|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Candidate**  **2011 Cohort #1** | **Program** | **%**  **Met\*** |
| Cottingham | Visual arts | 83 |
| Lebrun | Visual arts | 100 |
| Steward | Mathematics | 60 |
| Ciminowasielewski | English language arts | 77 |
| **Average % met** |  | **81** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Candidate**  **2012 Cohort #2** | **Program** | **%**  **Met\*** |
| Hunteman (58% 1st round) | Visual arts | 83 |
| Doehrman | Mathematics | 67 |
| Jeffries | English language arts | 92 |
| Morganett | English language arts | 100 |
| Nading | English language arts | 100 |
| West | English language arts | 100 |
| Meredith | English language arts | 77 |
| Gilb | Historical perspectives | 82 |
| Koon | Government | 78 |
| **Average % met** |  | **87** |
| **Cohort comparison** |  | **+6** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Candidate**  **2013 Cohort #3** | **Program** | **%**  **Met\*** |
| Britt | Historical Perspectives | 90% |
| Detienne | Health & Movement Studies | 92% |
| Gentry | Historical Perspectives | 71% |
| Jones | Mathematics | 86% |
| Lefever | English language arts | 84% |
| Martin | English language arts | 100% |
| Masters | Government | 92% |
| Regan | Health & Movement Studies | 92% |
| Wise | Visual arts | 100% |
| **Average % met** |  | **89.6%** |
| **Cohort comparison** |  | **+8.6** |

\*Percent met means that candidate scored a 3 or 4 (out of 4) per indicator in the rubric. N/A mark was counted as “not met.”

Criteria Not Met in 2013 cohort:

IDOE 6: Demonstrates a broad and comprehensive understanding of major events and developments in Indiana history \*\*

Integrates multicultural curriculum using Banks’ framework\*\*\*\*\*

IDOE 9.2 Adapts and modifies curriculum, instructional approaches, behavior management strategies, equipment, paying areas, and organizational strategies to support students with disabilities\*\*

IDOE 4: Demonstrates a broad and comprehensive understanding of major events and developments in world history

IDOE 7.5: Demonstrates a broad and comprehensive understanding of instructional strategies for promoting student learning and fostering the development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills in the social studies

IDOE 7.8: Demonstrates a broad and comprehensive understanding of strategies and skills for effectively assessing student understanding and mastery of essential historical concepts and skills

NCTE 3.5.3: Apply knowledge of works written for older children and young adults

IDOE & NCTE 3.6.3: Incorporates current technology to help students compose and respond to film, video, graphic, photographic, audio, and multimedia texts

NCTE 4.1: Examines and selects resources for ELA instruction

Mentor assessment of candidate performance invalid for the required 30 hours of field experience and practice teaching requirements (Gentry)

**Analysis of Three Secondary Cohorts Using New Differentiated Practice Teaching Assessment #3**

The EPP examined data for three secondary cohorts, who were first to use a new differentiated practice teaching assessment beginning in the second semester of 2011-12. There were six Fall 2011 secondary candidates who did not use this new key assessment #3 as approved by the Indiana Department of Education for the visual arts program and by NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, AAHE and NASPE SPAs. The data indicates that 16/22 junior secondary candidates (73%) met the EPP’s 80% mark for meeting corresponding SPA and Indiana teacher standards. The one history candidate in 2013 should have had high scores; scoring by her mentor seems less valid, in that too many indicators were not given a score. Criteria not scored were inconsistent, given the regularity of all other 21 scored rubrics. All scores represent judgments made by mentor teachers after one semester of field experience (30 hours). Secondary candidates steadily increased the percent of indicators met in three cohorts. It is noteworthy to see that the three mathematics majors increased percent of criteria met from 60 to 67 to 86%. The three visual arts majors and all English majors seem to be consistently successful in meeting over 80% of standard indicators in all three cohorts. The 11 men and 11 women seem to have similar performances. Aggregated strengths include knowledge of content, content specific pedagogy, and commitment to teaching. Consistent area of weakness seemed to be the indicator related to knowing and teaching Indiana history. Field experience placement and timing needed to coincide with when Indiana history curriculum was taught. This match was not always possible. Teacher candidates are expected to incorporate multicultural curriculum in their formal lesson plans, regardless of the content being taught. Mentor teachers too frequently allow the teacher candidate a “pass” on this requirement. This means that the EPP needs to more carefully prepare teacher mentors for this mid-level Decision Point 2 requirement. Another related area of weakness in associated with the teacher candidate’s ability to adapt curriculum and instruction for learners with special needs. This particular indicator which appears in all practice teaching rubrics is part of the EPP’s focus (CF) on preparing culturally responsive new teachers. All mid-level or junior secondary candidates noted in this data are also required to complete an analysis of student learning via the pre/post assessment assignment. This candidate assessment is a key assessment in all programs. Candidates analyze student data from pre and post assessments and must link results with students who have special needs and identify accommodations or adaptations that should have been made or could be made in the case of low-performance. Therefore, in all cases the teacher candidate should meet the IDOE criteria of: **Adapts and modifies curriculum, instructional approaches, behavior management strategies, equipment, paying areas, and organizational strategies to support students with disabilities** by the end of the semester. Areas of weakness could include three NCTE standard criteria noted above; these criteria are all related to the candidate’s consideration of resources and literature available to the English teacher and students. This particular weakness should be more seriously considered by the College English Department, the EDU English language arts methods course instructors, and the mentor teachers.

Historically and as the EPP first proposed SPA programs, there were several ways in which candidate data was analyzed. There are two examples below that illustrate how raw data was organized. Given guidelines from SPAs and from PassPort, the organization of data per assessment is cleaner, more consistent, better organized and consequently more reliable.

**Example 1 (June, 2011) without teacher standard alignment and without clear scoring criteria:**

EDU Summary of Secondary Practice Teaching Assessment, Decision Point 2

N = 1 chemistry, 3 physical education and health, 2 mathematics, 2 English, 1 German, 2 art = 11

**Please indicate a score using the following scale:**

**1 = unsatisfactory 2 = basic 3 = satisfactory 4 = strong x = not addressed in course**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indiana Standards/SPA Standards | **Criteria: Content Competence** | Scores per 11 candidates listed above as marked by mentors or Content Area Specialists | Comments | Score averages |
|  | Demonstrates broad and comprehensive understanding of structures, characteristics, principles, procedures, presentation, or applications given the content | 4 3 3 3 4 3 3 3 3 |  | 3.22 |
|  | **Criteria: Content Pedagogy** |  |  |  |
| IDOE | Addresses common core standards in the lesson | x x x x x x x x x x | All candidates addressed Indiana student proficiencies | 0.00 |
| IDOE | Demonstrates ability to differentiate instruction (RtI) to meet the needs of all learners at Tier 1 | x x 3 4 4 2 x x 2 x |  | 3.00 for 50% of candidates |
| IDOE | Demonstrates strategies for using technology to enhance teaching and learning | x x 2 3 4 2 4 2 3 3 |  | 2.88 for 80% of candidates |
| INTASC and Conceptual Framework | **Criteria: Competence**  **Organizing for Planning, Teaching and Critical Thinking** | 4 2 3 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 |  | 3.4 |
|  | **Criteria: Cultural Responsiveness** | 4 x 3 3 4 2 x x 2 4 | Specific to Banks’ framework | 3.14 for 70% of candidates |
|  | **Criteria: Commitment** | 3 3 4 4 4 4 x 3 4 4 |  | 3.67 for 90% of candidates |

*Very rough generalizations for first junior cohort using the practice teaching rubrics:*

* *Score average for content competence is lower than what we are used to in student teaching analysis and portfolio analysis.*
* *Content pedagogy standards are all new IDOE standards. Interpretation of strategies using technologies is interpreted without using ISTE standards here.*
* *Addressing RtI will not be modeled in most local/regional classrooms.*
* *Cultural responsive indicator is old and still depressed in scores.*
* *This data should be used as part of Unit Assessment System for Decision Point 2*