, such as a hold, tuition, etc... This may be want the student wants, as with Megan Greenwell, but it is important to ask first.
3. After the forms are collected and you approve, they go to Jennifer Shelly in Admissions.

Accreditation- Priority #9

1. Onsite visit is April 6-8 2014, which puts the IR due on August 6th, 2013.

ISTE conference

\$12,000⁰⁰

Department of Education Planning Timeline 2013-2015

Year	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
2013	Confirm student teaching arrangements Begin work with PassPort	Feedback from social studies, ELA, PE/Health SPAs	Visual Arts program update due to IDOE Title II resolution by 3/13 <i>3/15 e/ed response</i>	PEDS due 4/20 Annual NCATE report due 4/19 <i>IPRC - Title II 4/30/13</i>	Suicide prevention workshop due for seniors	ALT report		IR due 8/6	Kay's FEC dossier due <i>9/15 e/ed response</i> All program completers under REPA New Pearson Teacher Core Assessment <i>2/13 NCTM response</i> PassPort for EDU 230		Off-site review	Schedule mock review as retreat? DATA SET 2
2014			3/6-8 Continuing Accreditation Visit	<i>4/6/13</i>					SPA response to conditions due 9/15 at the latest!			DATA SET 3
2015												

Department Assignments (somewhat separate from UAS schedule of responsibilities)

Section II – List of Social Studies Assessments

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment is Administered
Assessment #1: Licensure content-based assessment	PRAXIS II	External standardized paper-pencil teacher placement exam (ETS)	Decision Point 3: During or after student teaching and before graduation
Assessment #2 Content knowledge in History	Major Course Grades	Major in History or Political Science, with supplemental social studies courses	Freshman-Senior year
Assessment #3 Candidate ability to plan and lead instruction	Practice Teaching Assessment (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based evaluation by supervisor and mentor teacher	Practice Teaching: mid-level or junior year before student teaching
Assessment #4 Student teaching evaluation	Student teaching final evaluation (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based collaborative evaluation by supervisor, student teacher, and cooperating teacher mentor	End of student teaching assignment
Assessment #5 Candidate effect on student learning	Pre-post student assessment assignment	Performance-based pre and post assessment of student learning	Decision Point 3: During student teaching
Assessment #6 Assessment that addresses NCSS	Final portfolio evaluation (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based evaluation of teacher certification work	Decision Point 3: After student teaching
Assessment #6 Assessment that addresses NCSS standards	Reflection on Standards 1.3, 1.8, and 1.9	Typed essay	Junior/Senior year before student teaching

Section II – List of Health Education Assessments

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment is Administered
Assessment #1: Licensure content-based assessment	PRAXIS II (0550)	External standardized paper-pencil teacher placement exam (ETS)	Decision Point 3: During or after student teaching and before graduation
Assessment #2 Content knowledge in Health Education	Health and Movement Study Major (new, replaced at the comprehensive exam from first report)	Major course grades in Health and Movement Studies course of Study	Senior year before graduation
Assessment #3 Candidate ability to plan and lead instruction	Decision Point 2 Practice Teaching (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based evaluation by supervising faculty	Decision Point 2: mid-level or junior year before student teaching (works in conjunction with Assessment #7)
Assessment #4 Student teaching evaluation	Student teaching final evaluation (revised for 2012-2013)	Performance-based collaborative evaluation by college faculty supervisor, student teacher, and cooperating health public teacher mentor	End of student teaching assignment
Assessment #5 Candidate effect on student learning	Pre-post student assessment assignment	Performance-based pre and post assessment of student learning	Decision Point 3: During student teaching
Assessment #6 Assessment that addresses AAHE standards	Hanover College Fitness Test (new for this revised report)	Performance-based evaluation	Decision Point 1 and 2: As a student becomes a candidate and right before student teaching
Assessment #7 Candidate ability to plan and lead instruction	Unit Plan (new for this revised report)	Written and performance-based evaluation by health education College faculty	Decision Point 2: mid-level or junior year before student teaching (works in conjunction with Assessment #3)

Section II – List of Health Education Assessments

Type and Number of Assessment	Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment is Administered
Assessment #1: Licensure content-based assessment	PRAXIS II (0550)	External standardized paper-pencil teacher placement exam (ETS)	Decision Point 3: During or after student teaching and before graduation
Assessment #2 Content knowledge in Health Education	Health and Movement Study Major	Major course grades in Health and Movement Studies course of Study	Senior year before graduation
Assessment #3 Candidate ability to plan and lead instruction	Practice Teaching (revised for 2012-2013)	Performance based evaluation	Decision Point 2: mid-level or junior year before student teaching
Assessment #4 Student teaching evaluation	Student teaching final evaluation (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based collaborative evaluation by college faculty supervisor, student teacher, and cooperating health public teacher mentor	End of student teaching assignment
Assessment #5 Candidate effect on student learning	Pre-post student assessment assignment (added for 2011-12, revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based pre and post assessment of student learning	Decision Point 3: During student teaching
Assessment #6 Assessment that addresses AAHE standards	Final portfolio evaluation (revised for 2012-13)	Performance-based evaluation of teacher certification work	Decision Point 3: End of student teaching before graduation
Assessment #7 Candidate ability to plan and lead instruction	Unit Plan (added for 2012-13)	Written and performance-based evaluation by health education College faculty	Decision Point 2: mid-level or junior year before student teaching

Hanover College Department of Education
Criteria for Mentor Teachers and Professor Evaluation of Mentor

Date of Evaluation: 2012-13 data (n=23) based on supervisor scores
 2011-12 data, n = 25

Criteria for Mentors	1 Unacceptable, not recommended	2 Developing	3 Meets criteria	4 Exceeds criteria
a. The teacher is recommended by his/her principal			3 13% 16%	20 87% 80%
b. The teacher has at least three years of teaching experience in that building.	4% 4%		2 9% 4%	21 91% 92%
c. The teacher collaborates effectively with teacher candidate.		2 9%	4 17% 16%	17 74% 76%
d. The teacher has a positive attitude about children, about teaching, and about mentoring teacher candidates.	8% 4%	1 4%	3 13% 24%	19 83% ↑ 72%
e. The teacher uses best practice and differentiated instruction to address needs of all students.	4%	1 4% 8%	9 39% 36%	13 57% 52%
f. The teacher is committed to using academic standards and to on-going assessment of student learning.	4%	3 13%	6 26% ↑ 8%	14 61% ↓ 88%
g. The teacher is culturally responsive.	4%	2 9% 20%	9 39% ↑ 24%	12 52% 52%

Data to be analyzed
 2.3.e

Qualitative Feedback from Student Teachers About Their Mentors

2012-13 n=11

Organization and information provided by the mentor teacher

9 or 82% marked **excellent**

1 or 9% marked **satisfactory**

1 or 9% marked **needs improvement**

- Great ideas, shared all resources, great to work together— co-teaching
- Organized with student teaching materials, always kept me informed
- Was ready to go every day and provided valuable information
- Sometimes neither of us were quite sure on some requirements
- Provided real life situations and teaching opportunities (challenging)
- Super organized! He also set up great classroom management that made for easy transitioning

Communication with mentor teacher about my performance in the classroom

9 or 82% marked **excellent**

1 or 9% marked **satisfactory**

1 or 9% marked **needs improvement**

- Met/talked daily about progress/performance, etc
- At times was helpful yet sometimes tone was hurtful
- She always made sure to let me know how my teaching was for the day; very helpful!
- Was always open and honest about my performance and what needed improvement
- Did not shy away from criticizing with feedback (good & bad)
- Almost instant response when I email about planning and such; always makes time/sets time aside for discussion before, after, and sometimes during school

Use of assessments by the mentor

10 or 91% marked instructional observations as **appropriate to the goals of the student teaching experience**

7 or 64% marked instructional observations as **sufficiently descriptive to record progress**

- Used constant informal and formal assessments to keep up with progress of students
- Very beneficial! It helped me know where to go next with my teaching
- Enables both mentor and advisor to monitor growth and direct feedback for goals

10 or 91% marked midterm and final evaluation as **appropriate to the goals of the student teaching experience**

6 or 55% marked midterm and final evaluation as **sufficiently descriptive to record progress**

1.3.f, 2.3.e, 2.3.h

Decision Point 2 data

Comparison of 2011-2012-2013 cohorts:

Student teaching goals	2011		2012		2013	
	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary	Elementary	Secondary
Competence:						
Use of technology	35%	10%	15%	37.5%	-	-
Creative/engaging lessons	41%	50%	15%	12.5%	-	25%
Planning-detailed, advance	47%	50%	15%	25%	30.7%	27.5%
English concerns	-	10%	10%	25%	-	12.5%
Teaching strategies-balancing fun with standards, slow down, motivate students, clear directions	-	10%	25%	25%	38.5%	37.5%
Content knowledge	52.9%	10%	70%	12.5%	7%	-
Varied teaching and assessment strategies		30%		-	92%	14%
Classroom Management	82.4%	100%	50%	100%	84.6%	75%
Voice /teacher presence	70.6%		100%	100%	76.9%	37.5%
Withitness	-		-		30.7%	25%
Critically Reflective:						
Seeking and receptive to feedback	29%	20%	10%	37.5%	38.4%	37.5%
Data to guide instruction-circular model of instruction	41%	60%	15%	50%	-	62.5%
Culturally Responsive:						
Diverse Learners	52.9%	80%	50%	100%	84.6%	62.5%
Commitment:						
Initiative	11.7%	40%	20%	25%	15%	50%
Confidence	-	-	-	-	38.5%	-
Professional manner	5.8%	-	5%	12.5%	7%	-
Taking risks outside comfort zone (transitioning from large to small group instruction-2013)	11.7%	20%	15%	-	53.8%	14%

Pre and Post Test Assignment

Group 2013

Elementary

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4
	Student Objectives	5	2	6	2
	Patterns		1	8	6
	Measurement		1	4	10
	Strategies and RTI		1	6	8
		5		24	26

15
15
15
15
55

Group 2013

Math

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4
	Student Objectives		1		
	Patterns				1
	Measurement			1	
	Strategies and RTI				1
			1	1	2

1
1
1
1
4

Group 2013

English Language

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4
	Student Objectives			4	0
	Patterns		1	1	2
	Measurement			2	2
	Strategies and RTI			2	2
			1	9	6

4
4
4
4
16

Group 2013

Social Studies History & Government

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4
	Student Objectives				2
	Patterns				2
	Measurement	1			1
	Strategies and RTI				2
		1			7

2
2
2
2
8

Group 2013

Visual Arts

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4
	Student Objectives				1
	Patterns				1
	Measurement				1
	Strategies and RTI				1
					4

1
1
1
1
4

Pre and Post Test Assignment

Group 2013

Elementary

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4	
	Student Objectives	5	2	6	2	15
	Patterns		1	8	6	15
	Measurement		1	4	10	15
	Strategies and RTI		1	6	8	15
		5		24	26	55

Group 2013

Math

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4	
	Student Objectives		1			1
	Patterns				1	1
	Measurement			1		1
	Strategies and RTI				1	1
			1	1	2	4

Group 2013

English Language

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4	
	Student Objectives			4	1	5
	Patterns		1	1	3	5
	Measurement			2	3	5
	Strategies and RTI			2	3	5
			1	9	10	20

Group 2013

Social Studies

Standards	Theme	1	2	3	4	
	Student Objectives				1	1
	Patterns				1	1
	Measurement	1				1
	Strategies and RTI				1	1
		1			3	4