Decision Point 2 Summary

2007-2013

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Year | Candidates:  Elementary Secondary | | Interventions:  Actions with End result | Most frequent documented weaknesses |
| 2006-2007 | 11 | 7 | 1-dispositions okay-gpa below 2.5  Not allowed to student teach |  |
| 2007-2008 | 9 | 3 | none |  |
| 2008-2009 | 10 | 5 | none |  |
| 2009-2010 | 11 | 7 | Total: 4  a).2 students with low gpa-one dismissed from program; one appealed to TEC and allowed to student teach  b). fieldwork concerns-personal intervention plan; allowed to student teach  c). poor dispositions-TEC intervened with personal meeting; improved and allowed to student teach | Meeting needs of diverse students  Classroom management  Teacher presence/voice  Circular model of instruction  Use of varied assessments  Professional mannerisms |
| 2010-2011\* | 17 | 10 | Total: 6  a). emotional issues-personal conference  b). disposition concerns/failure to pass Praxis I (reading)-personal conference; retook Praxis and passed with composite score  c). fieldwork concerns-personal intervention and placed on probation for student teaching  d). portfolio not level 2 with fieldwork concerns; candidate withdrew before student teaching  e). not pass Praxis I (math); personal intervention to assist in passing Praxis; allowed to student teach  f). fieldwork concern-personal intervention and probation; moved student teaching from urban to local site | Classroom management  Confidence/teacher presence in classroom  Professional mannerisms  Attention to diverse learners  Content knowledge  Circular model of instruction |
| 2011-2012\*\* | 20 | 8 | Total: 3  3- portfolio not level 2; minor changes made and allowed to student teach\*\*\* | Classroom Management  confidence/teacher presence  Attention to Diverse Learners  Content knowledge  Personal/Professional mannerisms |
| 2012-2013 | 13 | 8 | Total: 5  a). 2-fieldwork concerns; personal interventions developed for each candidate; placed on probation for student teaching  b). poor dispositions reported from faculty; investigated during interview; personal discussion about professional actions.  c). 2-portfolio not level 2; personal interventions developed for each candidate; allowed to student teach\*\*\* | Attention to Diverse Learners  Classroom management/teacher presence  Varied assessments and teaching strategies  Confidence in teaching  Circular model of instruction |

\*= 7 candidates withdrew from education program during junior level block

\*\*= 3 candidates withdrew from education program during junior level block

\*\*\*=change in curricular sequence; elimination of EDU 301 switched portfolio preparation to EDU 201; students with portfolio intervention had EDU 201 prior to change.

Development of Decision Point 2

2006-2007: Fieldwork data from junior level methods courses incorporated into interview

letters broad statements with some individual statements

2008-2009: Data analyzed according to feedback from junior level methods coursework

2009-2010: Decision Point 2 letters more detailed on individual level; personalized to needs of each student

Data collected on frequency of weaknesses of candidates noted in letters

Moved timing of Decision Point 2 interview to April/May after completion of second set of methods

2010-2011: TEC enforces admission criteria; “close calls” not admitted (2.5 gpa/Praxis/incomplete applications) unless appealed

Removal of EDU 301 from curriculum; portfolio preparation moved to EDU 201; students with EDU 201 in sophomore year missed additional guidance with portfolio preparation

2011-2012: 2.67 gpa in major required for student teaching

Decision Point 2 letter communicated to mentor teacher and college supervisor to establish initial goals for student teaching

TEC requires exit interview for candidates exiting program

2012-2013: Established rubric for passing Decision Point 2 interview for Pass-Port data collection system