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: 4a).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 teachc). poor dispositions-TEC intervened with personal meeting; improved and allowed to student teach  | Meeting needs of diverse studentsClassroom managementTeacher presence/voiceCircular model of instruction Use of varied assessments Professional mannerisms |
| 2010-2011\* |  17 |  10 | Total: 6a). 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 managementConfidence/teacher presence in classroomProfessional mannerisms Attention to diverse learnersContent 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 Managementconfidence/teacher presenceAttention to Diverse LearnersContent knowledgePersonal/Professional mannerisms |
| 2012-2013 |  13 |  8 | Total: 5a). 2-fieldwork concerns; personal interventions developed for each candidate; placed on probation for student teachingb). 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 presenceVaried assessments and teaching strategiesConfidence 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