

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

Endorsement Program: Middle Grades – Social Science

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			9	3.472 – 4.0	3.814
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			5	3.451 – 4.0	3.860

Undergraduate:

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

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

Graduate:

The graduation GPA of completers of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program is calculated on those credits earned at College of Saint Mary.

The average MAT program graduation GPA, for the candidates pursuing a Social Science endorsement, was a 3.8 for 2014-2015 and a 3.86 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			9	2.480 – 3.540	3.035
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			5	2.754 – 3.450	2.965

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 at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

The average Content Knowledge for 2014-2015 was a 3.03 and for 2015-2016 was a 2.97. Comparing the candidates' enrollment GPA with their overall CSM GPA, it shows strong academic growth during their time in the MAT program. We attribute this to careful individualized program planning, clear expectations, high standards, ongoing feedback, reflection, and recognition for their successes.

If a teacher candidate is identified as at-risk, a retention is designed and interventions are carefully monitored to help a teacher candidate be successful. If a teacher candidate does not show adequate progress, MAT policy states that after two Cs or any grade lower than a C, the candidate is 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					3.25 (N=4)*	25.0%	75.0%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.25 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	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					2.50 (N=4)*	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%

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		Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below			
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year		3.00 (N=4)*	25.0%	50%	25.0% 0%

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

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

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, there were only 4 teacher candidates. Three of the four teacher candidates were evaluated as frequent or consistent in standards 4 and 7.2. An area of strength was standard 4.1. In this standard, all teacher candidates were frequent or consistent. An area of growth identified was standard 4.3. For this standard, the ratings were equally split among the 4 categories. It is extremely difficult to draw meaningful conclusions from this data.

It should be noted, that there was a discrepancy in the number of teacher candidates represented in the data. One of the teacher candidates was hired on a provisional license, in a district, out of town, however, receiving feedback from her assigned cooperating teacher proved to be a challenge. Multiple attempts were made to request the final evaluation from the CT, but the data was never received. Her supervisor's notes and evaluations showed growth at the proficient level. A final grade and recommendation were received from the cooperating teacher which indicated proficient performance.

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
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2 %	11.1%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussion - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.22 (N=9)	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.44 (N=12)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%

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 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.

For 2014-2015, we were pleased no teacher candidates in the MAT program, who were seeking a Social Science endorsement, received a score in the unacceptable range and over 77.7% of the teacher candidates were in the proficient or exemplary range on all of the indicators. The data supports the belief that the candidates are well prepared to deliver 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					3.75 (N=4)*	75.0%	25.0%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.50 (N=4)*	50.0%	50.0%	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					3.75 (N=4)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%	0%
Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities.										
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.25 (N=4)*	25.0%	75.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	50.0%	50.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	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					3.75 (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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.25 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	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	2.75 (N=4)*	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	0%

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

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, Standard 3: Learning Environments and its sub-standards 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, and Standard 7.3 drawing upon knowledge of students and the community. These standards were selected to determine how well program completers in Middle Grades 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.

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, 100% of the teacher candidates were evaluated as frequent or consistent in the standards aligned with meeting the needs of the learner and creating a positive learning environment. None of the candidates were evaluated as rare on any of the 9 indicators. For standards 3.1, and 3.3, one candidate scored in the developing range and two candidates scored in the developing range for 7.3. Each of these standards relate to classroom management decision making. These skills will often develop over time in the classroom setting.

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
3.33 (N=9)	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Personal Development - Incorporates opportunities for social development				
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Social Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
PLANNING: Pre-assessment - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.22 (N=9)	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Expectations - Has high expectations for all student learning				
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Performance - Requires students to apply knowledge in authentic settings				

3.56 (N=9)	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Student needs - Modifies instructional approaches and materials for students with special needs				
3.33 (N=9)	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Resources - Uses IEP and/or consults with special education, reading or ESL teachers				
3.33 (N=9)	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	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				
3.56 (N=9)	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Classroom climate - Helps students respect contributions made by diverse learners in the classroom				
3.44 (N=9)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Curriculum - Includes multiple perspectives when presenting and assessing curriculum content				
3.44 (N=9)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Climate - Conducts a friendly, energetic, and businesslike classroom				
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Organization - Organized with planning and thus instruction – students have clearly communicated expectations				
3.44 (N=9)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Time management - Uses all of class time efficiently				
3.22 (N=9)	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Motivation/Engagement - Creates an engaging learning environment where students are on task and interested in the learning				
3.22 (N=9)	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Oral Projects - well when teaching; is confident and articulate when teaching				
3.33 (N=9)	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Written - Writes professionally with clarity, conciseness, and attention to detail				
3.56 (N=9)	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%

Graduate:

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; 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.

For 2014-2015, there were no candidates who were evaluated in the unacceptable range. A total of 89% or higher of the teacher candidates received a score of proficient or exemplary on 15 out of the 17 standards. There were 22.2% (2 out of 9) scored in the developing range on management motivation. Classroom management is a skill that we believe will further develop with time served in the classroom.

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				29.11 (N=9)	88.9%	11.1%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	40.0%	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				40.0 (N=9)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	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				19.22 (N=9)	77.8%	22.2%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%

Section 1: Contextual Factors; Section 4: Design for Instruction; and Section 5: Instructional Decision Making of the Case Study assignment were identified as a Key Assessment for evaluating authentic student performance in classroom related to Learners/Learning Environment. These sections were selected to determine how well program completers of the Middle Grades 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:

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

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, no candidates scored in the not met range. A total of 77-100% fully met the requirements for sections 1, 4 and 5. 88.9% (8 out of 9) met the standard for section 1, 100% (9 of 9)

met the requirements for section 4 and 77.8% (7 out of 9) met the requirements for section 5. Only one candidate scored a partially met on section 1 and two candidates scored a partially met on section 5. No candidates scored not met on sections 1, 4, and 5. Overall, the majority of the graduate candidates did well with contextual factors, designing for instruction, and instructional decision making.

For 2015-2016, no candidates scored in the not met category on sections 1 or 4. A total of 100% of the candidates met the requirement for section 4: Design for Instruction. For section 5, it should be noted that 60% (n=3) met all of the requirements, one candidate partially met the requirement and one candidate did not meet the requirements. The teacher candidate who did not meet the requirements for section 5 was missing information and did not use the analysis to inform differentiation.

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					2.75 (N=4)*	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	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					3.00 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	0%	25.0%

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

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as 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 Middle Grades endorsement program demonstrated understanding of multiple measurements of assessment and their ability to plan instruction that supports candidates in meeting learning goals.

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, none of the MAT teacher candidates scored in the category of rare on standard 6.1. Half of the candidates scored consistent on standard 7.1. There were only 4 teacher candidates represented in this data chart, with a wide range of scores, making it difficult to make any meaningful conclusions. Ultimately, the majority of the candidates did well with understanding multiple methods of assessment and planning instruction which supports every candidate 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
3.22 (N=9)	22.2%	77.8%	0%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussions - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.22 (N=9)	44.4%	33.3%	22.2%	0%

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 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.

For 2014-2015, two candidates scored exemplary on knowledge of applying professional literature and the remaining seven candidates scored proficient on this indicator. No candidates scored developing or unacceptable. Four out of nine scored exemplary when using higher order questions to promote student learning, and an additional three candidates scored proficient, and only two candidates scored in the developing range for this indicator. No teacher candidates were rated as unacceptable. Using higher order questions to promote student thinking is a skill that develops over time in the classroom.

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				26.67 (N=9)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	80.0%	20.0%	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				40.0 (N=9)	100%	0%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	100%	0%	0%

Sections of the Case Study assignment were identified as 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 Middle Grades endorsement program demonstrated knowledge of and use of assessment strategies and how this information was used in instructional design.

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

For 2014-2015 there was one teacher candidate who did not meet the requirements for section three, the assessment plan. The one candidate who did not meet the requirements was missing a visual representation of his/her assessments. A total of 100% fully met the requirements for section 4. The data supports the evidence that the candidates are well prepared for instructional design. While the

number of candidates having difficulty with assessment was low, it was identified as a priority area for overall program improvement.

For 2015-2016, 100% met or partially met the requirements for section 3 and 4 of the case study. For the teacher candidate who partially met the requirements (1 of 5), it should be noted that there was simply a lack of depth of evidence to earn full credit on this standard.

	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				96.00 (N=8)*	75.0%	25.0%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				92.89 (N=5)	20.0%	80.0%	0%

*One student completed the HPT Literature Review in 2009 - Data is not on record.

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

The History, Philosophy and Trends (HPT) Literature Review 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.

For 2014-2015, all of the candidates scored above the cut score of 80%. For 2014-2015, all of the scores were within the range of 84-100%, with an average score of 96%, which is outstanding. The data shows that all of the teacher candidates demonstrated the ability to do independent research, analyze existing literature, and synthesize information in a graduate level research paper.

For 2015-2016, all of the scores were in the 85-99% range, with an average score of 92.75%. Stringent guidelines are in place for the assessment of this paper. The data shows that all of the teacher candidates demonstrated the ability to do independent research, analyze existing literature, and synthesize information in a graduate level research 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					2.75 (N=4)*	25.0%	25.0%	50.0%	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					3.25 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	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					3.00 (N=4)*	25.0%	50.0%	25.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	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					3.25 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	0%

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

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as 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 the Middle Grades 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:

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

Graduate:

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.

In 2015-2016, 75% (3 out of 4) were evaluated as frequent or consistent on six of the seven standards related to effective instructional practice. None of the four were evaluated in the category of rare. The data shows evidence that the teacher candidates understand how to connect concepts across disciplines, use differing perspectives to engage students in critical thinking, use multiple methods of assessment, understand a variety of instructional strategies, use a variety of instructional strategies, and utilize available technology for instruction and assessment, and work to positively impact the learning and development for all students.

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
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
PLANNING: Appropriate plans - Uses plans that are appropriate to student level and background. Meets state standards				
3.67 (N=9)	66.7%	33.3%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Content Knowledge - Explains content accurately and clearly				
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
PLANNING: Choices of content - Uses appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry				
3.67 (N=9)	66.67%	33.3%	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				
3.44 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	0%	11.1%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Formative - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.00 (N=9)	22.2%	66.7%	22.2%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Summative - Uses summative evaluations based on multiple measures which give an accurate accounting of learning				
3.22 (N=9)	33.3%	55.6%	11.1%	0%

ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Measurements - Produces valid and reliable measurements of instructional objectives				
3.33 (N=9)	33.3%	66.7%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Print - Uses textbooks effectively and other readings/text to supplement instruction				
3.56 (N=9)	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Non-print - Uses white/chalk board, projector, charts, etc. effectively				
3.56 (N=9)	55.6%	44.4%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Electronic - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.44 (N=9)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Reading/writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.44 (N=9)	44.4%	55.6%	0%	0%

Undergraduate:

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

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.

We 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 they are in the process of cultivating their teaching skill set. If a teacher candidate receives unacceptable marks 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.

In 2014-2015, no teacher candidates scored in the unacceptable range on the clinical evaluation, except on one of the planning standards. This particular standard was one related to designing instruction to promote higher level thinking. This is often a skillset that develops over a period of time for new teachers. More than 88% or more scored in the proficient or exemplary categories. The data provides evidence that the teacher candidates are prepared to plan, design and implement assessment, and provide ongoing feedback to teacher candidates, and to cultivate critical thinking through implementation of quality inquiry learning experiences.

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				19.22 (N=9)	77.78%	22.22%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	20.0%	20.0%
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				16.11 (N=9)	77.78%	0%	22.22%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	40.0%	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	No completers for reporting year				36.22 (N=9)	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	40.0%	0%

Sections of the Case Study assignment identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in classrooms related to Instructional Practices: Effectiveness. Section 5, Section 6 and Section 7 were selected to determine how well program completers of the Middle Grades 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:

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

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all of the teacher candidates met or partially met the standard for section 5. A total of 77.8% (7 out of 9) met all of the requirements for section 5, 77.8% (7 out of 9) met all of the requirements for section 6, and 66.7% (6 out of 9) met all of the requirements for section 7. A total of 22.2% (2 out of 9) partially met the requirement for section 5 and 22.2% (2 out of 9) partially met the requirement for section 7. Two candidates did not meet the requirements in section 6 and one candidate did not meet the requirements in section 7. Teacher candidates who did not meet the standard were missing data and/or a direct connection in his/her reflection to the data analysis as required.

For 2015-2016, 60% fully met the requirements for section 5, 60% (3 out of 5) fully met the requirements for section 6 and 60% (3 out of 5) fully met the requirements for section 7. A total of 20% (1 candidate), partially met the requirement for section 5, 40% (2 candidates) partially met the requirement for section 6, and 40% (2 candidates) partially met the requirements for section 7. All of the teacher candidates met or partially met the requirements for sections 6 and 7. Only one candidate

did not meet the requirements for section 5 on instructional decision making because he/she was missing required information required to earn full credit.

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					3.25 (N=4)*	50.0%	25.0%	25.0%	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=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	No completers for reporting year					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 9.4 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					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	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					3.50 (N=4)*	50.0%	50.0%	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	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					3.50 (N=4)*	75.0%	0%	25.0%	0%

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

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in classrooms 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 Middle Grades 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:

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

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, none of the teacher candidates were evaluated as rare on any of the standards aligned with professional responsibility. A total of 75% (3 of the 4) of the teacher candidates scored consistently on standards 9.2, 9.3, 9.4 and 10.2. Additionally, the remaining 25% (1 of the 4) scored frequent on standards 9.2 and 9.3. Standards 9.2 (models ethical professional practice) and 9.3 (reflective practice) demonstrate areas of strength in the teacher candidates. While no teacher candidates were rated as rare on any of the standards, some areas of growth could be engaging ongoing professional learning, modeling professional dispositions, and seeking opportunities to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals. It is important to note that only one student was rated as occasional in these areas.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
COMMUNICATION: Interpersonal - Is approachable, assertive, and helpful				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.56 (N=9)	66.7%	22.2%	11.1%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Collegiality - Frequently seeks and offers assistance to other teachers				
3.78 (N=9)	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: School staff - Utilizes school staff and teacher assistants appropriately				
3.78 (N=9)	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Parents - Has professional formal and informal contact with parents				
3.44 (N=9)	55.6%	33.3%	11.1%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Community - Utilizes community resources; becomes a part of the surrounding community				
3.11 (N=9)	44.4%	22.2%	33.3%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Professional Association - Associates with other professional; attends meetings, joins professional societies, reads relevant literature				
3.78 (N=9)	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reflection - Changes practice based on input from others and then reflection				
3.78 (N=9)	77.8%	22.2%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Legal/ethical - Uses classroom practices that are legal and ethical				
3.89 (N=9)	88.9%	11.1%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reliable - Completes work in a timely manner, meets all professional expectations				
3.33 (N=9)	44.4%	44.4%	11.1%	0%

Undergraduate:

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

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 Communication which focused on interpersonal skills; Cooperation/Collaboration which addressed collegial support, effective use of school staff and assistants, engaging with parents and families and uses 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.

In 2014-2015, there were no candidates rated in the unacceptable range. More than 88.9-100% of all of the candidates scored at the exemplary or proficient range on all indicators with the exception of one indicator, where three candidates were in the developing range. In these clinical placements, teacher candidates were placed for only 8 weeks (1 of 2 placements) where teacher candidates may or may not have had ample opportunity to become part of the learning community or utilize the resources within the community.

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				36.22 (N=9)	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				fall: (N=2) spring: (N=3)	60.0%	40.0%	0%

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

Undergraduate:

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

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all, but one of the teacher candidates met or partially met the requirements for section 7 of the case study. A total of 66.7% (6 out of the 9) met the requirements for reflection and self-reflection on section 7. One candidate did not meet the requirements due to the lack of detailed evidence as required by the rubric.

For 2015-2016, a total of 60% (3 of the 5) fully met the requirements for section 7. The remaining two teacher candidates partially met the requirements and did not earn full points due to lack of detailed evidence as required by the rubric.

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 candidate on 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.

