

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

Endorsement Program: English Language Arts 7-12

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

Artifact 3: Narrative interpretation/summary of the assessment data from the institution's perspective.

Because of the low number of completer numbers across the 2 years and 2 programs represented in this portfolio, all data has been combined into one reporting group.

There were the following number of completers:

Completers By Year		
	Bachelors	Masters
2014- 2015	1	2
2015-2016	0	3

Content Knowledge #1

Graduation GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers		
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			6	3.779 – 4.0	3.863

The Graduation GPA includes all program requirements including courses in General Education, the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement courses, and the Professional Core Courses and Supporting Courses. All courses on the Program of Study are included in the final Graduation GPA. The MAT Graduation GPA includes all MAT Professional Core courses and any deficiency courses transferred into CSM.

Review of the data indicated that all of the completers for the academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 in the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from above a 3.75 to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

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

Praxis II Test: English Language Arts: Content and Analysis (passing score 168)	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers		
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			6	159* – 183	179.67

* The Praxis II was not required for certification prior to September 1, 2015, therefore two students who completed the program in fall 2014 did not receive a passing score. One student has not passed and not retaken 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.

PRAXIS II test data indicated that all but one of the completers passed Praxis II: English Language Arts Content and Analysis exam. PRAXIS II was not required for certification until September of 2015. Though this was not required for certification prior to 2015, it was a program requirement that all candidates take the PRAXIS II content. All other completers had passing scores and the mean of 179.67 is substantially above the minimum passing score.

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

Content Knowledge #2

Content GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers		
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			6	2.57 – 3.558	3.113

The Content GPA for English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement for undergraduate completers includes all endorsement requirements including courses in writing, literature, reading and communications. These courses identified on the Program of Study were included in the Content GPA. The MAT program requires a minimum undergrad GPA of 2.75, the same GPA required of undergraduate candidates prior to clinical. If a MAT student has a GPA that is reasonably close and they exhibit solid professional dispositions during an interview with the program director, they are typically admitted provisionally, with a one semester window to demonstrate solid academic skills. This admittance requires special permission by the Graduate Council.

Review of the data indicated that all of the completers for academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 in the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program achieved a mean Content GPA of 3.113 above admittance to MAT and undergraduate clinical. Analysis of the two MAT candidates that fell below the 2.75 admittance when compared to graduation GPA show significant difference in academic growth. Both candidates completed the program with a full 1 point GPA gain to place them in the 3.5 grade range.

Analysis of the data indicates that completers demonstrated mastery of writing, literature, reading and communications Content Knowledge specifically in the areas of theoretical knowledge, academic content knowledge relevant for learners and pedagogical knowledge with a specific emphasis upon literacy.

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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 4.3: The teacher candidate integrates Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 7.2: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015
Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in classroom related to Content Knowledge. These include: Standard 4: Content Knowledge and Standard 7.2: Planning for Instruction which focus on each teacher candidate's ability to draw upon knowledge of content areas in planning.

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the completers for academic years 2014-2016 in the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 7.2

Analysis of these findings indicated that all but one of the completers were highly knowledgeable about integrating Nebraska Content Standards and drawing upon content knowledge.

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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 1.3: The teacher candidate implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 2.2: The teacher candidate ensures inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 3.1: The teacher candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 3.2: The teacher candidate creates environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 3.3: The teacher candidate manages student behavior to promote a positive learning environment.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				

2015-2016	No completers for reporting year	3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 7.3: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of students and the community context.						
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year	4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015						
Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported						

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 English Language Arts 7-12 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.

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the completers for academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 in the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 3.1 3.3 and 7.3.

Analysis of these findings indicated that the completers were rated knowledgeable about Language Arts development, demonstrate an understanding of learning differences including cultural, linguistic and developmental differences and were able to establish positive and effective learning environments for their students.

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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		40%	60%
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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2)		100%	0%

		Spring 2016: (N=3)			
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	Low number of completers, data not reported	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016		Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)	80%	0%	20%

Sections of the Case Study assignment were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in 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 English Language Arts 7-12 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.

Review of the data indicated that 100 % the English Language Arts 7-12 program completers who completed the Case Study were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of Section 4: Design for Instruction interest in this Key Assessment. Only 40% (2 of 5) met criteria for Section 1: Contextual Factors, while 60% (3 of 5) only partially met the same criteria. With support of cooperating teacher and clinical fieldwork supervisor, these completers were able to demonstrate the ability to collect and analyze student data and adjust future instruction with the evidence of student learning in mind.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study Section 5: Instructional Decision Making indicates that all candidates demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners and designed appropriate instruction taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences with an 80% competency. Completers were able to extract key features about context and engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers. One completer did not meet the Section 5: Instructional Decision –Making section. Review of documentation demonstrated a need for more in-depth reflection on decision making. Linking her instruction decisions to data, research and outcomes. With support of cooperating teacher and clinical fieldwork supervisor, this completer was able to demonstrate the ability to collect and analyze student data and adjust future instruction with the evidence of student learning in mind.

Analysis of these findings indicate that the majority were rated successful in design for instruction using contextual information and instructional decision making.

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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 7.1: The teacher candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015	
Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported	

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in 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 English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program demonstrated understanding of multiple measurements of assessment and their ability to plan instruction that supports students in meeting learning goals.

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) on both Standards 6.1 and 7.1 in demonstrating these skills.

Analysis of these findings demonstrated that the majority were rated as successful in using multiple methods of assessment and planning 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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		80%	20%
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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		100%	0%

Sections of the Case Study assignment were identified one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in 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 English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program demonstrated knowledge of and use of assessment strategies and how this information was used in instructional design.

Review of the data indicated that 100% of the English Language Arts 7-12 program completers who submitted the case study were rated as having Met or Partially Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment. Only one completer partially met the criteria. With support of cooperating teacher and clinical fieldwork supervisor, this completer was able to demonstrate the ability to collect and analyze student data and adjust future instruction with the evidence of student learning in mind.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all completers demonstrate an understanding and ability to use multiple assessment strategies and to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

	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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					93.0 (N=5)	20%	80%	0%

The undergraduate Senior Research Paper and the MAT History Philosophy and Trends final paper has been identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating candidates Knowledge of Instructional Practices. To apply professional and pedagogical skills that demonstrate scholarly knowledge and skills, all students complete a major research project in their senior year or final semester prior to clinical in

MAT. This project includes a written paper and presentation to the university community. At the undergraduate level course instructor uses rubrics to evaluate each student's written research paper and oral presentation. Students present their research to a university-wide symposium on Scholar's Day each April. Program faculty and faculty outside of the program evaluate the presentation using a rubric. All presentation rubric scores are aggregated and combined with the research paper rubric ratings to determine a final score. At the MAT level the paper is written during the History Philosophy and Trends course and is evaluated by the faculty conducting the course.

Review of the data indicated that 100% of the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program completers were rated as having Exceeded (20%) or Met (80%) the criteria for the Senior Research or History Philosophy and Trends Paper.

Analysis of the evidence indicates that all of the candidates demonstrated the ability to research and write professionally, conduct action research projects focusing on educational practices and present scholarly work.

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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 8.1: The teacher candidate understands a variety of instructional strategies.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 8.3: The teacher candidate utilizes available technology for instruction and assessment.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 11.1: The teacher candidate works to positively impact the learning and development for all students										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015

Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in 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 English Language Arts 7-12 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.

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the candidates were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 5.1, 5.2, 6.2, 8.3 and 11.1.

Analysis of these findings that the majority (100%) were rated as successful in helping students connect concepts across disciplines and about local and global issues, using multiple methods of assessment, incorporating technology for assessment and instruction and impacting student learning and development.

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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		80%	0%
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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		80%	20%
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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)		60%	40%

Sections of the Case Study assignment identified one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in classroom related to Instructional Practices: Effectiveness. Section 5, Section 6 and Section 7 were selected to determine how well program completers of the English Language Arts 7-12 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.

Review of the data indicated that 80 % of the English Language Arts 7-12 program completers were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of Instructional Decision Making and Analysis of Student Learning in this Key Assessment. The one completer who did not meet section 5 had

limited documentation of choice of instructional practices based on research based practices. The one completer partially meeting Section 6 had limited analysis of data based on student learning. For the other area, Reflection and Self Evaluation 60% of the completers were rated as Met and (40%) received a score of Partially Met due to submission in this section with some difficulty in depth of reflection based on data, research based practices and outcome. With support of cooperating teacher and clinical fieldwork supervisor, these completers were able to demonstrate the ability to collect and analyze student data and adjust future instruction with the evidence of student learning in mind.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design, implementation and evaluation of learners. The evidence indicated that candidates were able to successfully engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers.

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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 9.2: The teacher candidate models ethical professional practice.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%
Standard 9.4 The teacher candidate models professional dispositions for teaching.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=4)	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 10.1: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.										
2014-2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	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	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					4.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%	0%

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015	
Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported	

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in 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 Language Arts 7-12 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.

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the Standards. Analysis of the data indicated that the majority of completers engaged in ongoing professional learning, modeled ethical behaviors and professional dispositions, took responsibility for student learning, reflected upon their impact on others and collaborated with students, families and colleagues inside and outside of the school settings.

Case Study (Section 7)								
Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, MAT – 20 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	Low number of completers, data not reported				Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers			
2015-2016					Fall 2014: (N=2) Spring 2016: (N=3)	60%	40%	0%

The section of the Case Study assignment identified as a Key Assessment for evaluating authentic student performance in classroom related to Professional Responsibility. Section 7 was selected to determine how well program completers of the English Language Arts 7-12 endorsement program demonstrated the ability engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Review of the data indicated that 60% (3 of 5) of the English Language Arts 7-12 program completers were rated as having Met the criteria and two completer (40%) Partially Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment due to submission of incomplete evidence causing some difficult in accessing student data and completing a full analysis.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to engage in reflection and self-evaluation function as intentionally reflective teachers while two completers found the reflection process slightly more challenging. With support of their cooperating teachers and clinical fieldwork supervisor, these two completers were able to demonstrate the ability to collect and analyze student data and adjust future instruction with the evidence of student learning in mind.

Overall Proficiency

Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey (2015 and 2016) Endorsement – Secondary English																		
	Reporting Year - 2015									Reporting Year - 2016								
	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total
Indicator 1.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 1.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 1.3	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 2.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 2.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 3.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 3.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 3.3	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 4.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 4.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 4.3	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 5.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 5.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 6.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 6.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 7.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 7.2	1	33.33%	1	33.33%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 7.3	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 8.1	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 8.2	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 8.3	2	66.67%		0.00%	1	33.33%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 9.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 9.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 9.3	1	33.33%	2	66.67%		0.00%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 9.4	1	33.33%	2	66.67%		0.00%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 10.1	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 10.2	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
Indicator 11.1	2	100%				0.00%		0.00%	2	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1

The Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey is distributed to principals who are supervising graduates from Nebraska teacher education programs. 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 2015 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey produced a small number of completed surveys(n=3). It is important to note that the left side of the data table represents 2013-2014 graduates. None of the previous data from the key assessments 1-6 represents data from these new teachers. It is expected that first year teachers would be rated in the occasional or frequent range on all of the indicators listed. This information was discussed by Teacher Education Committee during analysis at the Summer Data Retreat.

The 2016 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey also produced a small number of completed surveys (n=1). In reviewing the individual data, it appears that the majority (100 %) of the new teacher rated was rated at Frequent and consistent on all of the indicators as expected of a CSM completer. An n=1 does not supply enough data for full analysis against other indicators.

As the statewide facilitation of the First Year Teacher Survey becomes standard practice, it is hoped that more complete data will be provided in the future. It is important to note that not all completers seek and gain employment in Nebraska and evidence of performance of those completers would not be accessible through the Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey.