

“AGGREGATING DATA”

Combining, Summarizing, Sampling, and Interpreting Information on Candidate Performance for NCATE Accreditation

NCATE; EJE; last revised May 30, 2001

NCATE’s performance-based accreditation is founded on data. In the NCATE 2000 unit standards and related program documents there are references to “aggregating” data, as well as to “sampling,” “summarizing,” and “interpreting” data to make a reasoned case that standards are met. This paper describes what the standards drafters meant by such phrases, and provides some guidelines for aggregating data that are to appear in institutional reports and “exhibit rooms” for BOE site visits, as well as in program reports for review by specialty organizations. Finally, the paper provides some illustrative formats that may assist in displaying the aggregated information.

Introduction

“Aggregating,” “summarizing,” “sampling,” “interpreting” and similar phrases are intended, first, to assure that institutional faculty have thought through what data will most cogently demonstrate that candidates meet standards, and, second, that BOE teams and program reviewers will have information in forms they can use.

NCATE asks for summaries and samples of candidate data for two reasons:

- first, to constrain the volume of what might otherwise be an overwhelming array of information that Board of Examiner members and program reviewers would encounter, and
- second, to make a clear distinction between NCATE’s accreditation role in reaching judgments about units and programs, and the roles of institutions and states in rendering decisions about progress and licensure of individual candidates.

The NCATE 2000 standards drafters are looking for concise statements of quantitative and qualitative evidence for standards, using data to convey facts, and providing cogent reasons to support an argument that standards have been met. The intent is to make a strong case, based on data. “Aggregation,” “sampling and summarizing,” and “interpreting” are descriptions of ways to marshal and convey data for that purpose.

David Smith, Dean Emeritus of the college of education at the University of Florida, has made these observations about evidence for unit accreditation decisions, all applicable, as well, to evidence for program review decisions:

Remember: The burden of proof rests with the unit [or with the program]; you do not need to measure everything; and you need to present sufficient information for the BOE [or program reviewers] to make a reasoned and reasonable judgment. The real question is—does your assessment system provide sufficient information to permit you and NCATE to draw accurate and reasoned judgments about the quality and performance of your teacher candidates, faculty, unit (or program) and the context in which you function?”

Prior Assumptions

For the purposes of this paper, **each institution responding to the NCATE 2000 standards, or to program standards for performance-based review, is assumed to have an assessment system—or a plan for an assessment system—that provides information demonstrating candidate proficiencies.** That system, or plan, follows the characteristics for assessment systems listed on page 12 of the NCATE accreditation standards adopted in 2000. These characteristics include:

- assessments specifically address content of the standards
- rubrics or criteria describe the level of performance that the institution or program faculty expect of candidates
- there are multiple assessments—each aligned with the content, cognitive expectations, and level of difficulty appropriate for the standards they address
- information is provided on learning by K-12 students with whom candidates have worked
- there are continuing efforts to assure accuracy, consistency, fairness and avoidance of bias in the assessments

The assessment system makes it possible for the institution to provide an array of candidate performance-based evidence. For standard 1, *Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions*, the NCATE *Handbook for Continuing Accreditation Visits* includes this list of “types of evidence related to NCATE’s performance-based standards that the unit can make available in its exhibit room:”

- Summaries of assessments of candidates, including those at (a) entry, (b) critical stages in candidates’ development, and (c) prior to program completion
- Candidate proficiencies expected upon completion of programs and samples of candidate work.
- Follow-up studies of graduates
- Data on performance of graduates
- Records of current performance assessments of candidate progress and summary results
- SPA reports from NCATE-affiliated specialty organizations
- Program reports and findings of other national accreditation associations related to the preparation of educational professionals (e.g., ASHA, NASM, APA, CACREP)

- Most recent report prepared for a state approval visit and the state’s findings. If the visit is being conducted jointly with the state, the teams will share findings during the visit
- External assessment data
- Expected dispositions and proficiencies and assessments

A second assumption is that institutions and programs have data management capacity making it possible to retrieve candidate proficiency information easily, quickly, and frequently. Dale Scannell, Professor Emeritus at Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis, cites the purposes of a data management system:

The format of a data management system should be designed to reflect the uses to which the data will be put. For institutions participating in a review under NCATE 2000, four purposes will likely be common:

- *to provide evidence of program effectiveness, including the important element of candidate competence for summative evaluation;*
- *to make summative judgments about candidate qualifications relative to a recommendation the unit must make about licensure;*
- *to make formative judgments about candidate progress, thus supporting the advisement and instructional purposes; and*
- *to review programs to determine whether the need for modifications is indicated.*

A data management capacity that can fulfill these purposes will readily meet NCATE accreditation performance information requirements for program and institutional reports and for materials in the exhibit room.

A third assumption is that faculty have initiated their thinking about data several years prior to actual writing of a program or institutional report. “Several years” means four or five years to allow development, piloting, and refining of a candidate performance assessment data system, or two years for preparation of a plan for such a system. Over that period, faculty would have addressed such questions as these:

- How can we create a compelling case, from data, to demonstrate that candidates have met the standards?
- Can we build on and extend our institution’s current use of candidate assessment information?

If our institution has not previously been accredited by NCATE, what are we doing that can serve as a foundation for performance-based NCATE institutional and program reports?

If our institution has previously been NCATE accredited, then—under the 1995 NCATE unit standards—our institution was already expected to (1) assess candidate progress, use authentic performance-based assessments, and provide data from multiple sources to demonstrate candidate competence in academic and professional work; and (2) establish criteria/outcomes for exit, and use assessments with multiple sources of data to evaluate whether the candidates have succeeded. How can we build on these data and incorporate them into evidence for the new performance-based accreditation standards?

- How can we make a consistent interpretation of assessment evidence that comes from many faculty, courses, and programs and in differing forms?

The following sections provide suggestions for assembling data derived from the assessment system in order to support an argument that standards have been met by the unit or program. They are organized to address these questions:

- A. What is “aggregation” of data in a program or institutional report? (page 4)
- B. What is “sampling and summarizing” of data for a program or institutional report? (page 5)
- C. What does NCATE mean by “interpreting” data in a program or institutional report? (page 7)
- D. How is information from state licensure tests used in program and institutional reports? (page 8)
- E. How is information about candidate proficiencies assembled for program review purposes and for unit purposes so that duplication is avoided? (page 9)
- F. Is there an example of how candidate evidence might be aggregated during the Transition period with an assessment plan? (page 11)
- G. Is there an example of aggregation of performance data for a program report? (page 13)

These questions are repeated as the heading for each section.

A. What is “aggregation” of data in a program or institutional report?

Here are some guidelines about “aggregating” data for use in program and institutional reports and for the accreditation exhibit room. In dictionary terms, aggregating means “bringing together,” or “combining” or “collecting” and those terms are just what is intended by NCATE.

1. **The purpose for aggregating information is to make a case** to a BOE member, or a program reviewer that the unit’s accomplishments are consistent with the NCATE, specialty organization, or state standards. The unit or program “accomplishments” are represented by assessment results for the candidates, as a group. The “case” should be constructed to demonstrate, with data, that the candidates have developed proficiencies set out in the standards and rubrics.

2. **Organize the data around each unit or program standard**, making concise and cogent arguments to demonstrate that candidates are proficient across and within the standards. Standards usually have several component parts, or strands, or elements, and these structure the key expectations of BOE examiners and specialty organization program reviewers. Rubrics (such as those accompanying NCATE unit standards) provide a guide to the nature and level of candidate performance that is expected. For example, taking NCATE unit standard 1, *Candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions*, a case should illustrate candidate proficiencies described in the rubrics for each *element* of the standard—that is, *Content knowledge for teacher candidates*, *Pedagogical content knowledge for teacher candidates*, *Professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills for teacher candidates*, *Dispositions*, and *Student learning for teacher candidates*.
3. To assist in selecting the proficiency information best sustaining the case that standards are met, and to facilitate the work of BOE members and program reviewers, faculty will find it useful to **develop a crosswalk that allows moving easily between “standards” (or elements of standards) and assessments**. See questions F and G, below, for examples of crosswalks.

BOE examiners expect that institutions will create assessments around key points in a program rather than around standards per se. In selecting data that demonstrate candidates are proficient in the standards, faculty will choose from information gathered around such events as admission; completion of general education; completion of content studies, pedagogical and professional coursework; prior to the culminating clinical experience; program completion; graduate surveys; and employer evaluations during induction programs or after initial teaching. Several assessments may well provide information demonstrating candidate proficiencies in relation to a single standard. On the other hand, a single assessment may provide appropriate evidence for two or more standards. In either case, faculty need to display the evidence so that reviewers can examine it in relation to specific standards and a “crosswalk” can assist in creating such a display.

B. What is “sampling and summarizing” of data for a program or institutional report?

These terms are intended to have definitions consistent with common use. “Sampling” refers to taking a small part of something that represents, or stands for, or shows the quality, style, or nature of the whole. “Summarizing” refers to making a statement in a concise form.

Most institutions will have large amounts of information related to what candidates know and are able to do, and one challenge will be to select data that most compellingly document achievement of the standards. A second challenge will be to describe, chart, or display the selected data in cogent and accessible ways. Here are some guidelines on sampling and summarizing the data.

1. **The selection of data should provide a true representation of candidate proficiencies related to the standards, and the data should be displayed to represent “all candidates”** in a systematic way. “All candidates” might mean, for example, a cohort of candidates completing a program, all the candidates admitted, all the candidates engaged in clinical experiences, or the candidates a year or two after they are on the job. NCATE examiners and program reviewers expect that performance information most useful for accreditation purposes will be derived from assessments that are commonly administered to candidates in a program or unit. These common assessments, then, would provide comparable measures for all candidates which could be summed up.

There are two issues that need attention in considering “true representation” of candidate proficiencies. **One is representing candidate proficiencies across the domain of the standards** (i.e., NCATE 2000 standard 1 or specialty program standards). Assessments (and plans for assessments) should sample candidate proficiencies so as to represent candidate achievements across the full span or range of standards. **The second is representing candidates.** For example, when employer surveys are a source of success or progress of former candidates, now employed as teachers, faculty should show BOE examiners and program reviewers that the data are representative of the cohort of graduates under study.

2. **Candidates’ performances should be summarized in quantitative terms.** The numbers and proportion of candidates who reach each of the levels of performance established in the institution’s rubrics or criteria should be specified. For test results, a description of candidate proficiencies should be provided at the median and for the upper and lower ranges of achievement.
3. **Candidates’ performances should also be summarized in qualitative terms.** Faculty should convey descriptive information about the *nature* of candidate proficiencies and the *levels* of performance that are expected. Information about the nature of candidate proficiencies can be illustrated by including examples of **assessment instruments, or descriptions of instructional tasks** used to gather candidate performance evidence. Information about the levels of performance can be conveyed in program or institutional reports by including examples of **rubrics or criteria the institution has created to judge candidate work, plus actual samples of candidate responses.** The purpose of the instruments, tasks, rubrics, and samples is to assist reviewers’ understanding of the depth of candidate proficiencies called for, to illustrate the multiple types of information gathered by the unit or program, and to demonstrate the quality of candidate knowledge and skills. **The object is not to substitute for the quantitative information, but to add depth to reviewers’ understanding of what it means.**

4. Especially during the NCATE 2000 transition period prior to academic year 2004-2005, examiners and program reviewers need **information on the plans for assessment data** to supplement currently available candidate performance information. This should identify the types of assessments that will be used by the unit or program and the points during a candidate's course of preparation they will occur. The plans would also indicate the sources of assessment information—internal ones as well as external ones. See question F, below, for an example of a template that might be helpful for a program or institutional report during the Transition.

C. What does NCATE mean by “interpreting” data in a program or institutional report?

This section addresses interpretations of data, or saying what the data mean, *in relation to unit or program standards*. NCATE seeks interpretations from faculty who prepare program or institutional reports.

1. The most difficult task for the BOE members and program reviewers is to make sense of the data, to understand their meaning in terms of achieving the standards. Since the judgments are to be made on units and programs—not individual candidates—it is essential that **the faculty's assembly of data permits reviewers to interpret that information in context**. “Context” refers to **information about the institutional or program setting or operational environment that might have a bearing on assessments or on the particular qualities of candidate achievements demonstrated by assessments**—e.g., the institutional mission and conceptual framework, policies and practices, faculty's evaluation of institutional or program performance, or any unique state requirements that influence the institution or its preparation programs. Contextual information would appear in the introduction to an institutional report and in the context section of a program report. For program reports, it may be appropriate to supplement institutional context information with other material that is unique to the program.
2. **Institutions should reflect on aggregated candidate assessment results in relation to the standards**. The evidence should be described, weighed, and judged in terms of the requirements set out in the standards. The institution's interpretation is both a way to make a strong case that each of the standards has been met, and also a way to focus attention of reviewers on **what the institution's faculty find most significant in the evidence they have compiled**. One place faculty should record their reflections is on the accumulated results of program reviews from specialty organizations or program approvals from states. Are there commonly appearing strengths or weaknesses? If so, what does that say about the need for program improvements? See the reference to these faculty reflections on the chart in question E, on the right hand column of pages 10 and 11 below, point A, (1), (2), and (3), and also point D.

D. How is information from state licensure tests used in program and institutional reports?

Making use of state licensure test results is important because those results are indicators of candidate performance valued by the state. But licensure test results need careful interpretation. Institutions affiliated with NCATE should provide a copy of the same information they report for Title II purposes, but should **help reviewers understand what the results mean with regard to candidate mastery of unit or program standards**. Some guiding questions on use of state licensure test results follow:

1. What is the state cut score on each test? What is the average pass rate in the state, or the average pass rate for similar institutions? (from Title II information)
2. What is your institution's pass rate? (from Title II information)
3. How well, and in what ways, do the state licensure exams align with the content of the standards? (Note: this information is not provided in Title II reports)
By "align" we mean that:
 - (a) assessments are *congruent with content knowledge* described in standards,
 - (b) assessments *match the complexity, cognitive demands and skill requirements* that standards specify for knowledge, teaching and other professional performances, dispositions, and effects on student learning, and
 - (c) successful responses on assessments are *consistent with the rigor and difficulty specified in standards* for the specialty area and grade levels the candidate is preparing to teach.

Currently, no Praxis I or Praxis II test is a valid indicator of teaching skills. In some cases a Praxis II test assesses knowledge of teaching or of pedagogy, or content pedagogy, but only in pencil and paper form. Therefore, any standards that call for direct demonstration of classroom or other professional skills are not evaluated by these tests.
4. What is the average score for candidates in the unit or program, and the range of scores? (Note: this information is not provided in Title II reports)
5. For what standards do the licensure tests provide sub-scores and how relevant is that information in making a case the standards are met?

Here is an example of state licensure data, based on the NCATE elementary standards and the ETS Praxis test for elementary licensure:

From ETS we know the range of performance of the middle quartiles on each assessment, state cut scores for each assessment, and average US performance on each assessment. The Praxis II test in elementary education, "curriculum, instruction and

assessment,” is taken by more teacher candidates than any other Praxis II test. It has the following characteristics:

- Test score range is 100-200 points
- Median score of about 51,000 test takers last year was 179
- Average performance range for the two middle quartiles was 169-188
- 15 states require use of that test, with cut scores ranging from 143 to 168.

In this case, the passing scores from all states are below the 25th percentile, so reviewers would probably want to see additional information to confirm candidate proficiencies. For example, if an institution provided their average candidate score rate indicating performance in the upper quartile (above 188), that would be useful information to weigh. Also, information from subscale results in such areas as English, math, science and social studies knowledge, if available, would be directly relatable to the elementary standards.

It would be useful for BOE and program reviewers to have supplementary information addressing candidate learning in arts and sciences courses—e.g., term papers, group projects, essays, or results on end of course assessments that are consistent with content covered in the elementary teacher standards.

E. How is information about candidate proficiencies assembled for program review purposes and for unit purposes so that duplication is avoided?

The chart below describes the contents of data aggregated for a program report, in the left column, and for an institutional report, in the right column. Note, particularly, how the information compiled for the program report, the evaluation of that report by the specialty organization or state, and the rejoinder process, form a significant part of the evidence for standard 1, *Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions*, of the institutional report and on-site documents room.

**AGGREGATING CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE INFORMATION
At the Program and Unit Level**

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>AGGREGATING CANDIDATE DATA FOR A PROGRAM REPORT that responds to professional standards (Note: program reports are due 12 to 18 months prior to a BOE site visit)</p> | <p>AGGREGATING CANDIDATE DATA FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL REPORT OR THE ON-SITE DOCUMENTS ROOM that responds to NCATE unit standards (Note: institutional reports are due two months prior to a BOE site visit)</p> |
| <p><i>A. Aggregation of individual candidate proficiencies on assessments</i></p> | <p><i>A. Aggregation of program review results</i></p> |
| <p>Program faculty write a standard-by-standard narrative statement linked to professional, state or institutional standards; aggregate individual candidate information from different sources into totals, distributions, and qualitative descriptions; then summarize key findings and describe uses of data for improvement of programs.</p> | <p>For unit Standard 1, <i>Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions</i>, institutional faculty: (1) aggregate results, program-by-program, from specialty organization responses to program reports, and from state program approval reviews— as well as rejoinders, “national recognition” decisions and state program approval decisions; (2) summarize and analyze comments on strengths and weaknesses, especially those that occur frequently in specialty organization responses; and (3) note their reflections on such comments.</p> |
| <p><i>B. Information on program assessment system</i></p> | <p><i>B. Special note on the Transition period</i></p> |
| <p>To compensate for missing performance data, especially during the Transition period prior to 2004-2005, program faculty: (1) display already existing candidate evidence (e.g. from admissions, clinical teaching, state licensure, employer surveys, etc.), aggregated standard-by-standard, (2) supplemented with information on assessments that are planned or being developed (as called for in NCATE Transition Plan)</p> | <p>During Transition period prior to 2004/5, an institution may need to compensate for lack of candidate performance information in the program review process. This will be in areas where the evidence provided for program review decisions did not include candidate performance data (or assessment plans calling for future performance data).</p> |
| <p><i>C. Interpreted information on candidate performance for each standard</i></p> | <p><i>C. Aggregation of individual candidate proficiencies on outside-of-program assessments</i></p> |
| <p>Program faculty interpret aggregations in (A) and say how the program will use the data to overcome weaknesses in courses, experiences, teaching and counseling</p> | <p>(Note: Compare this with section A in the program reports column) Unit faculty: (1) write a narrative statement for institutional or state standards not covered by programs, or covered generically across programs ; (2) aggregate individual candidate information from different sources into totals, distributions, and qualitative descriptions; (3) then summarize key findings and describe uses of data for improvement of programs.</p> |
| <p><i>D. Matrix or other program information</i></p> | <p><i>D. Interpreted information on candidate performance</i></p> |
| <p>Program responds to other program report requirements, as stated by specialty organizations. These will change over the Transition period from 2001/2 to 2004/5 to place more emphasis on candidate performance evidence and less on course content and experiences.</p> | <p>Faculty interpret aggregations in (A) and (C) and say how the unit will use the data to overcome weaknesses in courses, experiences, teaching and counseling</p> |
| | <p><i>E. Information on the unit assessment system</i></p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>To compensate for missing performance data, especially during the Transition period prior to 2004-2005, faculty:</p> <p>(1) display already existing candidate evidence (e.g. from admissions, clinical teaching, state licensure, employer surveys, etc.), aggregated standard-by-standard;</p> <p>(2) supplemented with descriptions of assessment information that is planned or being developed (See NCATE Transition Plan requirements)</p> |
|--|---|

F. Is there an example of how candidate evidence might be aggregated during the Transition period with an assessment plan?

The National Council of Teachers of English prepared the “Sample Grid to Plan and Display Performance-Based Evidence” that appears on the next page. The grid was created as part of a project to develop criteria for candidate assessments in English language arts conducted in collaboration with NCATE, and titled *Assessment Standards for Preparing Teachers of English Language Arts*. It records where in a program—the courses, field experiences, or elsewhere—evidence is gathered in relation to specific standards, and what type or form of assessment is used or is to be created by the institution. It might serve an institution in developing an assessment plan, or in displaying information about what assessment information will eventually be available when assessment plans have been implemented.

SAMPLE GRID TO PLAN AND DISPLAY PERFORMANCE-BASED EVIDENCE
National Council of Teachers of English

Note: This grid suggests a format that a program might use as part of its efforts to document its assessment efforts and link them to the NCTE standards. Each program would need to adapt such a format to fit its own assessment plan. Descriptions of assessment tasks, with rubrics or other means for judging levels of performance, could be attached. Individual assessment tasks may evaluate candidate performance under more than one standard simultaneously; it is also possible that multiple assessments may be used for more than one standard. It may also be the case that a program may prefer to group together all those standards assessed by a particular assessment task and show the assessment that way; this could reduce the number of times a particular assessment might have to be listed.

| Standard | Sources of Evidence | | | | | | | | | | Types of Evidence | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-------|----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|------------|--------------|-------------------|---|----------------|------------------|---------------------|--|
| | General Education | English Courses | Education Courses | Methods Courses | Field Experiences | Faculty Observation | Cooperating Teacher Observation | Graduate Surveys | Employee Surveys | State Licensure Results | Other | Criterion-referenced Test | Norm-referenced Test | Video | Student Work Samples | Case Studies/ Vignettes | Candidate Journals | Unit Plans | Lesson Plans | Candidate Writing | Forms of Presentation (Oral and Technology) | Micro-teaching | Student Teaching | Candidate Portfolio | |
| 2.1. Demonstrate respect for the worth and contributions of all learners. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1.3. Show respect for and understanding of diversity in language use, patterns, and dialects across cultures, ethnic groups, geographic regions and social roles. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.2. Design instruction to meet the needs of all students and provide for students' continuous progress and success. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.5. Create learning environments that promote respect for and support of individual differences of ethnicity, race, language, culture, gender and ability. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Source: *Final Report of the NCTE/NCATE (NPEAT) Committee on “Assessment Standards for Preparing Teachers of English Language Arts,”* Hugh Thomas McCracken, Project Director. (Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, December 2000), p.16.

G. Is there an example of aggregation of performance data for a program report?

The “Standards and Candidate Demonstration of Mastery” example that follows this page is a format developed by Fitchburg State College¹, Fitchburg, Massachusetts. It was used for planning candidate assessment in relation to standards for elementary teacher preparation, and for displaying findings and information on what the faculty learned from assessment data. There are several points to note about this template:

- The pages are organized around specific standards. In this excerpt, the standard is English language arts, one of twenty standards for preparation of elementary teachers.
- The first column, “What do candidates do to demonstrate,” describes the activities or tasks in the Fitchburg program that yield information about candidate learning in relation to the English language arts standard.
- The second column, “How we evaluate it,” provides a description of the activities or tasks identified in the first column. There are references here to appendices that were part of the Fitchburg program report. These contained supporting information and examples of assessment tasks and candidate work.
- The third column, “Findings,” provides summary descriptions of the findings, qualitative interpretations of evidence, some conclusions about what candidates did well and not so well, quantitative data showing distributions of candidate performance on assessments.
- The fourth column, “What did we learn about our candidates? About our program?” sets out faculty conclusions about the implications of the data for program improvement as well as about instances where the assessments and rubrics need to be strengthened.

¹ The chart was prepared by Sandra Miller-Jacobs, Rosemarie Giovino, and Elaine E. Francis in the Fitchburg State College Special Education Department, Elementary Teacher Preparation Program.

STANDARDS AND CANDIDATE DEMONSTRATION OF MASTERY
 Fitchburg State College, Special Education Department

| Standard 2: Curriculum | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| 2b. English Language Arts—Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas. | | | |
| What do candidates do to demonstrate | How we evaluate it | Findings | What did we learn about our candidates? About our program? |
| Candidates develop and implement lessons in reading/ language arts that meet the developmental and diverse needs of students utilizing approaches such as: multi-sensory, phonics based, basal reader/literature-based materials, listening, writing. | Faculty evaluate candidates on observation report rubric (Appendix K) and on lesson plan rubric (Appendix J). | <p><u>Analysis of observation and lesson plan rubrics indicate:</u></p> <p>Reading</p> <p><u>Strengths</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing instructional materials • Sequencing of steps in lessons • Using appropriate teaching strategies • Utilizing appropriate evaluation procedures <p><u>Weaknesses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changing instructional environment to avoid inappropriate behavior • Reviewing past learning prior to initiating new skill development • Planning for multiple groups in reading • Writing measurable goals <p>Summary of data from lesson plans (Appendix J) in IPP indicate written and oral communication are not a problem. Goal and objective writing were problematic, but candidates are just beginning to acquire this skill in this experience.</p> | <p>Candidates need more work on correct writing of measurable goals and objectives and planning for multiple reading groups.</p> <p>Rubric data on lesson plans (Appendix J) needs to be aggregated according to curriculum areas</p> |
| Candidates develop an interdisciplinary unit with a language arts focus. | Faculty evaluate candidates unit using a rubric (Appendix I). | Some candidate research in content areas for thematic unit/capstones was limited | Candidates need to conduct more in-depth research in content areas---requirements need to be specified |

| <p>Candidates assess a student's reading skills on informal reading inventories and standardized tests, evaluate the results and make recommendations for goals, objectives, instruction and accommodations or modifications.</p> | <p>Faculty evaluate candidates scoring and analysis of the results of the tests and the recommendations for the student on an Assessment Report and Evaluation checklist.</p> <p>Faculty evaluate goals and objectives based on assessment data</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">17 Candidates</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;"></th> <th style="width: 15%;">Correct</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Inaccurate</th> <th style="width: 15%;">Incomplete</th> <th style="width: 25%;"></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Scoring</td> <td>14</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Analysis</td> <td>14</td> <td>3</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Recommendations</td> <td>12</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Goals</td> <td>13</td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Objectives</td> <td>10</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Candidates re-submit this document until they receive a grade of at least 2.5</p> | | Correct | Inaccurate | Incomplete | | Scoring | 14 | 3 | | | Analysis | 14 | 3 | | | Recommendations | 12 | 5 | | | Goals | 13 | 4 | | | Objectives | 10 | 7 | | | <p>Candidates were able to summarize strengths and weaknesses in reading skills and make recommendations.</p> <p>Difficulty existed with the correct writing of objectives.</p> <p>Separate evaluative rubrics need to be developed for the administration and scoring of Standardized tests and informal inventories.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---------|------------|------------|---|---------|---------|----|----|---|----------|----|--------------|----|----|-----------------|----|---|----------|----|-------|----|---|---|-----------|------------|----|---|---|---|--|----|----|---|---|---|-----------|----|----|---|---|---|---|
| | Correct | Inaccurate | Incomplete | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Scoring | 14 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Analysis | 14 | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Recommendations | 12 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Goals | 13 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Objectives | 10 | 7 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>In Assessment of Individuals with Special Needs, candidates assess the reading skills of students using criterion-referenced, standardized tests (achievement and diagnostic) and write a report summarizing data and making recommendations.</p> | | <p>No data has been collected on this because the course hasn't been taught in its current format. It will be taught in conjunction with student teaching. Previously was taught outside of the practicum experiences with a field-based experience.</p> | <p>Based on feedback from cooperating teachers and candidates, the course has been moved to student teaching to provide more opportunities for involvement with students prior to and during assessment.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Candidates research and give an oral and written presentation on a specialized approach to reading (e.g., Reading Recovery, Orton-Gillingham, Spalding). This is completed as a cooperative learning activity.</p> | <p>Faculty evaluate candidates using rubrics for oral and written presentations.</p> | <p>Data indicates that all candidates were able to perform at an acceptable level.</p> <p><u>Rubric Summary:</u> 5=exemplary 1=unacceptable</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%;"></th> <th style="width: 10%;">5</th> <th style="width: 10%;">4</th> <th style="width: 10%;">3</th> <th style="width: 10%;">2</th> <th style="width: 10%;">1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Content</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Organization</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Cohesion</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Resources</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Usage</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mechanics</td> <td>10</td> <td>10</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | Content | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Organization | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Cohesion | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Resources | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Usage | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | Mechanics | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | <p>Candidates performed well on criteria.</p> |
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Content | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organization | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cohesion | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Resources | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Usage | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Mechanics | 10 | 10 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>In student teaching, candidates develop and implement a thematic unit integrating all curriculum areas and that utilizes effective instructional and evaluative practices.</p> | <p>Faculty evaluate candidates with the Thematic Unit Rubric (Appendix I).</p> | <p>No data has been collected on this for student teaching (other than grades from previous semesters), but data has been collected for SPED 2522 Language arts: Teaching and Adapting Instruction. Data from SPED 2522 indicates that at this first attempt, 10 out of 13 candidates performed at an acceptable level or better in all aspects of thematic unit development.</p> | <p>Need to compare performance in pre-practicum work with student teaching data when available.</p> <p>Data indicates candidates are performing acceptably in the student teaching experience.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Candidates develop appropriate lessons in the language arts and write journal entries reflecting on lessons taught and adaptation made for diverse learners.</p> | <p>Faculty evaluates journal entries using "Reflective Journal Rubric"(Appendix G).</p> <p>Lesson Plan Rubric (Appendix J)</p> <p>Observation Report (Appendix K) (oral and written communication)</p> | <p>Data on rubric are not specific but reflect overall strong performance in journal writing.</p> <p>80% pass rate on rubrics for written and oral communication</p> | <p>Questions for reflective journals need more focus (new questions have been developed for IPP)</p> <p>Rubric needs revision and clearer breakdown of expectations.</p> <p>Candidates need to focus on accommodations for diverse learners in the general education curriculum. Current rubric is very broad and does not break down skill areas sufficiently. A new rubric was developed Spring 2000 and will be used in the fall. A Writing Across the Curriculum coordinator has been hired for FA 00. The college has made a concerted effort to evaluate the teaching of writing across the campus, and it is hoped this will help candidates improve in the future.</p> <p>N.B.: It has been observed that some candidates require additional time to revise writing assignments. The timed nature of the MECT creates problems. Also, it has been observed that candidates use of vernacular and/or slang results in them being marked down.</p> |
| <p>Candidates evaluate software for Reading/Language Arts using guidelines.</p> | <p>Faculty use Criteria Sheet to evaluate candidates' critique.</p> | <p>Candidates completed the Evaluation of Reading software using the guidelines adequately. They addressed type of program, ease of use, instructional design, content accuracy and special features. 3/13 candidates experienced difficulty in the areas of teaching considerations and modifications. One of the three candidates who experienced difficulty had other problems and was counseled out of the program .</p> | <p>Since this is a pre-practicum course, some difficulty in addressing teaching issues are expected. For the most part, candidates performed well. . After examining the software that was reviewed, it became clear that there is a need to continue to upgrade and expand the variety and types of software available to ensure candidates are exposed to both instructional and skill reinforcing software.</p> |