

College of Saint Mary
Rule 24 Section 2 – Artifacts 2 and 3
Key Assessments and Findings

Endorsement: Elementary Education

Artifact 2: Data tables with summarized data for each key assessment.

Artifact 3. Provide a narrative interpretation/summary of the assessment data from the institution's perspective.

Content Knowledge #1

Graduation GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	12	2.724 – 3.934	3.488	13	3.503 – 4.0	3.916
2015-2016	11*	2.917 – 3.977	3.538	12	3.593 – 3.984	3.892

* One student has not graduated as of May 17, 2016 due to missing transfer course.

Undergraduate

The Graduation GPA for students seeking bachelor's degrees includes all program requirements including courses in General Education, the Elementary Education major, the Professional Core Courses and Supporting Courses. All courses on the Program of Study are included in the final Graduation GPA.

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicated that the undergraduate Elementary Education completers for the academic year 2014-2015 achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B- (2.66) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. The data from 2015-2016 indicated that the completers in the undergraduate Elementary Education endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly a B (3.00) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Graduate

The graduation GPA of completers of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program is calculated on transfer credits and those credits earned at College of Saint Mary. Review of the data indicated that graduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Elementary Education endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly an A- (3.66) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. For 2015-2016, graduate completers achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly an A- (3.66) to around an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Summary

Analysis of the data indicates that all undergraduate and graduate completers demonstrated mastery of Content Knowledge that includes general academic content knowledge, theoretical knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge.

Praxis II Test: Elementary Education: Curriculum and Instruction Assessment (test 5017 - passing score 153) (Includes three test 5011 Passing score 159)*	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	12	153 – 187	166.34	13	159 – 180	170.38
2015-2016	12	157 – 180	167.4	12	149** – 181	161.78

*Data includes 1 Bachelors (2014-2015) and 2 Masters completers (1 in 2014-2015 and 1 in 2015-2016) who took and passed the Praxis II: EECIA (#5011) exceeding the cut score of 159.

**One student has not passed the Praxis II as of May 16, 2016. Graduation requirements do not include a passing score on the Praxis, only that the student has taken the appropriate test. Therefore, the student is considered a completer of this endorsement program.

The Praxis II requirement for the Elementary Education endorsement became a requirement for certification in 2015. In 2007-2015, passing of the exam was not a certification requirement, though taking the exam was a program requirement. Completers after September 2015 are required to receive a passing score in order to be recommended for certification. Students take the test in the semester prior to beginning Clinical Practice.

Undergraduate

Review of the data indicated that all 12 undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program in 2014-2015 and all undergraduate completers in 2015-2016 passed the Praxis II: Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment (either EECIA #5017 or #5011).

Graduate

The data from 2014-2015 shows that all 12 of the graduate completers in the Master of Arts in Teaching Program passed the Praxis II Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment (either EECIA #5017 or #5011). The data from 2015-2016 shows that 11 of the 12 graduate completers passed the Praxis II: Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment exam. One program completer (scoring a 149) has not yet passed the exam and though he/she has completed the program, he/she will not be eligible to apply for certification until a passing score is achieved.

Summary

Analysis of the data indicates that all undergraduate completers and all but one of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated mastery of Content Knowledge in the areas of general academic content knowledge, pedagogical principles and processes, curriculum planning, instructional design, and assessment of student learning in the context of the elementary level subjects of reading and language arts, mathematics, science, social studies, art, music, and physical education.

Content Knowledge #2

Content GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	12	2.724 – 3.934	3.488	13	3.503 – 4.0	3.916
2015-2016	11*	2.917 – 3.977	3.538	12	3.593 – 3.984	3.892

* One student has not graduated as of May 17, 2016 due to missing transfer course.

Undergraduate

The Content GPA for the Elementary Education endorsement undergraduate completers includes all endorsement requirements including courses in the Elementary Education major, the Professional Core Courses, and Supporting Courses, excluding Theology and Philosophy. These courses identified on the Program of Study were included in the Content GPA.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that all of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B- (2.66) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. Undergraduate completers for the academic year 2015-2016 achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly below a B (3.00) to nearly an A (4.00).

Graduate

The Content GPA for the Elementary Education endorsement graduate completers includes all endorsement requirements including courses in the Elementary Education endorsement program and the Professional Core Courses.

Review of the data indicated that all of the graduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Elementary Education endorsement program achieved a Content GPA that ranged from between B+ (3.33) and A- (3.66) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. The data from 2015-2016 indicated that the graduate completers achieved Content GPAs ranging from between a B+ (3.33) and A- (3.66) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Summary

Analysis of the data indicates that all completers in both undergraduate and graduate Elementary Education endorsement programs demonstrated mastery of Content Knowledge specifically in the areas of developmental characteristics of children, theoretical knowledge, academic content knowledge relevant for all learners, and pedagogical knowledge with a specific emphasis upon developmentally appropriate practices and instructional strategies.

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 4 and 7.2)										
Standard 4.1: The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.67 (N=12)	66.67%	33.33%	0%	0%	3.73 (N=12)	72.73%	27.27%	0%	0%
Standard 4.2: The teacher candidate creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for students to assure mastery of the content.										
2014-2015	3.5 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	83.3%	16.7%	0%	0%	3.73 (N=12)	72.73%	27.27%	0%	0%
Standard 4.3: The teacher candidate integrates Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%	3.82 (N=12)	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 7.2: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy.										
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.0%	8.33%	0%	3.64 (N=12)	63.64%	36.36%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
INSTRUCTION: Reading/Writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.69 (N=13)	69.23%	30.80%	0%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussion - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.38 (N=13)	53.85%	30.80%	15.38%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Content Knowledge. These include: Standard 4: Content Knowledge and its sub-standards 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, and Standard 7.1: Planning for Instruction

which focus on each teacher candidate's ability to draw upon knowledge of content areas in planning instruction.

Undergraduate

Review of the data indicates that 83.3% of the undergraduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards. One completer was rated as Occasional for Standard 4.3 and Rare for 4.1, 4.2 and 7.2. An additional completer was rated as Occasional for Standards 4.2 and 7.2 and Rare for 4.1 and 4.3.

Analysis of these findings indicated that the majority of completers in 2014-2015 were knowledgeable about integrating Nebraska Content Standards and drawing upon content knowledge. The large majority (83.34% or 10 of 12 completers) demonstrated clear understanding of central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of disciplines (4.1) and the ability to draw upon content knowledge and other key areas in planning (7.2). The remaining two completers (16.7%) received ratings in the lowest two levels, indicating some challenges in the areas of understanding central concepts and tools of inquiry, drawing upon content knowledge in teaching, and integrating Nebraska Content Standards.

The completer receiving two Occasional and two Rare ratings experienced challenges in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

The completer receiving one Occasional rating and three Rare ratings had challenges in her first half of the semester clinical placement in her assigned setting. This completer received support from her clinical practice supervisor and Teacher Education Program Director to provide support and guidance and this completer agreed to lessen outside commitments prior to her second half placement. The intervention, along with weekly check-ins, helped this completer demonstrate improved levels of performance, finish the program, and become certified in two endorsement areas.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all but one of the Standards in this Key Assessment. The data showed that 91.67% of completers were rated in the two highest levels for Standard 7.2 with one completer (8.33%) receiving a rating of Occasional. Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of undergraduate completers demonstrated clear understanding of central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of disciplines, use of Nebraska Content Standards, were able to provide accessible and meaningful learning experiences, and demonstrated the ability to draw upon content knowledge and other key areas in planning instruction.

Graduate

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation in 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and include Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable. Sections of this Clinical Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments and included Instruction: Reading/Writing which focuses on using

reading and writing skills to learn content; Instruction: Variety which includes using a variety of instructional strategies to help students attain knowledge; Instruction: Discussion which encourages use of higher order questions; and Instruction: Critical Thinking which requires students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels for Instruction: Variety. It was found that 92.3% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels for Instruction: Reading and Writing and Instruction: Critical Thinking with 7.69% of completers rated as Developing. The data indicated that 84.6% were rated in the two highest levels for Instruction: Discussion with 15.38% rated as Developing. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to use a variety of instructional strategies including reading and writing, higher order questioning, and critical thinking experiences to connect students with content learning.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the Standards on this Key Assessment. Analysis of the data indicates that these completers demonstrated clear understanding of central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of disciplines, use of Nebraska Content Standards, were able to provide accessible and meaningful learning experiences, and demonstrated the ability to draw upon content knowledge and other key areas in planning instruction.

Learner/Learning Environments

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 1, 2, 3 and 7.3)										
Standard 1.1: The teacher candidate understands how students grow and develop.										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	16.67%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.67 (N=12)	75.0%	16.67%	8.33%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 1.2: The teacher candidate recognizes that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas.										
2014-2015	3.50 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	91.67%	0%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 1.3: The teacher candidate implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.										
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.0%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities.										
2014-2015	3.67 (N=12)	66.67%	33.33%	0%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 2.2: The teacher candidate ensures inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards.										
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.0%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 3.1: The teacher candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.										
2014-2015	3.50 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 3.2: The teacher candidate creates environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.50 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%	3.73 (N=11)*	72.73%	27.27%	0%	0%
Standard 3.3: The teacher candidate manages student behavior to promote a positive learning environment.										
2014-2015	3.67 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	16.67%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.50 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0%	3.64 (N=11)*	72.73%	18.18%	9.09%	0%

Standard 7.3: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of students and the community context.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%

* One completer did not complete his/her clinical practice in elementary education with CSM, therefore the clinical evaluation is not included in this data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Intellectual Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.69 (N=13)	76.92%	15.38%	7.69%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Personal Development - Incorporates opportunities for social development				
3.69 (N=13)	69.23%	30.80%	0%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Social Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.69 (N=13)	69.23%	30.80%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Pre-assessment - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.62 (N=13)	61.54%	38.46%	0%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Expectations - Has high expectations for all student learning				
3.77 (N=13)	84.62%	7.69%	7.69%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Performance - Requires students to apply knowledge in authentic settings				
3.62 (N=13)	61.54%	38.46%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Student needs - Modifies instructional approaches and materials for students with special needs				
3.69 (N=13)	76.92%	15.38%	7.69%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Resources - Uses IEP and/or consults with special education, reading or ESL teachers				
3.54 (N=13)	61.54%	30.80%	7.69%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Instructional strategies - Uses strategies such as visuals, graphic organizers, gestures, and appropriate communication modifications to better teach all students				
3.77 (N=13)	76.92%	23.07%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Classroom climate - Helps students respect contributions made by diverse learners in the classroom				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Curriculum - Includes multiple perspectives when presenting and assessing curriculum content				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Climate - Conducts a friendly, energetic, and businesslike classroom				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Organization - Organized with planning and thus instruction – students have clearly communicated expectations				
3.77 (N=13)	76.92%	23.07%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Time management - Uses all of class time efficiently				

3.37 (N=13)	46.15%	46.15%	7.69%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Motivation/Engagement - Creates an engaging learning environment where students are on task and interested in the learning				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Oral Projects - well when teaching; is confident and articulate when teaching				
3.77 (N=13)	76.92%	23.07%	0%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Written - Writes professionally with clarity, conciseness, and attention to detail				
3.69 (N=13)	69.23%	30.80%	0%	0%

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in classroom related to Learners/Learning Environment. These include: Standard 1: Student Development and its sub-standards 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3, Standard 2: Learning Differences and its sub-standards 2.1 and 2.2, and Standard 3: Learning Environments and its sub-standards 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3. These standards were selected to determine how well program completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated knowledge of developmental characteristics of learners including knowledge of learning and cultural differences and how well they were able to create inclusive and positive learning environments using knowledge of learners.

Undergraduates

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standard 2.1 which addresses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities. The data indicates that 83% (10 of 12) of completers received ratings in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for the remaining standards with 16.7% (2 of 12) of completers receiving ratings of Occasional for Standards 1.1 and 3.3. For the remaining standards, 8.3% or one completer received a rating of Occasional for Standards 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.2 and 7.3. One completer received a rating of Rare for Standards 1.2, 1.3, 3.1, 3.3 and 7.3. Two completers received ratings of Rare for Standard 2.2 which addresses setting up inclusive learning environments that support high standards for each learner.

Analysis of these findings indicated that all of the undergraduate completers understood individual differences, cultures, and communities and the majority of completers (83% or 10 of 12) demonstrated clear skills in knowledge about children's growth and development, addressing learning differences, planning developmentally appropriate, collaborative, socially supporting and positive learning environments, and drawing upon student and community contexts.

One completer who received six Occasional ratings (1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.2 and 3.3) and three Rare ratings (2.2, 3.1 and 7.3) experienced challenges in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

The completer who received four Occasional ratings (1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 7.3) and five Rare ratings (1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 3.2 and 3.3) had challenges in her first half of the semester clinical placement in her assigned setting. This completer received support from her clinical practice supervisor and Teacher Education Program Director to provide support and guidance and this completer agreed to lessen outside commitments prior to her second half placement. These changes, along with weekly check-ins, helped this completer be more successful in demonstrate satisfactory levels of performance, finish the program, and become certified in two endorsement areas.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 2.1 (individual and cultural differences) and 7.3. (knowledge of students and community context). The data shows that 91.67% of the undergraduate completers were rated in the two highest levels for Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2 and 3.1. and 83.33% were rated in the two highest levels for Standard 3.2.

Analysis of the data indicates that the all of the undergraduate completers in 2015-2016 demonstrated particular strength in recognizing individual and cultural differences and drawing upon student and community contexts. The large majority of undergraduate completers were knowledgeable about student growth and development and were able to create learning environments that addressed individual differences and supported collaborating learning.

Graduates

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting use of the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation for 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and include Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable.

Sections of this Clinical Evaluation identified as one of the Key Assessments included indicators related to: Learner Development which focuses on understanding all developmental domains; Planning Pre-Assessment/Assessment and Evaluation which includes assessing prior knowledge, having high expectations for learners and requiring application of knowledge in authentic settings; and Meeting Needs of All Students that focuses on modifying instruction for students with special needs, using IEPs and special education resources, adjusting instructional strategies, promoting a respectful classroom climate, and using multiple perspectives in curriculum content. In addition, this Key Assessment includes indicators related to Management Motivation that focuses on maintaining an effective classroom climate, planning and organizing instruction, managing time on task, motivating and engaging learners, and includes indicators on Communication, including effective oral and written communication.

Review of the NDE Clinical Evaluation data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 10 of the 17 indicators in this Key Assessment and 92.3% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 7 indicators. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were knowledgeable about learner development, were able to use a variety of assessment and evaluation strategies, were able to meet needs of all learners, could maintain a positive and engaging classroom environment, and were able to use effective communication skills.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the Standards except Standards 3.3 where 90.91% of graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) and only 9.09% of completers were rated as Developing.

Case Study (Sections 1, 4, 5)								
Section 1: Contextual Factors (Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters - 30 points possible 2014-15 and Fall/Spring 2015-16)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	9.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	28.85 (N=13)	84.62%	7.7%	7.7%
2015-2016	9.0 (N=12)	100%	0%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 28.5 (N=10)	66.7%	33.3%	0%
Section 4: Design for Instruction (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters - 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	12.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	39.69 (N=13)	92.3%	7.7%	0%
2015-2016	11.92 (N=12)	91.67%	8.33%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 19.2 (N=10)	58.33%	41.67%	0%
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 6 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	6.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	19.92 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	5.83 (N=12)	91.67%	0%	8.33%	fall: (N=2) spring: 14.5 (N=10)	83.3%	8.3%	8.3%

* One completer did not complete the Case Study due to changes in clinical placement

Sections of the Case Study assignment which were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Learners/Learning Environment. Section 1: Contextual Factors, Section 4: Design for Instruction, and Section 5: Instructional Decision Making were selected to determine how well program completers of the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated knowledge of contextual features of the learning environment and how they used this knowledge to engage in intentional decision-making in designing instruction.

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 100% of the Elementary Education undergraduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners and designed appropriate instruction, taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences. Completers were able to engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the Elementary Education undergraduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 1 and 91.67% (11 of 12) Met the criteria for Sections 4 and 5 with one completer Partially Meeting criteria for Section 4, but Not Meeting the criteria for Section 5. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners and designed appropriate instruction taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences. Completers were able engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Graduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 100% of the Elementary Education graduate completers Met the criteria for Section 5: Instructional Decision Making, 92.3% (12 of 13) Met the criteria and 8.77% (1 of 13) Partially Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction, and 84.6% (11 of 13) Met the criteria, 8.7% (1 of 13) Partially Met the criteria, and one graduate completer (8.7%) did Not Meet the criteria for Section 1: Contextual Factors.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all 2014-2015 graduate completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners. More than half of these completers demonstrated the ability to design appropriate instruction, taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences and were able to engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Three separate completers did not fully meet the criteria across all three sections of the Case Study represented in this Key Assessment. One graduate completer only Partially Met the criteria while another completer did Not Meet the criteria for Section 1. One additional graduate completer only Partially Met the criteria for Section 4. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 58.33% (7 of 12) of the Elementary Education graduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction and 41.67% (5 of 12) were rated as having Partially Met the Case Study requirements for this section. It was found that 83.3% (10 of 12) of graduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 5: Instructional Decision Making with 8.3% (1 of 12) rated as having Partially Met the criteria, and 8.3% (1 of 12) was rated as having Not Met the criteria. The data revealed that 66.7% (8 of 12) of the graduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 1: Contextual Factors with 33.3% (4 of 12) rated as having Partially Met the criteria.

Analysis of the 2015-2016 evidence from the Case Study indicates that a majority of the graduate completers of the Elementary Education endorsement program were able to engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers. While a majority of graduate completers were able to identify contextual factors and were able to design appropriate instruction, several of the completers Partially Met this criterion and found identifying this information more challenging.

It is important to note that the due date for the Case Study has been changed to an earlier date in the clinical practice semester to allow for revisions and enhancements to assist teacher candidates in meeting all of the criteria. In addition, the scoring guide will be examined to clarify deductions so that

all supervisors assessing the assignment will score the projects consistently and improve the reliability of the scores.

Instructional Practices - Knowledge

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 6.1 and 7.1)										
Standard 6.1: The teacher candidate understands multiple methods of assessment.										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	3.50 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 7.1: The teacher candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.3%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.50 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%

* One completer did not complete his/her clinical practice in elementary education with CSM, therefore the clinical evaluation is not included in this data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
PLANNING: Knowledge of professional literature Applies knowledge from the professional literature				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussions - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.38 (N=13)	53.85%	30.80%	15.38%	0%

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Instructional Practices: Knowledge including Standard 6.1 and Standard 7.1. These standards were selected to determine how well program completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated understanding of multiple measurements of assessment and their ability to plan instruction that supports students in meeting learning goals.

Undergraduates

Review of the data indicates that 83.33% of the undergraduate Elementary Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) on Standards 6.1 and 7.1 while two completers (16.67%) were rated as Rare for Standard 6.1, one completer was rated at Occasional, and one was rated at Rare for Standard 7.1.

Analysis of these findings indicates that a large majority (83.34% or 10 of 12 completers) were rated as successful in using multiple methods of assessment and planning instruction that supports students' achievement of rigorous goals.

The completer who received one Occasional rating (7.1) and one Rare rating (6.1) experienced challenges in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

The completer who received Rare ratings for both Standards 6.1 and 7.1 had challenges in her first half of the semester clinical placement in her assigned setting. This completer received support from her clinical practice supervisor and Teacher Education Program Director to provide support and guidance and this completer agreed to lessen outside commitments prior to her second half placement. These changes, along with weekly check-ins, helped this completer be more successful in demonstrating satisfactory levels of performance, finish the program, and become certified in two endorsement areas.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 100% of the undergraduate Elementary Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) on Standard 6.1 and 91.67% (1 of 12) completers were rated in the two highest levels for Standard 7.1. Only one undergraduate completer received a rating of Occasional for Standard 7.1. while two completers (16.67%) were rated as Rare for Standard 6.1, one completer was rated at Occasional, and one was rated at Rare for Standard 7.1.

Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of the undergraduate completers in 2015-2016 demonstrated high level skills in using multiple methods of assessment and planning instruction that supports students' achievement of rigorous goals.

Graduates

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting use of the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation for 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and included Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable. Sections of this Clinical Evaluation identified as one of the Key Assessments included Planning: Knowledge of Professional Literature which focuses on applies knowledge gained from professional reading and Instruction: Discussions which focuses on using higher order questions to promote student learning.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 92.3% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for Planning and 84.6% of completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for Instruction. None of the graduate completers received a rating of Unacceptable in either area. Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of the graduate completers in 2014-2015 demonstrated the ability to apply knowledge that they gained from professional literature and were able to use higher order questions to promote student learning.

The 2015-2016 data from the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels

(Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards in this Key Assessment. Analysis of these findings indicates that all of the graduate completers in 2015-2016 were able to use multiple methods of assessment and plan instruction that supports students' achievement of rigorous goals.

Case Study (Sections 3 and 4)								
Section 3: Assessment Plan (Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters - 30 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	9.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	28.46 (N=13)	84.62%	0%	15.38%
2015-2016	9.0 (N=12)	100%	0%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 17.6 (N=10)	58.3%	25.0%	8.3%
Section 4: Design for Instruction (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters - 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	12.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	39.69 (N=13)	92.3%	7.7%	0%
2015-2016	11.92 (N=12)	91.67%	8.33%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 19.2 (N=10)	58.33%	41.67%	0%

* One completer did not complete the Case Study due to changes in clinical placement

Sections of the Case Study assignment were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Instructional Practices: Knowledge. Section 3: Assessment Plan and Section 4: Design for Instruction were selected to determine how well program completers of the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated knowledge of and use of assessment strategies and how this information was used in instructional design.

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 100% of the Elementary Education undergraduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all completers demonstrated understanding and ability to use multiple assessment strategies and to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria Section 3: Assessment Plan and 91.67% of the undergraduate completers Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction. Only one completer (8.33%) was rated as having Partially Met the criteria for Section 4. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the large majority of undergraduate completers are able to use multiple assessment strategies and to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

Graduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 84.6% (11 of 13) of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program Met the criteria for Section 3: Assessment Plan, with two

completers (15.4%) Not Meeting the criteria. The data revealed that 92.3% of the graduate completers Met the criteria for Case Study Section 4: Design for Instruction, while one the completers did Not Meet the criteria for this section. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of 2014-2015 graduate completers did demonstrate understanding and ability to use multiple assessment strategies and to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

Three separate completers did not fully meet the criteria across both sections of the Case Study represented in this Key Assessment. One graduate completer only Partially Met the criteria for Section 4. Two different completers did Not Meet the criteria for Section 3. One additional graduate completer only Partially Met the criteria for Section 4. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 58.3% (7 of 12) of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program Met the criteria for Section 3: Assessment Plan, with 25.6% of completers only Partially Meeting the criteria and one completer (8.3%) Not Meeting the criteria. The data revealed that 58.3% (7 of 12) of the graduate completers Met the criteria, 41.67% (5 of 12) Partially Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the over half of the 2015-2016 graduate completers did demonstrate understanding and ability to use multiple assessment strategies. Slightly over half of the completers (7 of 12) fully met the criteria for Section 4 and demonstrated the ability to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

Five separate completers did not fully meet the criteria across both sections of the Case Study represented in this Key Assessment. One completer Partially Met Section 3 and failed to meet the criteria in Section 4. Another completer only Partially Met the criteria in both sections. Two additional completers only Partially Met the criteria in Section 3 and another completer did not meet the not meet the criteria in Section 3. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

It is important to note that the due date for the Case Study was changed to an earlier date in the clinical practice semester to allow for revisions and enhancements to assist students in meeting all of the criteria. In addition, the scoring guide will be examined to clarify deductions so that all supervisors assessing the assignment will score the projects consistently and improve the reliability of the scores.

	Bachelors - Senior Research Paper (10 points possible)				Masters - HPT Literature Review (100 points possible)			
	Mean	Exceeded	Met	Not Met	Mean	Exceeded	Met	Not Met
2014- 2015	9.37 (N=12)	58.33%	41.67%	0%	94.0 (N=13)	53.85%	46.15%	0%
2015-2016	9.40 (N=12)	66.67%	33.33%	0%	91.25 (N=12)	75.0%	16.67%	8.33%

Undergraduate

The Senior Research Paper has been identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating undergraduate completers' Knowledge of Instructional Practices. The purpose of the research project is to provide an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and skills and to present the results at a symposium in a genuine, meaningful, and practical learning experience.

Review of the data for 2014- 2015 indicated that 100% of the undergraduate Elementary Education program completers were rated as having Exceeded (7 of 12) or Met (5 of 12) the criteria for the Senior Research Paper. Examination of the data of the data for 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the undergraduate completers Exceeded (8 of 12) or Met (4 of 12) the criteria for the Senior Research Paper and the evidence indicates that all of the completers over the past two years demonstrated the ability to research and write professionally, conduct action research projects focusing on educational practices, and present scholarly work to a broad audience.

Graduate

The History, Philosophy and Trends (HPT) Literature Review Paper has been identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating graduate completers' Knowledge of Instructional Practices. The purpose of the literature review is to research and become familiar with an educational topic of interest and to write a scholarly paper designed to inform readers about existing research on the topic.

Review of the data for 2014- 2015 indicated that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Exceeded (7 of 13) or Met (6 of 13) the criteria for the Literature Review Paper. Examination of the data for 2015-2016 indicated that 91.67% (11 of 12) of the completers Exceeded (9 of 12) or Met (2 of 12) the criteria, but one completer (8.33%) did not meet the criteria for the Literature Review Paper.

Analysis of the evidence indicates that the majority of the graduate completers demonstrated the ability to research a topic and prepare a scholarly paper that met the high standards of professional writing. Only one graduate completer did not meet the criteria for this assignment and processes are now in place requiring students to use detailed feedback from the instructor to review and revise the HPT Literature Review Paper prior to being cleared for clinical practice.

Instructional Practices - Effectiveness

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 5, 6.2, 8, 11)										
Standard 5.1: The teacher candidate understands how to connect concepts across disciplines.										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	3.08 (N=12)	58.33%	25.0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.33 (N=12)	41.67%	50.0%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 5.2: The teacher candidate uses differing perspectives to engage students in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.										
2014-2015	3.08 (N=12)	41.67%	41.67%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.42 (N=12)	41.67%	58.33%	0%	0%	3.55 (N=11)*	63.64%	27.27%	9.09%	0%
Standard 6.2: The teacher candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage students in their own growth, to monitor student progress, and to guide the teacher candidate's and student's decision making.										
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	75.0%	8.33%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.58 (N=12)	58.33%	41.67%	0%	0%	3.64 (N=11)*	63.64%	36.36%	0%	0%
Standard 8.1: The teacher candidate understands a variety of instructional strategies.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.67 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	16.67%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 8.2: The teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.										
2014-2015	3.5 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.33 (N=12)	50.0%	33.33%	16.67%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	81.82%	18.18%	0%	0%
Standard 8.3: The teacher candidate utilizes available technology for instruction and assessment.										
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 11.1: The teacher candidate works to positively impact the learning and development for all students										
2014-2015	3.67 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	16.67%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	4.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	0%

* One completer did not complete his/her clinical practice in elementary education with CSM, therefore the clinical evaluation is not included in this data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
PLANNING: Organization of plans - Is well organized with written daily and unit plans				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.62 (N=13)	61.54%	38.46%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Appropriate plans - Uses plans that are appropriate to student level and background. Meets state standards				
4.0 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Content Knowledge - Explains content accurately and clearly				
3.46 (N=13)	53.85%	38.46%	7.69%	0%
PLANNING: Choices of content - Uses appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Student experiences - Engages students in meaningful learning experiences where they can construct their own knowledge using a wide array of tasks and materials				
3.69 (N=13)	76.92%	15.38%	7.69%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Formative - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.92 (N=13)	92.3%	7.69%	0%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Summative - Uses summative evaluations based on multiple measures which give an accurate accounting of learning				
3.77 (N=13)	76.92%	23.07%	0%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Measurements - Produces valid and reliable measurements of instructional objectives				
3.54 (N=13)	53.85%	46.15%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Print - Uses textbooks effectively and other readings/text to supplement instruction				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Non-print - Uses white/chalk board, projector, charts, etc. effectively				
3.77 (N=13)	76.92%	23.07%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Electronic - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.54 (N=13)	61.54%	30.80%	7.69%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Reading/writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.69 (N=13)	69.23%	30.80%	0%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Instructional Practices: Effectiveness. Standards 5.1, 5.2, 6.2, 8.1 and 8.2 and 11.1 were selected to determine how well program completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrate understanding and use of multiple measurements of assessment, show ability to plan and implement instruction that positively impacts learners, and to use technology for instruction and assessment.

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 83.3% of the undergraduate Elementary Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) on all of the Standards used in this Key Assessment. The data indicates that 16.7% (2 of 12) of completers received ratings of Occasional for Standard 11.1. It was found that 8.3% (1 of 12) of the completers were rated as Occasional and 8.3% of completers (1 of 12) were rated as Rare on Standards 5.1, 8.1 and 8.3 and 16.7% of the completers (2 of 12) were rated as Rare on Standards 5.2, 6.2 and 8.2.

Analysis of these findings indicate that the large majority (83.34% or 10 of 12 completers) were rated as successful in connecting concepts across disciplines, helping students engage in deep critical thinking about local and global issues, using multiple methods of assessment, using a variety of instructional strategies that are engaging and meaningful to learners, incorporating technology for assessment and instruction, and positively impacting learning and development for all students.

Areas that proved to be challenging for some of the completers were Standard 5.2 related to encouraging global thinking, Standard 8.1 which addresses using a variety of instructional strategies, and Standard 8.3 which focuses on using technology for instruction and assessment with two of the completers receiving Rare ratings in those areas.

The completer who received three Occasional ratings (8.1, 8.3 and 11.1) and four Rare ratings (5.1., 5.2, 6.2 and 8.2) experienced challenges in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

The completer who received Rare ratings for all Standards, except an Occasional rating for Standard 11.1 had challenges in her first half of the semester clinical placement in her assigned setting. This completer received support from her clinical practice supervisor and Teacher Education Program Director to provide support and guidance and this completer agreed to lessen outside commitments prior to her second half placement. These changes, along with weekly check-ins, helped this completer be more successful in demonstrate satisfactory levels of performance, finish the program, and become certified in two endorsement areas.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 5.2 (engaging students in critical thinking related to authentic local and global issues) and 6.2 (using multiple methods of assessment). The data indicated that 91.67% (11 of 12) of the undergraduate completers were rated in the highest two levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 5.1 (connecting concepts across disciplines), 8.3 (using technology), and 11.1 (impacting student learning and development). Finally, 83.33% (10 of 12) completers were rated in the highest two levels for Standards 8.1 (use of variety of instructional strategies) and 8.2 (using instructional strategies to

build deep understanding and apply knowledge). No completers received Rare ratings on any of the standards in this Key Assessment.

Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of the undergraduate completers in 2015-2016 demonstrated skills in connecting concepts across disciplines, helping students engage in deep critical thinking about local and global issues, using multiple methods of assessment, using a variety of instructional strategies that are engaging and meaningful to learners, incorporating technology for assessment and instruction, and positively impacting learning and development for all students.

Graduate

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting use of the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation for 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and include Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable. Sections of this Clinical Evaluation identified as one of the Key Assessments included indicators for Instruction: Planning which includes developing plans that meet state standards, address content accurately, use appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry and engage students in meaningful learning experiences; Assessment and Evaluation that addresses using formative and summative assessment strategies that provide valid and reliable evidence that objectives are met; Technology which includes effective use of textbooks and reading materials, non-print learning materials and electronic forms of technology for instruction and feedback and Instruction which addresses teaching reading and writing strategies for learning content, using a variety of teaching strategies and implementing inquiry learning experiences that help students engage in critical thinking.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 9 of the 14 indicators in this Key Assessment and 92.3% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 5 indicators. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to plan meaningful learning experiences that enabled students to master content, conduct effective formative and summative assessments, use technology for instruction and feedback, and use a variety of instructional strategies that promoted reading, writing and critical thinking.

The 2015-2016 data from the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards in this Key Assessment with except for Standards 5.2 where 90.91% (10 of 11) completers were rated in the highest two levels and only one completer was rated as Occasional.

Analysis of the data indicates that all the graduate completers in 2015-2016 demonstrated strong skills in connecting concepts across disciplines, helping students engage in deep critical thinking about local and global issues, using multiple methods of assessment, using a variety of instructional strategies that are engaging and meaningful to learners, incorporating technology for assessment and instruction, and positively impacting learning and development for all students.

Case Study (Sections 5, 6, and 7)								
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 6 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	6.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	19.92 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	8.58 (N=12)	91.7%	0%	8.33%	fall: (N=2) spring: 14.5 (N=10)	83.3%	8.3%	8.3%
Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning (Bachelors - 6 points, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 30 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	6.0 (N=11)*	100%	0%	0%	20 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	5.5 (N=12)	91.7%	0%	8.3%	fall: (N=2) spring: 29.1 (N=10)	75.0%	25.0%	0%
Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters – 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 80 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	5.5 (N=11)*	83.3%	0%	16.7%	39.54 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	11.58 (N=12)	83.3%	16.7%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 79.0 (N=10)	83.3%	16.7%	0%

* One completer did not complete the Case Study due to changes in clinical placement

Sections of the Case Study assignment identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Instructional Practices: Effectiveness. Section 5, Section 6, and Section 7 were selected to determine how well program completers of the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated the ability to make decisions about instruction, to implement instruction, analyze evidence of student learning, and engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Undergraduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 100% of undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria for Case Study Section 5: Instructional Decision Making and Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning. The data revealed that 83.3% (10 of 12) completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation and 16.7% (2 of 12) completers were rated as Not Meeting the criteria for this section.

Analysis of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that all completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design and analyze student learning implementation and evaluation of learners. The majority of undergraduate completers (83.3%) were able to demonstrate engaging in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 91.7% of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria for Sections 5 and 6 and 83.3% of the completers fully Met the criteria for Section 7. One completer (8.3% or 1 of 12) was rated as Partially Meeting the criteria for Sections 5 and 6 and two completers (2 of 12) Partially Met the criteria for Section 7.

Analysis of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 91.7% (11 of 12) of undergraduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making and the ability to analyze student learning implementation. The majority (83.3% or 10 of 12) of completers were engaged in reflection and evaluation.

Graduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 100% of graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria for all sections of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment.

Analysis of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that all graduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design and analyze student learning implementation and evaluation of learners and were able to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 83.3% (11 of 12) graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program Met the criteria for Sections 5 and 7, with 75.0% (9 of 12) of graduate completers rated as having Met the criteria for Section 6. Three completers Partially Met the criteria for Section 6 and two completers Partially Met the criteria for Section 7. For Section 5, one completer Partially Met the criteria and one completer was rated as Not Meeting the criteria for the Case Study. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Analysis of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that the majority of graduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design and analyze student learning implementation and evaluation of learners and were able to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers. It was evident that a few of the completers were not able to provide clear evidence of meeting all of the criteria for this assignment.

It is important to note that the due date for the Case Study has been changed to an earlier date in the clinical practice semester to allow for revisions and enhancements to assist students in meeting all of the criteria. In addition, the scoring guide will be examined to clarify deductions so that all supervisors assessing the assignment will score the projects consistently and improve the reliability of the scores.

Professional Responsibility

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 9 and 10)										
Standard 9.1: The teacher candidate engages in ongoing professional learning.										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	3.58 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.82 (N=11)*	90.91%	0%	9.09%	0%
Standard 9.2: The teacher candidate models ethical professional practice.										
2014-2015	3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 9.3: The teacher candidate uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each student.										
2014-2015	3.5 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.73 (N=11)*	72.73%	27.27%	0%	0%
Standard 9.4 The teacher candidate models professional dispositions for teaching.										
2014-2015	3.67 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	16.67%	0%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 10.1: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.										
2014-2015	3.5 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	0%	16.67%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%	3.91 (N=11)*	90.91%	9.09%	0%	0%
Standard 10.2: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth.										
2014-2015	3.42 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	8.33%	8.33%	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	3.67 (N=12)	75.0%	16.67%	8.33%	0%	3.73 (N=11)*	72.73%	27.27%	0%	0%

* One completer did not complete his/her clinical practice in elementary education with CSM, therefore the clinical evaluation is not included in this data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
COMMUNICATION: Interpersonal - Is approachable, assertive, and helpful				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
4.0 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Collegiality - Frequently seeks and offers assistance to other teachers				

3.92 (N=13)	92.3%	7.69%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: School staff - Utilizes school staff and teacher assistants appropriately				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Parents - Has professional formal and informal contact with parents				
3.69 (N=13)	76.92%	15.38%	7.69%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Community - Utilizes community resources; becomes a part of the surrounding community				
3.62 (N=13)	69.23%	23.07%	7.69%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Professional Association - Associates with other professional; attends meetings, joins professional societies, reads relevant literature				
3.85 (N=13)	84.62%	15.38%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reflection - Changes practice based on input from others and then reflection				
3.92 (N=13)	92.3%	7.69%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Legal/ethical - Uses classroom practices that are legal and ethical				
3.92 (N=13)	92.3%	7.69%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reliable - Completes work in a timely manner, meets all professional expectations				
3.92 (N=13)	92.3%	7.69%	0%	0%

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Professional Responsibility. Standards 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and Standards 10.1 and 10.2 were selected to determine how well program completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program engage in professional development, demonstrate ethical practices and professional dispositions, assume responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with students, families and colleagues, as well as constituents outside of school settings.

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate Elementary Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standard 9.2 and 83.33% receiving ratings in the highest two levels for the remaining Standards used in this Key Assessment. The data indicates that one completer (8.3%) received a rating of Occasional on Standard 9.3. One completer received ratings of Occasional and one completer received ratings of Rare for Standards 9.1 and 10.2. Two completers received ratings of Rare for Standards 9.3 and 10.1.

Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of undergraduate completers demonstrated engagement in professional development, exhibited ethical practices and professional dispositions, assumed responsibility for student learning, and collaborated with students, families and colleagues, as well as constituents outside of school settings.

The completer who received three Occasional ratings (9.1, 9.4, 10.2) and two Rare ratings (9.2 and 10.1) experienced challenges in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

The completer who received one Occasional ratings (9.4) and four Rare ratings (9.1, 9.3, 10.1, 10.2) had challenges in her first half of the semester clinical placement in her assigned setting. This completer received support from her clinical practice supervisor and Teacher Education Program Director to provide support and guidance and this completer agreed to lessen outside commitments prior to her second half placement. This intervention, along with weekly check-ins, helped this completer demonstrate improved levels of performance, finish the program, and become certified in two endorsement areas.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers were rated in the highest two levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standard 9.2 (ethical practice) and 91.67% (11 of 12) of the undergraduate completers were rated in the two highest levels for all of the remaining standards in this Key Assessment. One completer received ratings of Occasional for all of the standards except for a rating of Frequent for Standard 9.2. This completer had some challenges in demonstrating the highest levels of performance in clinical practice, but with support from the cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, and advisor, this completer was able to demonstrate competence and complete the endorsement program.

Analysis of the 2015-2016 data indicates that the large majority of the undergraduate completers were engaged in professional development, exhibited ethical practices and professional dispositions, assumed responsibility for student learning, and collaborated with students, families and colleagues, as well as constituents outside of school settings.

Graduate

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting use of the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation for 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and include Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable. Sections of this Clinical Evaluation which were identified as one of the Key Assessments included: Communication which focused on interpersonal skills; Cooperation/Collaboration which addressed collegial support, effective use of school staff and assistants, engaging with parents and families, using community resources, and Professionalism which included involvement in professional associations, engaging in reflection, using legal and ethical classroom practices, and exhibiting reliable, timely and professional behaviors.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 7 of the 9 indicators in this Key Assessment and 92.3% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 2 indicators. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to communicate well with others, engage in collegial and collaborative interactions with other teachers, school staff, and families, effectively use community resources, demonstrate professional, legal, and ethical behaviors, and display professional dispositions.

The 2015-2016 data from the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards in this Key Assessment except for Standard 9.1 (engaging in ongoing professional learning) where 90.91% of the completers were rated at the highest levels (Consistent), and only one completer was rated as Occasional.

Analysis of the data indicates that the large majority of graduate completers demonstrated engagement in professional development, exhibited ethical practices and professional dispositions, assumed responsibility for student learning, and collaborated with students, families and colleagues, as well as constituents outside of school settings.

Case Study (Section 7)								
Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters – 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 80 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	5.5 (N=11)*	83.3%	0%	16.7%	39.54 (N=13)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	11.58 (N=12)	83.3%	16.7%	0%	fall: (N=2) spring: 79.0 (N=10)	83.3%	16.7%	0%

* One completer did not complete the Case Study due to changes in clinical placement

The section of the Case Study assignment identified as one of these Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Professional Responsibility. Section 7 was selected to determine how well program completers of the Elementary Education endorsement program demonstrated the ability engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Undergraduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicated that 83.3% of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education program were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study, but 16.7% of completers did Not Meet the criteria for this Key Assessment. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to successfully engage in reflection and self-evaluation and function as intentionally reflective teachers. Two completers provided limited information that did not meet the criteria.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicated that 83.3% (10 of 12) of the undergraduate completers in the Elementary Education program were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment. Two completers Partially Met the criteria for Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to successfully engage in reflection and self-evaluation and function as intentionally reflective teachers. Generally, these completers provided limited information that partially met the criteria.

Graduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 100% of graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 7 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment.

Analysis of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that all of the graduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design, analyze student learning

implementation and evaluation of learners, and were able to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 83.3% of graduate completers in the Elementary Education endorsement program were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 7 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment while 16.7% completers were rated as Partially Meeting the criteria. Generally, these completers provided limited information that partially met the criteria.

It is important to note that the due date for the Case Study has been changed to an earlier date in the clinical practice semester to allow for revisions and enhancements to assist students in meeting all of the criteria. In addition, the scoring guide will be examined to clarify deductions so that all supervisors assessing the assignment will score the projects consistently and improve the reliability of the scores.

Analysis of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that the majority of graduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design, analyze student learning implementation and evaluation of learners, and were able to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers

Overall Proficiency

Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey (2015 and 2016)																		
Endorsement – Elementary																		
	Reporting Year - 2015									Reporting Year - 2016								
	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total
Indicator 1.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 1.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 1.3	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 2.1	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	4	66.67%	2	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 2.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 3.1	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 3.2	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 3.3	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 4.1	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 4.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 4.3	1	33.33%	2	66.67%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 5.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%		0.00%	1	16.67%		0.00%	6
Indicator 5.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	4	66.67%	2	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 6.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 6.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 7.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 7.2	1	50.00%	1	50.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 7.3	1	50.00%	1	50.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 8.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 8.2	1	33.33%	2	66.67%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 8.3	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 9.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 9.2	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 9.3	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 9.4	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 10.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 10.2	3	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
Indicator 11.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6

The Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey is distributed to principals who are supervising graduates from Nebraska teacher education programs. The skills areas addressed include Student Development, Learning Differences, Learning Environments, Content Knowledge, Application of Content, Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Instructional Strategies, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, Leadership and Collaboration, and Impact on Student Learning and Development. Building principals are asked to evaluate the teachers on 28 indicators using the rating scale of Consistent, Frequent, Occasional, and Rare for each indicator. The 28 indicators are consistent with the Standards on the Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation. The survey includes detailed sections on Student Development, Learning Differences, Learning Environments, Content Knowledge, Application of Content, Assessment, Planning for Instruction, Instructional Strategies, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice, Leadership and Collaboration, and Impact on Student Learning and Development. The Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey was identified as the Key Assessment for examining Overall Proficiency.

Review of the data from 2015 indicated that 100% of the teachers (N = 3) were rated as Consistent for Indicators 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1, 8.3, 9.2 and 9.3. Ratings of Consistent are at the highest level and would indicate areas of particular strength for these teachers. For all of the remaining indicators, 100% of the teachers were received ratings at the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent). Analysis of the data indicates that teachers holding Elementary Education endorsements from this program demonstrated high levels of skills in all 28 indicators with highest ratings in 6 of the indicators. The highest areas were understanding individual differences and diverse cultures; creating environments that support individual and collaborative learning; encouraging engagement, social interaction and self-motivation; understanding central concepts and tools of inquiry in disciplines; using technology for instruction and assessment; and engaging in ongoing professional learning and modeling ethical practices.

Review of the data from 2016 indicated that 100% of the teachers (N = 6) were rated in the highest two levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the Indicators except for 5.2 where 83.33% (5 of 6) were rated as Consistent and one teacher (16.67%) was rated as Occasional. This indicator addressed connecting concepts across disciplines.

Analysis of the data indicates that teachers holding Elementary Education endorsements from this program demonstrated high levels of skills in all 28 indicators with highest ratings in 27 of the indicators for 83.33% (5 of 6) teachers who were rated in the 2016 survey. The only indicator rated as Occasional for one teacher (5.2) related to connecting concepts across disciplines. This evidence supports the conclusion that teachers completing the Elementary Education endorsement program are successful in demonstrating many strengths in knowledge of learners including individual and cultural differences, using multiple forms of assessments to plan learning experiences that engage students in engaging and meaningful activities, use and build on content knowledge, create supportive and positive learning environments, display professional and ethical behaviors, and engage in ongoing professional development.