

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

Endorsement Program: Special Education K-6, 7-12

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 | 8 | 3.217 – 3.934 | 3.573 | 12 | 3.572 - 4.0 | 3.900 |
| 2015-2016 | 3 | 2.917 – 3.977 | 3.477 | 9 | 3.650 – 4.00 | 3.890 |

Undergraduate

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

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicated that the undergraduate Special Education completers for the academic year 2014-2015 achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B (3.217) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. The data from 2015-2016 indicated that the completers in the undergraduate Special Education endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly a B- (2.917) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Graduate

The graduation GPA of completers of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program is calculated on transfer credits and those credits earned at College of Saint Mary. Review of the data indicated that graduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Special Education endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly an B+ (3.572) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. For 2015-2016, graduate completers achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly an A- (3.66) to around an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Summary

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

| Praxis II Test: Special Education: Core Knowledge and Applications (passing score 151) | Bachelors | | | Masters | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|--------|
| | N | Range | Mean | N | Range | Mean |
| 2014- 2015 | 8 | 160 - 185 | 169.25 | 11* | 165 - 189 | 175 |
| 2015-2016 | 3 | 161 - 180 | 173.67 | 9 | 158 - 189 | 178.11 |

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

PRAXIS II test data indicated that all but one of the completers passed Praxis II: Special Education Content and Analysis exam except for one individual. PRAXIS II was not required for certification until September of 2015. Completers after September 1, 2015 are required to receive a passing score in order to be recommended for certification. 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 ranging from 169.25-178.11, all substantially above the minimum passing score.

Analysis of the data indicates that all undergraduate completers, and all but one MAT graduate, 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 | 8 | 3.492 – 4.00 | 3.773 | 12 | 3.572 - 4.0 | 3.900 |
| 2015-2016 | 3 | 3.353 – 3.971 | 3.629 | 9 | 3.650 – 4.00 | 3.890 |

Undergraduate

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

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that all of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B (3.492) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. Undergraduate completers for the academic year 2015-2016 achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly below a B+ (3.353) to nearly an A (4.00).

Graduate

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

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

Summary

Analysis of the data indicates that all completers in both undergraduate and graduate Special Education endorsement programs demonstrated mastery of Content Knowledge specifically in the areas of developmental characteristics of children, theoretical knowledge, academic content knowledge relevant for all learners, and pedagogical knowledge with a specific emphasis upon attributes of disabilities, assessment, inclusion, accommodation, and Special Education law and ethics.

| 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 | Graduate Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 4.2: The teacher candidate creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for students to assure mastery of the content. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 4.3: The teacher candidate integrates Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 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 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |

| Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015 | | | | |
|---|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| INSTRUCTION: Reading/Writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content | | | | |
| Mean | Exemplary | Proficient | Developing | Unacceptable |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Discussion - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 41.67% | 50.0% | 8.33% | 0% |

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Content Knowledge. These include: Standard 4: Content Knowledge and its sub-standards 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, and Standard 7.1: Planning for Instruction which focus on each teacher candidate's ability to draw upon knowledge of content areas in planning instruction.

Undergraduate

Review of the data indicates that 92.8% of the undergraduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards. One completer was rated as Occasional for Standard 4.1, 4.3, and 7.2.

Analysis of these findings indicated that the majority of completers in 2014-2015 were knowledgeable about integrating Nebraska Content Standards and drawing upon content knowledge. The large majority (87.5% or 11 of 12 completers) demonstrated clear understanding of central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of disciplines (4.1), the ability to integrate Nebraska Content Standards (4.3), and the ability to draw upon content knowledge and other key areas in planning (7.2). The remaining one completer (12.5%) received ratings in the Occasional level, indicating some challenges in the areas of understanding central concepts and tools of inquiry, drawing upon content knowledge in teaching, and integrating Nebraska Content Standards. The remaining Standard 4.2 stressing learning experiences that make content accessible to students was met by 100%.

The completer receiving three Occasional ratings can be rather quiet and does not easily ask for assistance. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director and program faculty that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the Standards in this Key Assessment.

Analysis of the data indicates that the majority of undergraduate completers demonstrated clear understanding of central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of disciplines, use of Nebraska Content Standards, were able to provide accessible and meaningful learning experiences, and demonstrated the ability to draw upon content knowledge and other key areas in planning instruction.

Graduate

In 2014-2015, an alternative Clinical Evaluation was used prior to adopting the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation in 2015-2016. The Performance Descriptors are defined on the evaluation tool and include Exemplary, Proficient, Developing, and Unacceptable. Sections of this Clinical Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments and included Instruction: Reading/Writing which focuses on using reading and writing skills to learn content; Instruction: Variety which includes using a variety of instructional strategies to help students attain knowledge; Instruction: Discussion which encourages use of higher order questions; and Instruction: Critical Thinking which requires students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels for all categories except in Instruction: Critical Thinking, with one completer rated in the Developing category for Instruction: Critical Thinking (7.2). Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to use a variety of instructional strategies including reading and writing, higher order questioning, and critical thinking experiences to connect students with content learning.

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

Learner/Learning Environments

| NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 1, 2, 3 and 7.3) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------|----------|------------|------|---|------------|----------|------------|------|
| Standard 1.1: The teacher candidate understands how students grow and develop. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bachelors Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare | Graduate Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 1.2: The teacher candidate recognizes that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 1.3: The teacher candidate implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 2.2: The teacher candidate ensures inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 3.1: The teacher candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 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 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 3.3: The teacher candidate manages student behavior to promote a positive learning environment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% | 0% |

| Standard 7.3: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of students and the community context. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|-------|-------|----|----|---|--------|--------|----|----|
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |

| 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 |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |
| LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Personal Development - Incorporates opportunities for social development | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Social Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| PLANNING: Pre-assessment - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 33.33% | 66.67% | 0% | 0% |
| ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Expectations - Has high expectations for all student learning | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Performance - Requires students to apply knowledge in authentic settings | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Student needs - Modifies instructional approaches and materials for students with special needs | | | | |
| 3.67 (N=12) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% |
| MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Resources - Uses IEP and/or consults with special education, reading or ESL teachers | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 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 | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Classroom climate - Helps students respect contributions made by diverse learners in the classroom | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Curriculum - Includes multiple perspectives when presenting and assessing curriculum content | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 41.67% | 58.33% | 0% | 0% |
| MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Climate - Conducts a friendly, energetic, and businesslike classroom | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 41.67% | 58.33% | 0% | 0% |
| MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Organization - Organized with planning and thus instruction – students have clearly communicated expectations | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 58.33% | 33.33% | 8.33% | 0% |
| MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Time management - Uses all of class time efficiently | | | | |
| 3.25 (N=12) | 33.33% | 58.33% | 8.33% | 0% |
| MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Motivation/Engagement - Creates an engaging learning environment where students are on task and interested in the learning | | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----|
| 3.33 (N=12) | 50.0% | 33.33% | 16.67% | 0% |
| COMMUNICATION: Oral Projects - well when teaching; is confident and articulate when teaching | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 41.67% | 50.0% | 8.33% | 0% |
| COMMUNICATION: Written - Writes professionally with clarity, conciseness, and attention to detail | | | | |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |

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

Undergraduates

Review of the data indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels for all standards addressed.

Analysis of these findings indicated that all of the undergraduate completers understood individual differences, cultures, and communities and the majority of completers (100%) demonstrated clear skills in knowledge about children's growth and development, addressing learning differences, planning developmentally appropriate, collaborative, socially supporting and positive learning environments, and drawing upon student and community contexts.

Graduates

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

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

Review of the NDE Clinical Evaluation data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 13 of the 17 indicators in this Key Assessment, 91.66% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and

Proficient) for 2 of the remaining indicators, and 83.33% of the completers were rated in the highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining one indicator. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were knowledgeable about learner development, were able to use a variety of assessment and evaluation strategies, were able to meet needs of all learners, modify instruction to meet IEP and individual learning, could maintain a positive and engaging classroom environment, and were able to use effective written communication skills.

Review of this data indicates that 100% of completers in Special Education programs were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) in all areas excluding Management and Oral Communication. With the additional support of clinical teachers and supervisors, the three students involved were able to continue to improve skills within these areas to the Developing level.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent).

| 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 | Graduate Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
| 2014-2015 | 9 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 29.17 (N=12) | 83.33% | 16.67% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 9 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 30.0 (N=8) | 100% | 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 | 12 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 40.0 (N=12) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 11.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 19.63 (N=8) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% |
| Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 6 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016) | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 6 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 20.0 (N=12) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 5.33 (N=3) | 66.67% | 0% | 33.33% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 14.25 (N=8) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% |

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

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 100% of the Special Education undergraduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key

Assessment. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners and designed appropriate instruction, taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences. Completers were able to engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the Special Education undergraduate completers were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 1 and 4, while 66.67% (2 of 3) Met the criteria for Sections 5 with one completer Not Meeting the criteria for Section 5, due to lack of depth in reflection. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners and designed appropriate instruction taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences. Completers were able engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Graduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 100% of the Special Education graduate completers Met the criteria for Section 5: Instructional Decision Making and Section 4: Design for Instruction. For Section 1: Contextual Factors, 83.3% (10 of 12) Met the criteria, while 16.67% (2 of 12) met the Partially Met criteria.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that all 2014-2015 graduate completers demonstrated understanding of contextual aspects affecting learners. More than 80% of these completers demonstrated the ability to design appropriate instruction, taking into account knowledge of learners and their individual differences and were able to engage in intentional decision-making as reflective teachers.

Two separate completers did not fully meet the criteria across all three sections of the Case Study represented in this Key Assessment. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the Special Education graduate completers met Section 1: Contextual Factors at the Met criteria. For Section 4: Design for Instruction and Section 5: Instructional Decision Making, 22.22% (2 of 8) were rated as having Partially Met the Case Study requirements for those sections. It is important to note that the Partially Met criteria in these sections occurred with four different completers. Three of the four were teaching on provisional permits with support from a clinical supervisor, without the day to day support of a clinical teacher.

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

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

Instructional Practices - Knowledge

| NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 6.1 and 7.1) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|------------|----------|------------|------|---|------------|----------|------------|------|
| Standard 6.1: The teacher candidate understands multiple methods of assessment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bachelors Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare | Graduate Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare |
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 7.1: The teacher candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |

| 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 |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 33.33% | 66.67% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Discussions - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 41.7% | 58.3% | 0% | 0% |

Sections of the Clinical Practice Evaluation were identified as one of the Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Instructional Practices: Knowledge including Standard 6.1 and Standard 7.1. These standards were selected to determine how well program completers in the Special Education endorsement programs 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; Exemplary and Proficient) on both Standards 6.1 and 7.1 in demonstrating these skills.

Analysis of these findings 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 | Graduate Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
| 2014-2015 | 9 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 28.92 (N=12) | 83.3% | 8.33% | 8.33% |
| 2015-2016 | 9 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 19.50 (N=8) | 66.67%% | 33.33% | 0% |
| Section 4: Design for Instruction (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters - 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016) | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 12 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 40.0 (N=12) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 11.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.3% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 19.63 (N=8) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% |

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

Undergraduate

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

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria Section 3: Assessment Plan and 66.67% (2 of 3) of the undergraduate completers Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction. Only one completer (33.33%) was rated as having Partially Met the criteria for Section 4. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the large majority of undergraduate completers are able to use multiple assessment strategies and to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

Graduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that 83.3% (10 of 12) of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement program Met the criteria for Section 3: Assessment Plan, with one completer (8.33%) Partially Met the criteria, and one completer (8.33%) Not Meeting the criteria. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria. The data revealed that 100% of the graduate completers Met the criteria for Case Study Section 4: Design for Instruction.

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

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicated that 66.67% (6 of 9) of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs Met the criteria for Section 3: Assessment Plan, with 33.3% of completers only Partially Meeting the criteria. The data revealed that 77.78% (8 of 9) of the graduate completers Met the criteria, 22.22% (1 of 9) Partially Met the criteria for Section 4: Design for Instruction. The differences in percentage can be explained by point value changes between years.

Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the over half of the 2015-2016 graduate completers demonstrated understanding and ability to use multiple assessment strategies. Over 75% of the completers fully met the criteria for Section 4 and demonstrated the ability to use evidence to design appropriate instruction.

One completer did not fully meet the criteria across both sections of the Case Study represented in this Key Assessment. Generally, this completer provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

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

| | Bachelors - Senior Research Paper (10 points possible) | | | | Masters - HPT Literature Review (100 points possible) | | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|-------|---------|--|----------|--------|---------|
| | Mean | Exceeded | Met | Not Met | Mean | Exceeded | Met | Not Met |
| 2014- 2015 | 9.414 (N=8) | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 94.83 (N=12) | 75.0% | 16.67% | 8.33% |
| 2015-2016 | 9.30 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.3% | 0% | 93.83 (N=9) | 44.44% | 55.56% | 0% |

The undergraduate Senior Research Paper and the MAT History, Philosophy, and Trends Literature Review 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, the 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. Typically, a short presentation of the data is shared in the HPT class.

Review of the data indicated that 100% of the Special Education endorsement programs' undergraduate completers were rated as having Exceeded or Met the criteria for the Senior Research. In the MAT program, 100% of completers in 2015-2016 Met or Exceeded the criteria for the History, Philosophy, and Trends paper. In the 2014-2015 cohort, 91.67% Met or Exceeded expectations. The one student who did not meet expectations missed cut score by 1% point. The timeline for the HPT paper has been extended to allow time for instructor feedback and revisions.

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 | Graduate Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 5.2: The teacher candidate uses differing perspectives to engage students in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.33 (N=3) | 33.33% | 66.67% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 88.89% | 0% | 11.11% | 0% |
| Standard 6.2: The teacher candidate uses multiple methods of assessment to engage students in their own growth, to monitor student progress, and to guide the teacher candidate's and student's decision making. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 8.1: The teacher candidate understands a variety of instructional strategies. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 8.2: The teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 8.3: The teacher candidate utilizes available technology for instruction and assessment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.375 (N = 8) | 50.0% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 3.67 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 0% | 11.11% | 0% |
| Standard 11.1: The teacher candidate works to positively impact the learning and development for all students | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |

| 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) | 33.33% | 58.33% | 8.33% | 0% |
| PLANNING: Appropriate plans - Uses plans that are appropriate to student level and background. Meets state standards | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| PLANNING: Content Knowledge - Explains content accurately and clearly | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 50.0% | 41.67% | 8.33% | 0% |
| PLANNING: Choices of content - Uses appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry | | | | |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 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 | | | | |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |
| ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Formative - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 41.67% | 58.33% | 0% | 0% |
| ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Summative - Uses summative evaluations based on multiple measures which give an accurate accounting of learning | | | | |
| 3.25 (N=12) | 33.33% | 58.33% | 8.33% | 0% |
| ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Measurements - Produces valid and reliable measurements of instructional objectives | | | | |
| 3.25 (N=12) | 25.0% | 75.0% | 0% | 0% |
| TECHNOLOGY: Print - Uses textbooks effectively and other readings/text to supplement instruction | | | | |
| 3.25 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| TECHNOLOGY: Non-print - Uses white/chalk board, projector, charts, etc. effectively | | | | |
| 3.583 (N=12) | 58.33% | 41.67% | 0% | 0% |
| TECHNOLOGY: Electronic - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 33.33% | 66.67% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Reading/writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content | | | | |
| 3.5 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 41.67% | 58.33% | 0% | 0% |
| INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 41.67% | 50.0% | 8.33% | 0% |

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

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate Special Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) on Standards 5.2, 6.2, 8.1, 8.2, and 11.1 used in this Key Assessment. The data indicates that 12.5% (1 of 8) of completers received ratings of Occasional for Standards 5.1 and 8.3.

Analysis of these findings indicate that the large majority (7 of 8 completers) were rated as successful in connecting concepts across disciplines, helping students engage in deep critical thinking about local and global issues, using multiple methods of assessment, using a variety of instructional strategies that are engaging and meaningful to learners, incorporating technology for assessment and instruction, and positively impacting learning and development for all students.

Areas that proved to be challenging for one of the completers were Standard 5.1 related to understanding how to connect concepts across disciplines and Standard 8.3 which focused on using technology for instruction and assessment.

The completer who received two Occasional ratings (5.1 and 8.3) tends to be quiet and had difficulty asking for assistance in part due to personal hardships during her clinical practice semester. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty, as well as extended time to complete clinical practice that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) across all Standards.

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

Graduate

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

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 10 of the 14 indicators in this Key Assessment and 91.66% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 4 indicators. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to plan meaningful learning experiences that enabled students to master content, conduct effective formative and summative assessments, use technology for instruction and feedback, and use a variety of instructional strategies that promoted reading, writing and critical thinking.

The 2015-2016 data from the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards in this Key Assessment with except for Standards 5.2 and 8.3 where 88.99% (8 of 9) completer were rated in the highest two levels and only one completer was rated as Occasional. The one completer rated as Occasional was teaching on a provisional permit without the day to day mentoring of a clinical teacher.

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

| Case Study (Sections 5, 6, and 7) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|---|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 6 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016) | | | | | | | | |
| | Bachelors Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met | Graduate Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
| 2014-2015 | 6 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 20.0 (N=12) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 5.33 (N=3) | 66.67% | 0% | 33.33% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 14.25 (N=8) | 77.78% | 22.22% | 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 | 6 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 20 (N=12) | 100% | 0% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 5.0 (N=3) | 66.67% | 0% | 33.33% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 25.875 (N=8) | 77.78% | 0% | 22.22% |
| 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 | 12 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 38.42 (N=12) | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 11 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 73.125 (N=8) | 33.33% | 55.56% | 11.11% |

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

Education endorsement programs demonstrated the ability to make decisions about instruction, to implement instruction, analyze evidence of student learning, and engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Undergraduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 100% of undergraduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria for all Sections.

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

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 66.67% of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria for Sections 5, 6, and 7. One completer (33.3% or 1 of 3) was rated as Partially Meeting the criteria for Section 7 and the same completer Not Meeting the criteria for Sections 5 and 6. The completer who struggled with Sections 5 and 6 had surface level data with limited reflection. Those factors impacted instruction decision making. With additional support from her clinical teacher and supervisor, she was able to progress in these skills during her clinical rotations.

Analysis of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that more than half (2 of 3) of undergraduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making and the ability to analyze student learning implementation. The majority of completers were engage in reflection and evaluation.

Graduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 100% of graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria for Sections 5 and 6 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment. Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation found 75% (8 of 12) at the Met criteria, with 25% (4 of 12) Partially Meeting the criteria. Lack of depth across the reflection weakened scores in this Section.

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

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 77.78% (8 of 11) graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs Met the criteria for Sections 5 and 6, with 33.33% (3 of 9) of graduate completers rated as having Met the criteria for Section 6. Three completers Partially Met the criteria for Section 7 and one completer Not Meeting the criteria for Section 7. For Section 5, one completer Partially Met the criteria and, in Section 6, one completer was rated as Not Meeting the criteria for the Case Study. Generally, these completers provided limited information that Partially Met the criteria or did not elaborate with sufficient detail to fully meet the criteria.

Analysis of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that the majority of graduate completers demonstrated the ability to engage in intentional decision-making about instructional design and analyze student

learning implementation and evaluation of learners, but were not able to engage in reflection and self-evaluation as reflective teachers. It was evident that a few of the completers were not able to provide clear evidence of meeting all of the criteria for this assignment.

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

Professional Responsibility

| NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 9 and 10) | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------|----------|------------|------|---|------------|----------|------------|------|
| Standard 9.1: The teacher candidate engages in ongoing professional learning. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Bachelors Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare | Graduate Mean | Consistent | Frequent | Occasional | Rare |
| 2014-2015 | 3.75 (N = 8) | 75.0% | 25.0% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 9.2: The teacher candidate models ethical professional practice. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 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 | 3.625 (N = 8) | 62.5% | 37.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 9.4 The teacher candidate models professional dispositions for teaching. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.0 (N=9) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 10.1: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities to take responsibility for student learning. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.875 (N = 8) | 87.5% | 12.5% | 0% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.89 (N=9) | 88.89% | 11.11% | 0% | 0% |
| Standard 10.2: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | 3.5 (N = 8) | 62.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 0% | Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below | | | | |
| 2015-2016 | 4.0 (N=3) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.78 (N=9) | 88.89% | 0% | 11.11% | 0% |

| Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015 | | | | |
|---|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|
| COMMUNICATION: Interpersonal - Is approachable, assertive, and helpful | | | | |
| Mean | Exemplary | Proficient | Developing | Unacceptable |
| 3.67 (N=12) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% |
| COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Collegiality - Frequently seeks and offers assistance to other teachers | | | | |
| 3.67 (N=12) | 75.0% | 16.67% | 8.33% | 0% |

| | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|----|
| COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: School staff - Utilizes school staff and teacher assistants appropriately | | | | |
| 3.33 (N=12) | 50.0% | 33.33% | 16.67% | 0% |
| COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Parents - Has professional formal and informal contact with parents | | | | |
| 3.50 (N=12) | 50.0% | 50.0% | 0% | 0% |
| COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Community - Utilizes community resources; becomes a part of the surrounding community | | | | |
| 3.25 (N=12) | 41.67% | 50.0% | 8.33% | 0% |
| PROFESSIONALISM: Professional Association - Associates with other professional; attends meetings, joins professional societies, reads relevant literature | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 50.0% | 41.67% | 8.33% | 0% |
| PROFESSIONALISM: Reflection - Changes practice based on input from others and then reflection | | | | |
| 3.5 (N=12) | 58.33% | 33.33% | 8.33% | 0% |
| PROFESSIONALISM: Legal/ethical - Uses classroom practices that are legal and ethical | | | | |
| 3.67 (N=12) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | 0% |
| PROFESSIONALISM: Reliable - Completes work in a timely manner, meets all professional expectations | | | | |
| 3.417 (N=12) | 50.0% | 41.67% | 8.33% | 0% |

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

Undergraduate

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate Special Education completers were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for Standards 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 10.1 and 77.5% received ratings in the highest two levels for the remaining Standard 10.2 used in this Key Assessment. The data indicates that one completer (8.3%) received a rating of Occasional on Standard 10.2.

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

The completer who received the one Occasional rating (10.2) was a quiet individual who did not easily ask for assistance. As a result, this completer received support from her cooperating teacher, clinical practice supervisor, Teacher Education Program Director, and program faculty that enabled her to demonstrate competence in her teaching performance by the end of the term. This support enabled her to finish the program and become certified in her endorsement area.

Review of the data from 2015-2016 indicates that 100% of the undergraduate completers were rated in the highest two levels (Consistent and Frequent) across all Standards.

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

Graduate

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

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicates that 100% of the graduate completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for 5 of the 9 indicators in this Key Assessment, 91.67% of the completers were rated in the two highest levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 5 indicators, and 83.33% of the completers were rated in the highest two levels (Exemplary and Proficient) for the remaining 1 indicator. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of graduate completers from 2014-2015 were able to communicate well with others, engage in collegial and collaborative interactions with other teachers, school staff, and families, effectively use community resources, demonstrate professional, legal, and ethical behaviors, and display professional dispositions.

The 2015-2016 data from the NDE Clinical Practice Evaluation indicates that 100% of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated in the two highest levels (Consistent and Frequent) for all of the standards in this Key Assessment except for Standards 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 10.1 where 88.89% of the completers were rated at the highest levels (Consistent), and only one completer was rated as Occasional in Standard 10.2: Appropriate Use of Technology.

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

| Case Study (Section 7) | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------|--------|---------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--------|---------------|---------|
| Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters – 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 80 points possible Spring 2016) | | | | | | | | |
| | Bachelors Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met | Graduate Mean | Met | Partially Met | Not Met |
| 2014-2015 | 12 (N=8) | 100% | 0% | 0% | 38.42 (N=12) | 75% | 25% | 0% |
| 2015-2016 | 11 (N=3) | 66.67% | 33.33% | 0% | Fall: N=1 Spring: 73.125 (N=8) | 33.33% | 55.56% | 11.11% |

The section of the Case Study assignment identified as one of these Key Assessments for evaluating authentic student performance in the classroom related to Professional Responsibility. Section 7 was

selected to determine how well program completers of the Special Education endorsement programs demonstrated the ability engage in reflection and self-evaluation.

Undergraduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicated that 100% of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education programs were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to successfully engage in reflection and self-evaluation and function as intentionally reflective teachers.

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicated that 66.67% (2 of 3) of the undergraduate completers in the Special Education program were rated as having Met the criteria for the Case Study components of interest in this Key Assessment. One completer Partially Met the criteria for Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation. Analysis of the evidence from the Case Study indicates that the majority of completers demonstrated the ability to successfully engage in reflection and self-evaluation and function as intentionally reflective teachers. Generally, this one completer provided limited information that partially met the criteria.

Graduate

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicates that 75% of graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 7 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment. 25% of the graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement program were rated as Partially Meeting the criteria for Section 7 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment.

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

Review of the 2015-2016 data indicates that 33.3% of graduate completers in the Special Education endorsement programs were rated as having Met the criteria for Section 7 of the Case Study used in this Key Assessment while 55.56% completers were rated as Partially Meeting the criteria and 11.1% were rated as Not Meeting. Generally, these completers provided limited information that partially met the criteria or had limited depth in their reflections. Additionally, all completers in the Partial Met and Not Met categories were teaching on provisional permits and lacked the daily guidance of a clinical teacher within the classroom.

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

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

Overall Proficiency

| Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey (2015 and 2016) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------|----------|---------|------------|--------|------|--------|-------|-----------------------|--------|----------|--------|------------|--------|------|-------|-------|
| Endorsement – Special Education | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Reporting Year - 2015 | | | | | | | | | Reporting Year - 2016 | | | | | | | | |
| | Consistent | | Frequent | | Occasional | | Rare | | Total | Consistent | | Frequent | | Occasional | | Rare | | Total |
| Indicator 1.1 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 1.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 1.3 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 2 | 50.00% | 2 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 2.1 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 2.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 3.1 | | 0.00% | 2 | 100.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 2 | 50.00% | 2 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 3.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 3.3 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 4.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 4.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 4.3 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 5.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 2 | 50.00% | 2 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 5.2 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 6.1 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 6.2 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 7.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 2 | 50.00% | 2 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 7.2 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 7.3 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 8.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 1 | 25.00% | 3 | 75.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 8.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 1 | 25.00% | 3 | 75.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 8.3 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | 2 | 1 | 25.00% | 3 | 75.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 9.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 1 | 25.00% | 3 | 75.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 9.2 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 9.3 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 9.4 | | 0.00% | 2 | 100.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 10.1 | 1 | 50.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 10.2 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 2 | 50.00% | 2 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |
| Indicator 11.1 | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 1 | 50.00% | | 0.00% | 2 | 3 | 75.00% | 1 | 25.00% | | 0.00% | | 0.00% | 4 |

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

Review of the data from 2015 indicated that 100% of the teachers (N = 2) were rated at the highest levels (Consistent or Frequent) for Indicators 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 4.3, 6.1, 8.2, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, and 10.1. For all of the remaining indicators, the teachers received ratings at the Occasional level. Analysis of the data indicates that teachers holding Special Education endorsements from this program demonstrated high levels of skills in all 28 indicators with highest ratings in 14 of the indicators. The highest areas were understanding how students grow and develop; recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas; understanding individual differences and diverse cultures and communities; ensuring inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards; working with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning; creating environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; creating learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for students to assure mastery of the content; integrating Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction; understanding multiple methods of assessment; using 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; modeling ethical professional learning; using 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 adapting practice to meet the needs of each student; modeling professional dispositions for teaching; and seeking opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.

Analysis of the data indicates that teachers holding Special Education endorsements from this program demonstrated high levels of skills in all 28 indicators with highest ratings in 27 of the indicators for 3 of 4 teachers who were rated in the 2016 survey. The only indicator rated as Occasional for one teacher (1.2) related to connecting concepts across disciplines. This evidence supports the conclusion that teachers completing the Special Education endorsement programs are successful in demonstrating many strengths in knowledge of learners including understanding how students grow and develop; recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas; understanding individual differences and diverse cultures and communities; ensuring inclusive learning environments that enable each student to meet high standards; working with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning; creating environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation; creating learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for students to assure mastery of the content; integrating Nebraska Content Standards and/or professional standards within instruction; understanding multiple methods of

assessment; using 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; modeling ethical professional learning; using 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 adapting practice to meet the needs of each student; modeling professional dispositions for teaching; and seeking opportunities to take responsibility for student learning.