

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

Endorsement Program: Middle Grades – Language Arts

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	No completers for reporting year			12	3.842 – 4.0	3.929
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			9	3.451 – 4.0	3.844

Undergraduate:

There were no completers, at the undergraduate level, for the reporting years.

Graduate:

MAT candidates represent a non-traditional student population. Candidates have a Bachelor's degree in a field that may or may not be related to teacher education. They are often times juggling full-time employment, families, and other life responsibilities outside of the classroom. These candidates are typically career changers, who have discovered their calling to teach and are very focused and driven. The average MAT program graduation GPA, for the candidates pursuing a Language Arts endorsement, is a 3.9 for 2014-2015 and a 3.8 for 2015-2016 which is outstanding.

Praxis II Test: NO TEST REQUIRED	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	NO TEST REQUIRED					
2015-2016						

*As of 2016, middle level rule does not require the Praxis Content Tests for Middle Level Endorsements.

The Praxis II Content Tests for each area became a requirement in 2015. In 2014-2015 passing of the exam was not a certification requirement though taking the exam was a program requirement. Completers after September 2015 are required to earn a passing score in order to be recommended for certification. Candidates take the test in the semester prior to beginning Clinical Practice. As of 2015-2016, there is no Content Test required for the Middle Grades endorsement.

Content Knowledge #2

Content GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	No completers for reporting year			12	2.594 – 3.400	3.039
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			9	2.628 – 3.260	3.004

The Content GPA for Middle Grades endorsement completers includes all courses in Core Academic Area of the endorsement. The courses identified on the Program of Study are included in the Content GPA.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers, for the undergraduate level, for the reporting years.

Graduate:

The MAT program requires a minimum undergrad GPA of 2.75. If a candidate has a GPA that is reasonably close and they exhibit solid professional dispositions during an interview the program director, they are typically admitted provisionally, with a one semester window to demonstrate solid academic skills (3.0 or higher GPA). The candidates admitted into the MAT program and whom were seeking the Language Arts endorsement exceeded the minimum GPA for both of the reporting years. Comparing the candidates' enrollment GPA with their overall CSM GPA, there is almost a full point difference in academic growth, during their time in the MAT program. This is attributed to careful individualized program planning, clear expectations, high standards, ongoing feedback, reflection, and recognition of their successes.

If a candidate is identified as at-risk, a retention plan is designed and interventions are carefully monitored to help the candidate be successful. If a candidate does not show adequate progress, MAT policy states that after two Cs or any grade lower than a C, the candidate is dismissed. Between 2014 and 2016, no candidate seeking a Language Arts endorsement was dismissed.

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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

Standard 4.3: The teacher candidate integrates Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction.						
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year	3.63 (N=8)*	62.5%	37.5%	0%	0%
Standard 7.2: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy.						
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year	No completers for reporting year				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year	3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

*One candidate was working under a provisional teaching license during the clinical semester. No evaluation was received from the cooperating teacher/administrator.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers in undergraduate for either of the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, all eight clinical candidates were recognized as frequent or consistent on all indicators for standards 4 and 7.2. This indicates that teacher candidates were well prepared in instructional knowledge by College of Saint Mary and content areas by their undergraduate institution for their clinical practice.

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 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.

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
3.25 (N=12)	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.25 (N=12)	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussion - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%

All MAT teacher candidates in clinical practice are expected to achieve at the developing or proficient levels for their clinical experiences. It is important to remember that they are in the process of cultivating their teaching skill set. If a teacher candidate receives unacceptable ratings and/or additional feedback on significant areas of growth, the teacher candidate will be required to repeat the clinical placement in the upcoming semester before a recommendation for certification can be made.

For 2014-2015, no candidates in the MAT program, who were seeking a Language Arts endorsement, received a score in the unacceptable range and only a small percentage received a score of developing. More than 80% received marks of proficient or exemplary. The data supports our confidence that our teacher candidates are well prepared to deliver their content in the classroom.

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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%
Standard 1.3: The teacher candidate implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%
Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 2.2: The teacher candidate ensures inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%
Standard 3.1: The teacher candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.63 (N=8)*	62.5%	37.5%	0%	0%
Standard 3.3: The teacher candidate manages student behavior to promote a positive learning environment.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

Standard 7.3: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of students and the community context.						
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year	Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year	3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%

*One candidate was working under a provisional teaching license during the clinical semester. No evaluation was received from the cooperating teacher/administrator.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers for the years 2014-2015 or 2015-2016 at the undergraduate level.

Graduate:

College of Saint Mary would expect all of the MAT teacher candidates in clinical to achieve at the developing or proficient levels for their clinical experience. It is important to remember that the candidates are in the process of cultivating their teaching skill set. If a clinical candidate receives unacceptable marks and/or additional feedback on significant areas of growth, the clinical candidate will be required to repeat the clinical placement in the upcoming semester before a recommendation for certification can be made.

For 2015-2016, all eight clinical candidates were recognized as frequent or consistent on all indicators for standards 1, 2, 3, and 7.3. This indicates that teacher candidates were well prepared to meet the needs of the learner and create a meaningful learning environment for their clinical practice.

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
3.25 (N=12)	33.33%	58.33%	8.33%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Personal Development - Incorporates opportunities for social development				
3.42 (N=12)	50.00%	41.67%	8.33%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Social Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0%
PLANNING: Pre-assessment - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.00 (N=12)	16.67%	66.67%	16.67%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Expectations - Has high expectations for all student learning				
3.50 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Performance - Requires students to apply knowledge in authentic settings				
3.75 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Student needs - Modifies instructional approaches and materials for students with special needs				
3.50 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0%

MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Resources - Uses IEP and/or consults with special education, reading or ESL teachers				
3.50 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	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				
3.42 (N=12)	50.00%	41.67%	8.33%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Classroom climate - Helps students respect contributions made by diverse learners in the classroom				
3.67 (N=12)	75.00%	16.67%	8.33%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Curriculum - Includes multiple perspectives when presenting and assessing curriculum content				
3.67 (N=12)	66.67%	33.33%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Climate - Conducts a friendly, energetic, and businesslike classroom				
3.58 (N=12)	58.33%	41.67%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Organization - Organized with planning and thus instruction – students have clearly communicated expectations				
3.33 (N=12)	58.33%	16.67%	25.00%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Time management - Uses all of class time efficiently				
3.33 (N=12)	41.67%	50.00%	8.33%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Motivation/Engagement - Creates an engaging learning environment where students are on task and interested in the learning				
3.42 (N=12)	41.67%	58.33%	0%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Oral Projects - well when teaching; is confident and articulate when teaching				
3.33 (N=12)	41.67%	50.00%	8.33%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Written - Writes professionally with clarity, conciseness, and attention to detail				
3.75 (N=12)	75.00%	25.00%	0%	0%

College of Saint Mary would expect all of the MAT teacher candidates in clinical to achieve at the developing or proficient levels for their clinical experience. It is important to remember that the candidates are in the process of cultivating their teaching skill set. If a clinical candidate receives unacceptable marks and/or additional feedback on significant areas of growth, the clinical candidate will be required to repeat the clinical placement in the upcoming semester before a recommendation for certification can be made.

For 2014-2015, there are no scores in the unacceptable range. Only 8.33% of the candidates were rated at the developing level in all of the standards, with the exception of two. The remaining scores were at the proficient or exemplary level for all of the standards for the learner or learning environments.

The two standards where 16% of the candidates were identified at the developing level, covered assessment. A new research methods course was in development during the 2014-2015 year but was

not implemented until January of 2016. EDU 662, Teachers as Researchers, directly addresses using assessment for quality improvement in the classroom. It is the expectation, going forward that the teacher candidates will have a stronger foundation in assessment and assessment data.

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	No completers for reporting year				28.0 (N=12)	66.67%	25%	8.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 29.6 (N=5) spring: 29.12 (N=4)	77.78%	22.22%	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	No completers for reporting year				37.25 (N=12)	75%	16.67%	8.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 40.0 (N=5) spring: 20.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				19.83 (N=12)	91.67%	8.33%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 17.6 (N=5) spring: 15.0 (N=4)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%

Undergraduate:

There were no completers for the reporting years at the undergraduate level.

Graduate:

It would be the expectation that the teacher candidates would achieve enough points to at least partially meet the requirements within each section of the case study. If a candidate does not meet the expectation, they have an opportunity to revise to provide evidence of growth. The case study is comprised of seven total sections. These three sections best align with the learner and learning environment. This data, partnered with the clinical evaluation data (see above), provides an overall picture of the teacher candidates' abilities to demonstrate competency with meeting the needs of the learner and develop an engaging learning environment.

For 2014-2015, only one candidate struggled to meet the required depth of evidence required in sections one and four on the case study. This is consistent with the feedback on the clinical evaluation. This candidate was rated at the developing level, which is the minimum requirement.

For 2015-2016, 7 out of 9 met the standard for section 1 (contextual factors) and 2 candidates partially met the requirement. For section 4, 100% of the 9 candidates met the standard for the design of instruction. For section 5 (instructional decision making), 7 candidates met the standard, 1 partially met the standard, and 1 did not meet the standard. The candidates who did not meet the requirements were missing sufficient evidence to earn the points required on the rubric to qualify as partially met or met, for example, not providing detailed analysis to inform differentiation or not including a necessary data chart.

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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.63 (N=8)*	62.5%	37.5%	0%	0%

*One candidate was working under a provisional teaching license during the clinical semester. No evaluation was received from the cooperating teacher/administrator.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, all 8 of the candidates scored in the consistent or frequent range for standards 6.1 and 7.1. This indicates that teacher candidates were well prepared in multiple methods of assessment and planning for instruction which support every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.

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
3.17 (N=12)	33.33%	50.00%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussions - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%

For 2014-2015, none of the MAT teacher candidates scored in the unacceptable range. This indicates that teacher candidates were well prepared in multiple methods of assessment and planning for instruction which support every student in meeting rigorous learning 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	No completers for reporting year				29.00 (N=12)	75%	25%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 23.8 (N=5) spring: 20.0 (N=4)	88.89%	0%	11.11%
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	No completers for reporting year				37.25 (N=12)	75%	16.67%	8.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 40.0 (N=5) spring: 20.0 (N=4)	100%	0%	0%

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all of the candidates met or partially met the standards for section 3 (assessment plan) for the case study. For section 4, there was only one candidate who did not meet the requirements for section 4. This was a teacher candidate who was consistently lacking detail in the case study.

For 2015-2016, 8 of the 9 teacher candidates met the requirements for section 3 for the case study. One candidate did not meet the requirements due to a lack of detail within this section. For the same year, 100% of the teacher candidates met the requirements for section 4 (design for 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	No completers for reporting year				94.42 (N=12)	66.67%	25.0%	8.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				92.89 (N=9)	33.33%	66.67%	0%

Undergraduate:

There were no completers for the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, there were 11 out of 12 teacher candidates who met or exceeded the cut score of 80% on the final literature review paper. There was one candidate who did not meet the cut score of 80%, by one percent, for the final literature review paper. As of 2015-2016, the timeline for this paper has been moved up to provide more time for instructor feedback and required revisions when the cut score is not met. For 2015-2016, 100% of the candidates met or exceeded the cut score of 80% on the final literature review paper.

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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 8.1: The teacher candidate understands a variety of instructional strategies.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%
Standard 8.3: The teacher candidate utilizes available technology for instruction and assessment.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 11.1: The teacher candidate works to positively impact the learning and development for all students										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%

*One candidate was working under a provisional teaching license during the clinical semester. No evaluation was received from the cooperating teacher/administrator.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, 75% or more of the teacher candidates were consistent with the effectiveness of their instructional practices. The remaining 12.5-25% were rated as frequent on the standards related to effectiveness of instructional practice. There were no teacher candidates evaluated as occasional or rare on any of the standards related to effectiveness of instructional practice. The data supports that the teacher candidates are well prepared to deliver instruction using a variety of methods.

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
3.25 (N=12)	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0%
PLANNING: Appropriate plans - Uses plans that are appropriate to student level and background. Meets state standards				
3.67 (N=12)	83.33%	0%	16.67%	0%
PLANNING: Content Knowledge - Explains content accurately and clearly				
3.25 (N=12)	50.00%	25.00%	25.00%	0%
PLANNING: Choices of content - Uses appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry				
3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	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				
3.42 (N=12)	50.00%	41.67%	8.33%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Formative - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.58 (N=12)	75.00%	8.33%	16.67%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Summative - Uses summative evaluations based on multiple measures which give an accurate accounting of learning				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Measurements - Produces valid and reliable measurements of instructional objectives				
3.50 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Print - Uses textbooks effectively and other readings/text to supplement instruction				
3.50 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Non-print - Uses white/chalk board, projector, charts, etc. effectively				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Electronic - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.50 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Reading/writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				

3.25 (N=12)	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.25 (N=12)	41.67%	41.67%	16.67%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%

In 2014-2015, no teacher candidates scored in the unacceptable range on the clinical evaluation. More than 75% scored in the proficient or exemplary categories.

Case Study (Sections 5, 6, and 7)								
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 9 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	No completers for reporting year				19.83 (N=12)	91.67%	8.33%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 17.6 (N=5) spring: 15.0 (N=4)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%
Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning (Bachelors - 12 points, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 30 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				18.67 (N=12)	83.33%	8.33%	8.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 19.2 (N=5) spring: 28.75 (N=4)	77.78%	22.22%	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	No completers for reporting year				38.00 (N=12)	75%	25%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: 36.8 (N=5) spring: 78.5 (N=4)	77.78%	22.22%	0%

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all teacher candidates met or partially met the requirements for the case study on sections 5 and 7. Only one teacher candidate did not meet the requirements for the case study on section 6. This teacher candidate consistently lacked depth in the evidence required for the case study.

For 2015-2016, all teacher candidates met or partially met the requirements for sections 6 and 7. Only one teacher candidate did not meet the requirements for section 5. This teacher candidate was missing details and did not provide evidence of using the data to inform differentiation.

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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 9.2: The teacher candidate models ethical professional practice.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	0%	0%
Standard 9.4 The teacher candidate models professional dispositions for teaching.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 10.1: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.88 (N=8)*	87.5%	12.5%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.75 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%

*One candidate was working under a provisional teaching license during the clinical semester. No evaluation was received from the cooperating teacher/administrator.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, all 8 of the teacher candidates were evaluated in the consistent and frequent range. There were no teacher candidates in the occasional or rare categories. This indicates the teacher candidates were recognized for demonstrating professional responsibility in the clinical setting.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
COMMUNICATION: Interpersonal - Is approachable, assertive, and helpful				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.83 (N=12)	83.33%	16.67%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Collegiality - Frequently seeks and offers assistance to other teachers				
3.67 (N=12)	75.00%	16.67%	8.33%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: School staff - Utilizes school staff and teacher assistants appropriately				
3.5 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Parents - Has professional formal and informal contact with parents				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Community - Utilizes community resources; becomes a part of the surrounding community				
3.42 (N=12)	58.33%	25.00%	16.67%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Professional Association - Associates with other professional; attends meetings, joins professional societies, reads relevant literature				
3.5 (N=12)	58.33%	33.33%	8.33%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reflection - Changes practice based on input from others and then reflection				
3.5 (N=12)	66.67%	16.67%	16.67%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Legal/ethical - Uses classroom practices that are legal and ethical				
3.67 (N=12)	75.00%	16.67%	8.33%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reliable - Completes work in a timely manner, meets all professional expectations				
3.58 (N=12)	66.67%	25.00%	8.33%	0%

In 2014-2015, there were no candidates rated in the unacceptable range. More than 80% of all of the candidates scored at the exemplary or proficient range.

Case Study (Sections 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	No completers for reporting year				38.00 (N=12)	58.33%	41.67%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fail: 36.8 (N=5) spring: 78.5 (N=4)	77.78%	22.22%	0%

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, all candidates met or partially met the requirements of section 7 of the case study, showing they are able to provide evidence of reflection and self-evaluation in response to the case study results.

Overall Proficiency

Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey (2015 and 2016) Endorsement – Middle Grades																		
	Reporting Year - 2015									Reporting Year - 2016								
	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total
Indicator 1.1	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4		0.00%	2	50.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 1.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	0.00%	1	0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 1.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	0.00%	1	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	0.00%	4
Indicator 2.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	0.00%	1	00.00%	1	0.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 2.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 3.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 3.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 3.3	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.2	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.3	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 5.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 5.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 6.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 6.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.2	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 8.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 8.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 8.3	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 9.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.2	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 10.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 10.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 11.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4

Due to the small number of completed surveys, the data represented in the chart above may or may not directly connect to the endorsement area within this folio. All of the first year teacher survey data was compiled together due to low numbers.

The 2015 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey produced a small number of completed surveys. 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. For 2015, three of the four first year teachers were rated occasional or higher on all of the indicators. There was one exception where a new teacher was rated as rare on two of the indicators. The program is unaware of the circumstances related to the dispositional concerns of that teacher. The program records were reviewed, and at no time did this candidate demonstrate a deficiency in dispositions during his/her time in the program.

The 2016 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey also produced a small number of completed surveys. In reviewing the individual data, it appears that the majority (75%) of the new teachers were rated at occasional or higher on all of the indicators. There was one new teacher who was rated as rare on many of the indicators. During his/her time in the program there were some minor dispositional concerns and lack of depth in required coursework. There were some opportunities to advise this students of existing concerns. Within the data represented in this folio, her data scores on the case study, the research paper and the clinical evaluation did not provide significant areas of concern.