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Certification Programs

Early Childhood – Middle Childhood
- Birth – age 10 or pre-school – grade 5
- Education majors with a minor in Early Childhood
  - Gen Ed = 48 credits
  - Education major = 62 credits
  - Early childhood = 22 credits
  - Total = 132 credits

Middle Childhood – Early Adolescence
- Ages 6 – 12/13 or grades 1 – 8
- Education majors with a minor
  - Gen Ed = 48 credits
  - Education major = 62 credits
  - Minor = 24 credits
  - Total = 134 credits
Certification Programs

Early Adolescence – Adolescence
• Ages 11 – 21 or grades 6 – 12
• Major in teaching area (biology, chemistry, physics, mathematics, English, Spanish*, French*, German*, history, political science, economics, psychology, sociology communications) with teacher certification program
  – Gen Ed = 48 credits
  – Educ Cert = 42 credits
  – Major = 40-48 credits
  – Total = 130 – 138 credits

*Certification is EC-A

Music
Early childhood – Adolescence
• All ages birth – 21 or all grades
• Choral
• General
• Instrumental
• Major in music with teacher certification
  – Gen Ed = 48 credits
  – Educ Cert = 26 – 34 credits
  – Major = 56 – 58 credits
  – Total = 130 – 140 credits
08 Cohort: Distribution of Program Completers by Certification
(N = 82)
Certification Program Completers

- 82 program completers
- Program completer = graduate who meets all requirements and was eligible to apply for state licensure
- License/certification covers two age ranges so common experiences are shared throughout the program by different certification groups.
Indicators

• Entering Student Quality
  – ACT
  – PPST

• Student Learning outcomes
  – GPA
  – Praxis II
  – Cooperating Teachers Evaluation of Student Teaching (2)
  – Portfolio
08 Cohort: Program Completers Average Composite ACT
(N = 82)
ACT Composite Scores

• ACT scores are commonly used as one indicator of the academic quality of the students entering college programs.

• For the total population 75% scored at or above the SNC average (24). Thus, this cohort seems somewhat stronger than the population of the college as a whole.

• Average ACT Composite for cohort = 24.51
08 Cohort: Program Completers Average Composite ACT by Certification
(N = 82)
ACT Composite Averages

- EA-A had highest average ACT scores
- Music was second highest
  - Average for both of these above SNC average
- ECMC and MC-EA were just above the SNC average
- Thus, the average for all three groups is modestly above the college average indicating that those in the Teacher Education program were slightly more academically qualified than students at the college as a whole.
08 Cohort: Program Completers Overall GPA (N = 82)

- 2.74 and below: 1%
- 2.75 to 2.99: 12%
- 3.0 to 3.24: 34%
- 3.25 to 3.49: 20%
- 3.50 to 3.74: 20%
- 3.75 to 4.0: 1%
Final Cumulative GPAs for Program Completers

• The average GPA for program completers was 3.59
• With the requirements of at least a 2.75 overall GPA continuation and completion of the program and an expectation of a 3.0 in the major, minor and professional education courses final GPAs are typically above 3.0 and will be very high on the average. Because students are held to the GPA criteria in order to move forward in the program at the end of each academic year, students with GPAs lower than the criteria exit the program at some point during the four years.
08 Cohort: Program Completers Overall GPA by Certification (EC-MC N = 21; MC-EA N = 33; EA-A N = 21; Music N = 7)
08 Cohort Program Completers Average Overall GPA by Certification (EC-MC N =21; MC-EA N =33; EA-A N =21; Music N =7)
Average GPAs for Certification Areas

• The average GPA for each certification track is relatively similar (a range of only .13). The students in the MC-EA had the highest average and the EC-MC the lowest. But the averages are so similar that differences are relatively meaningless.
Comparison of Final GPA: 2006 with Graded Student Teaching and 2007 and 2008 with Pass/Fail Student Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certification</th>
<th>2006 Cohort</th>
<th>2007 Cohort</th>
<th>2008 Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECMC</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCEA</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impact of Changing the Grading of Student Teaching

- It should be noted that beginning with the 2007 cohort, students no longer earned letter grades for their courses in the semester that they student teach. Instead, students were assessed on a pass/fail basis. This change occurred in response to the discipline’s program review and was an attempt to create a more representative GPA.

- Comparison of GPA based on certification track reveals that for both major groups the GPA increased, with the MC-EA actually exceeding the 2006 average that included graded student teaching. The EC-MC increased 1.4% over the 2007 average, while the MC-EA average increased 3.4% over that same time period.

- The EA-A and Music groups experienced a drop in average GPA from both the 2006 and 2007 averages. The changes were generally modest except for the Music group were the average GPA dropped nearly 5% from 2007.
Praxis I (PPST) Scores

- Praxis I/PPST is used as an indicator of the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in a teacher education program. By meeting the cut score students are judged to possess the minimum knowledge and skills necessary.
- Cut (passing) scores are set by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) for each of the three Praxis I exams (Reading, Writing, Mathematics).
- Each institution is allowed to grant waivers for up to 10% of its candidates each year. Waivers can be granted for Praxis I or final GPA.
- Students can request a waiver for a PPST exam if they have taken the exam at least two times with scores close to passing, have exhibited competency in the area tested through college coursework, and signed that they understand that no waivers are available for the Praxis II exam.
- A request is sent to the Chair of Teacher Education who presents it to the faculty for approval of the waiver to be granted or denied.
- Each subtest of the Praxis I counts as 1/3 of a waiver.
- Waivers were granted for Praxis I to the 2006 cohort for 8 PPST subtests (1 reading, 5 writing, and 2 math) = 2-2/3 waivers (3.3%) total for this cohort.
08 Cohort: Program Completers PPST Reading
(Cut Score = 175) [N = 82]
08 Cohort: Program Completers PPST Writing
(Cut Score = 174) [N = 82]
08 Cohort: Program Completers PPST Math (Cut Score = 173) [N = 82]
Praxis I (PPST) Scores

- Praxis I/PPST is used as an indicator of the knowledge and skills necessary to be successful in a teacher education program. By meeting the cut score students are judged to possess the minimum knowledge and skills necessary.
- Cut (passing) scores are set by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) for each of the three Praxis I exams (Reading, Writing, Mathematics).
- Each institution is allowed to grant waivers for up to 10% of its candidates each year. Waivers can be granted for Praxis I or final GPA.
- Students can request a waiver for a PPST exam if they have taken the exam at least two times with scores close to passing, have exhibited competency in the area tested through college coursework, and signed that they understand that no waivers are available for the Praxis II exam.
- A request is sent to the Chair of Teacher Education who presents it to the faculty for approval of the waiver to be granted or denied.
- Each subtest of the Praxis I counts as 1/3 of a waiver.
08 Cohort: Program Completers Average PPST Reading Scores by Certification (Cut Score = 175) [N = 82]
Praxis I Reading Scores

• Test items are multiple choice items referring to a reading selection.
• The average reading score for the 2008 cohort was 179.80
• The EA-A group had the highest average score, while the MC-EA and Music certification group scored slightly lower. The EC-MC group was the lowest, but the difference was minimal (less than 2% below the EA-A groups score).
08 Cohort: Program Completers Average PPST Writing By Certification
(Cut Score = 174) [N = 82]
Praxis I Writing Scores

• The writing exam is made up of a series of multiple choice items and a prompt to which the students construct an essay in a 20-minute time period.
• The average Praxis I writing score for the 2008 cohort was 178.56
• The EA-A group had the highest average score, while the Music group has the lowest. However, there was very little difference between these means, a range of only 1.21 points.
08 Cohort: Program Completers Average PPST Math
(Cut Score = 173) [N = 82]
Praxis I Math Scores

• The mathematics portion of the exam is made up of multiple choice items with problems to be solved. Calculators are not allowed.

• The average mathematics score on the Praxis I for the 2008 cohort = 181.53

• The average scores for all four groups are so similar (a range of only .85 points), any differences are negligible.
Praxis II

• Praxis II is used as an indicator of the content knowledge and skills relative to the curriculum at the level the student will be certified to teach. Thus, there are different exams for each certification.

• EC-MC students take an exam focusing on elementary level concepts and skills, while MC-EA students take an exam that centers on the content and skills that are part of the middle school curriculum.

• Because those in the EA-A track are certified to teach in a specific content area, they take exams focusing on the content of the high school curriculum relative to their majors (e.g., a math major takes an exam centering on knowledge and skills included in the high school math curriculum).

• Music students take an exam specific to the music curriculum at the K-12 level.
Praxis II

• Passing scores are set by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction (WDPI) for each of the Praxis II exams.

• Students must pass the exam before they can student teach. No waivers can be given.

• Earning a passing score provides one indication that the student possesses enough of an understanding of the content to be a successful teacher at that level.
Praxis II for EC-MC

• The Praxis II exam for the EC-MC certification students is the Elementary Content Exam which tests the four core areas of Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Sciences.

Time: 2 hours
Number of Questions: 120
Format: Multiple-choice questions, scientific or four-function calculator use permitted

# of Items/% of Examination
I. Reading/Language Arts 30 25%
II. Mathematics 30 25%
III. Social Studies 30 25%
IV. Science 30 25%
08 Cohort: Early Childhood/Middle Childhood Program Completers
Praxis II Scores (n = 21)
(Test 10014, Cut Score = 147)
EC-MC Praxis II Scores

• The most significant information regarding the Praxis II is that all those who were required to pass the exam did so. This outcome indicates that those completing the Early Childhood program at SNC possess the necessary content knowledge to teach successfully at the elementary level.

• Examination of the distribution of the scores indicates that the majority of students in this program (67%) earned scores that exceeded the cut score by more than 10 points; with 29% exceeding the cut score by at least 30 points. This data indicates that these students possess relatively strong content knowledge respective to the curriculum at the grade levels they will teach.
The Praxis II exam for the MC-EA certification students is the Middle School Content Exam which tests the four core areas of Language Arts, Social Studies, Mathematics, and Sciences.

Time: 2 hours
Number of Questions: 120
Format: Multiple-choice questions, nonprogrammable calculator use permitted

# of Questions/% of Examination
I. Literature and Language Studies 30 25%
II. Mathematics 30 25%
III. History/Social Studies 30 25%
IV. Science 30 25%
08 Cohort: Middle Childhood/Early Adolescence Program Completers
Praxis II Scores (n = 33)
(Test 20146; Cut Score = 146)
MC-EA Praxis II Scores

• As was the case with the EC-MC students, the most significant information regarding the Praxis II is that all those who were required to pass the exam did so. This outcome indicates that those completing the Middle Childhood-Early Adolescent program at SNC possess the necessary content knowledge to teach successfully at the elementary and middle school levels.

• Examination of the distribution of the scores indicates that the vast majority of students in this program (79%) earned scores that exceeded the cut score by more than 10 points; with 18% exceeding the cut score by at least 30 points. This data indicates that these students possess relatively strong content knowledge relative to the grade levels they will teach.
Praxis II for EA-A Certifications

• The Praxis II for any candidate for EA-A or Music certification is dependent upon the program they are completing. Because the number of students participating in each separate content area is relatively small, individual student’s scores rather than group data are represented here. Thus, the following slides illustrate the number of students who took each exam and their results.
08 Cohort: EA-A Modern Languages and Literatures Program
Completers Praxis II Scores
Spanish- Test 10191, Cut Score = 158
French- Test 20173, Cut Score = 156
08 Cohort: EA-A Social Studies Program Completers Praxis II Scores
(Test 10081; Cut Score = 153)
08 Cohort: EA-A Mathematics Program Completers Praxis II Scores
(Test 10061; Cut Score 135)

Scores

Cases

138
145
146
158
161

1
2
4
5

120 130 140 150 160 170 180 190 200
Scores
08 Cohort: EA-A English Program Completers Praxis II Scores (Test 10041; Cut Score = 160)
EA-A Praxis II Scores

• As was the case with the EC-MC and MC-EA students, the most significant information regarding the Praxis II is that all those who where required to pass the exam did so. This outcome indicates that those completing the Early Adolescent-Adolescent program at SNC posses the necessary content knowledge to teach successfully at the middle school and high school levels.

• The above graphs indicate the distribution of EA-A certification students in a range of content disciplines. The numbers of majors across areas varies significantly- one student in French, two in Spanish and science, four in English, five in mathematics, and eight in social studies. While these distributions vary from year to year, social studies is consistently the largest group.

• Given the limited number of participants in each content area it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions from these data. Aggregate data from several years may provide more meaningful information.
08 Cohort: Music Program Completers Praxis II Scores
(Test 10113, Cut Score = 150)
Music Praxis II Scores

• As was the case with the other certifications, the most significant information regarding the Praxis II is that all those who were required to pass the exam did so. This outcome indicates that those completing the Music Education program at SNC possess the necessary content knowledge to teach successfully at the elementary, middle school, and high school levels.

• The above graph indicates the distribution of individual scores on the Praxis II for students in the Music Education program. Given the limited number of participants it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions from these data. Aggregate data from several years may provide more meaningful information.
Student Teaching

- Student teaching is a major performance assessment for those seeking teacher certification at SNC. All students complete 16 weeks of full time student teaching during one of their final 2 semesters at the college.

- The function of student teaching is to provide the student with the opportunity to demonstrate competence in all SNC Teacher Education Professional Teaching Standards. Unlike other assessments, student teaching requires the sustained integration and application of the standards in a “real world” setting.

- The SNC Teacher Education Program uses a series of Professional Teaching Standards as its learning outcomes.

- Ten standards are adopted from the WDPI standards for teaching. Prior to 2006 SNC had two additional standards included.
Student Teaching

• Each student in the EC-MC, MC-EA, EA-A certifications are provided with two eight-week placements, one at each level they will be certified to teach. Students are assigned to a cooperating teacher in a local school for each placement. Cooperating teachers mentor the students- providing guidance and support over the course of the placement. In addition, the college provides a supervisor who periodically visits the student in the school observing his or her performance and providing feedback. In addition, supervisors meet with small groups of students under their supervision during periodic seminars back on campus to discuss common topics or issues.
Student Teaching

• Data on student performance during each placement is collected from cooperating teachers using an extensive rubric requiring evaluation of the student on each of the substandards. In 2006 there were 62 substandards associated with the 10 standards for majors (EC-MC & MC-EA) and 59 substandards for those in the EAA certification. The difference in the standards is due to the fact that majors must address content in the four core content areas (math, science, social studies, language arts) while the EAA students focus exclusively on the content associated with their major. Thus, each student receives two comprehensive evaluations of his or her teaching competence based on eight weeks of full time work in the k-12 classroom by veteran teachers.

• The fact that those conducting the evaluation are experienced practitioners who are only indirectly associated with the SNC Teacher Education Program provides a degree of external validity to the assessment data. In addition, the fact that two separate assessments are conducted by different individuals in different schools provides two comprehensive judgments of the students knowledge/skills and ability to apply them in the classroom.
Levels of Proficiency in Student Teaching

- The rubric used to assess student teacher performance includes 62 substandards for the Elementary majors (EC-MC and MC-EA tracts). Performance on each substandard is judged against a four point scale: minimal, progressing, proficient, and advanced, with proficient serving as the target. Each point on the rubric includes a narrative description of the level of performance appropriate to that category. The rubric for the EAA group is the same except the substandards under standard 1. These are different because of the content knowledge emphasis in the certifications. The rubric for these student teachers contains 59 items.

- The ideal criteria for success in student teaching is to have each student achieve a proficient or advanced score on all the substandards in their cooperating teacher evaluations. However, because these assessments are conducted by many different teachers (as as many as 100 a semester), who may have different conceptualizations of the learning outcomes, there is some degree of measurement error in the process. Consequently, it is unreasonable to expect all students to earn 100% proficiency on all substandards in these evaluations.
Proportion of Judgments of Student Teachers by Cooperating Teachers at Each Level of Proficiency (Based on 7,777 total judgments by 164 teachers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Progressing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EC-MC</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-EA</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA-A</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
08 Cohort: Sub-standards With More than One Case Scored Below Proficiency in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECMC</th>
<th>1a, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3c, 4c, 4d, 4f, 4g, 5c, 6d, 7e, 8f, 9a, 9d, 9e, 9f, 10a, 10b, 10c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MCEA</td>
<td>3d, 3h, 5b, 5c, 5d, 8e, 9a, 9f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demonstrated Levels of Proficiency

- It is clear that the student teachers in the 2008 cohort were judged by their cooperating teachers to have performed at a high level of proficiency.
- The MC-EA and EA-A groups reached 99% proficiency with approximately half of the ratings at the advanced level.
- Although the EC-MC group did not meet the level of proficiency of the other two groups, they still were ranked as proficient 96% of the time. Like their peers in the other groups, about half of their evaluations were at the advanced level.
- The distribution of substandards were students failed to meet the criteria for proficiency was relatively widespread, particularly for the EC-MC group. The broad distribution of these areas of weakness would seem to indicate isolated problems rather than a systematic issue within the structure of the program. Examining, patterns of weakness across years may provide greater insight in this area.
Demonstrated Levels of Proficiency

• It is clear that the student teachers in the 2008 cohort were judged by their cooperating teachers to have performed at a high level of proficiency.

• The MC-EA and EA-A groups reached 99% proficiency with approximately half of the ratings at the advanced level. About half the judgments were made at the advanced level for these groups, with the EA-A group scoring modestly higher than the MC-EA group.

• Although the the EC-MC group did not meet the level of proficiency of the other two groups, they still were ranked as proficient 96% of the time. Like their peers in the other groups, about half of their evaluations were at the advanced level.

• The distribution of substandards were students failed to meet the criteria for proficiency was relatively widespread, particularly for the EC-MC group. The broad distribution of these areas of weakness would seem to indicate isolated problems rather than a systematic issue within the structure of the program. Examining, patterns of weakness across years may provide greater insight in this area.
Student Teaching Performance by Standard

• Further examination of performance on student teachers as assessed by cooperating teachers can be achieved by looking at the average level of proficiency for each substandard.

• By converting the qualitative assessment of minimal, progressing, proficient, and advanced on the rubric into corresponding numerical values of 1, 2, 3, and 4 we can calculate the average level of proficiency by substandard.

• This index allows us to compare the relative strengths and weaknesses of our program based on student learning outcomes.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)
EC-MC & MC-EA Student Teachers
Standard 1
Standard 1: Teachers know the subjects they are teaching. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the disciplines he or she teaches, and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for pupils.

Sub-standards for Early Childhood-Middle Childhood and Middle Childhood-Early Adolescence certification candidates:

1a. Knowledge of the mathematics content relevant to the level he or she will be certified to teach, including major concepts critical to the discipline.
1b. Knowledge of the language arts content relevant to the level certified to teach, including major concepts critical to the discipline.
1c. Knowledge of science content relevant to the level certified to teach, including major concepts critical to the discipline.
1d. Knowledge of the social studies content relevant to the level he or she will be certified to teach, including major concepts critical to the discipline.
1e. Knowledge of how students develop understanding and skill within the content area(s) one will be certified to teach, including how students demonstrate this competence.
1f. Identifies and employs relevant, content specific, curriculum materials.
1g. Designs and employs relevant, content specific, teaching strategies.
1h. Designs and employs relevant, content specific, assessments.
Standard 1: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• MC-EA Group- Substandards a, d, f and g earned the strongest scores. While substandards b, d, and e were relatively weak areas of performance.

• EC-MC Group- Like the MC-EA group, this group performed well on substandard f and g with a weaker performance on substandards b, c, d and h.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)
EA-A Student Teachers
Standard 1
Standard 1: Teachers know the subjects they are teaching. The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the disciplines he or she teaches, and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for pupils.

Sub-standards for Early Adolescence-Adolescence certification candidates:

1a. Knowledge of the content one will be certified to teach, including major concepts critical to the discipline(s).
1b. Knowledge of how students develop understanding and skill within the content area(s) one will be certified to teach, including how students demonstrate this competence.
1c. Identifies and employs relevant, content specific, curriculum materials.
1d. Designs and employs relevant, content specific, teaching strategies.
1e. Designs and employs relevant, content specific, teaching strategies, assessments.
Standard 1: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• For the EA-A Group- Substandard a earned the strongest score. While the the weakest performance for this group was on substandard b.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)

Standard 2
Standard 2: Teachers know how children grow. The teacher understands how children with broad ranges of ability learn and provides instruction that supports their intellectual, social and personal development.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

2a. Normative characteristics of age groups.
2b. How students vary from the developmental norm for the age group.
2c. Designs instructional activities consistent with the developmental characteristics of age groups.
2d. Adjusting instruction activities for individual students reflecting their developmental characteristics.
Standard 2: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• For the MC-EA and EA-A groups substandard c was scored the highest level, while substandards a and b were consistently lower for these groups.

• The EC-MC groups scores were relatively consistent across all four substandards scoring at a somewhat modest level of performance.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced) Standard 3
Standard 3: Teachers understand that children learn differently. The teacher understands how pupils differ in their approaches to learning and the barriers that impede learning and can adapt instruction to meet the diverse needs of pupils, including those with disabilities and exceptionalities.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

3a. Knowledge of varying learning needs based on cultural background.  
3b. Knowledge of varying learning needs based on socio-economic background.  
3c. Knowledge of varying learning needs based upon unique learning styles.  
3d. Knowledge of learning needs of individuals with disabilities and exceptionalities.  
3e. Instructional activities consistent with characteristics of students’ cultural backgrounds.  
3f. Instructional activities consistent with characteristics of students’ socioeconomic backgrounds.  
3g. Instructional activities consistent with characteristics of students’ unique learning styles.  
3h. Instructional activities consistent with the characteristics of students with disabilities and exceptionalities.
Standard 3: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

- The distribution of scores for the substandards for standard 3 were relatively flat for all three groups.
- The EA-A generally scored somewhat higher than the other two groups.
- The EC-MC group performed modestly better than their peers in the MC-EA group on all the substandards.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced) Standard 4
Standard 4: Teachers know how to teach. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies, including the use of technology to encourage children's development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills.

*Sub-standards for all certification candidates:*

4a. Theories of learning.
4b. Knowledge of instructional strategies.
4c. Instructional strategies for meeting learning goals.
4d. Teaching strategies that employ higher order thinking skills.
4e. Instructional strategies appropriate to curriculum content.
4f. Adjusting strategies in response to learner feedback.
4g. Technology integration.
4h. Technology awareness.
Standard 4: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandard e and f consistently involved strongest performance across certifications.
• The weakest performance was on substandards g and h for the EC-MC group. For the MC-EA and EA-A groups substandard d was scored the lowest.
• The level of performance was rather similar for all three certification groups on this standard.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced) 
Standard 5
Standard 5: Teachers know how to manage a classroom. The teacher uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

5a. Knowledge of theories of motivation.
5b. Create a strong positive classroom environment (i.e., an environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation).
5c. Designs motivational strategies for individual students consistent with their specific needs.
5d. Monitors the effectiveness of classroom management strategies and makes adjustments based on student performance.
Standard 5: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandard b consistently involved strongest performance across certifications.

• Substandards a and c generally resulted in the weakest level of performance for all three certification groups.

• The level of performance was rather similar for all three certification groups on this standard.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)

Standard 6
Standard 6: Teachers communicate well. The teacher uses effective verbal and nonverbal communication techniques as well as instructional media and technology to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

6a. Communication strategies.
6b. Oral communication.
6c. Written communication.
6d. Nonverbal communication.
6e. Listening skills.
6f. Support and expansion of learner expression.
6g. Use of multimedia communication tools.
Standard 6: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandard e involved the strongest performance for all three certification groups.
• For the MC-EA and EA-A groups substandard f involved the weakest performance, while for the ECMC group they were weakest on substandard g.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)

Standard 7
Standard 7: Teachers are able to plan different kinds of lessons. The teacher organizes and plans systematic instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, pupils, the community and curriculum goals.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

7a. Lesson plan goals & objectives.
7b. Lesson plans.
7c. Learning activities.
7d. Long-term planning – unit planning.
7e. Planning interdisciplinary learning experiences.
Standard 7: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandards a, b, and c consistently involved strongest performance across certifications.
• The weakest performance was on substandards d and e for all three certification groups.
• Although the pattern of strengths and weaknesses was the same, the EC-MC group consistently performed below the other two certification groups across all substandards. In addition, the EA-A group performed somewhat better than the MC-EA group on all substandards.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)

Standard 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-standards</th>
<th>EAA</th>
<th>MCEA</th>
<th>ECMC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 8: Teachers know how to test for student progress. The teacher understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the pupil.

*Sub-standards for all certification candidates:*

- 8b. Assessment and evaluation techniques for measuring student learning outcomes.
- 8d. Feedback to students.
- 8e. Learner’s self-assessment.
- 8f. Record keeping.
Standard 8: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

- Substandards d and f generally involved strongest performance for all three certification groups, although the EA-A performed significantly above their peers on standard f.
- while the weakest performance for all three certification groups was on substandard e.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced) Standard 9
Standard 9: Teachers are able to evaluate themselves. The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on pupils, parents, professionals in the learning community and others, and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

9a. Self-assessment.
9b. Response to students.
9c. Commitment to professional growth.
9d. Benefits of lessons, methods and resources.
9e. Drawing on expertise of colleagues.
9f. Reforming and maximizing education environment for students.
9g. Influence of parents and community.
Standard 9: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandards d and e involved strongest performance for the MC-EA and EA-A groups. The EC-MC group did best on substandards a and b, scoring somewhat higher than their peers in the other two groups.

• The weakest performance was on substandards f and g for all three certification groups.
08 Cohort: Average Proficiency on Sub-Standards in Student Teaching, As Assessed by Cooperating Teachers (3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced) Standard 10

Mean

Sub-standards

10a

10b

10c

10d

10e

EAA

MCEA

ECMC

Mean
Standard 10: Teachers are connected with other teachers and the community. The teacher fosters relationships with school colleagues, parents and agencies in the larger community to support pupil learning and well-being and who acts with integrity, fairness and in an ethical manner.

Sub-standards for all certification candidates:

10a. Interaction with teachers, staff and administration.
10b. Interaction with families.
10c. Use of community resources.
10d. Punctuality.
10e. Professional appearance.
Standard 10: Areas of Relative Strength and Weakness

• Substandards e and f consistently involved strongest performance across certifications.

• The weakest performance was on substandards b and c for all three certification groups.
Summary of Student Teaching Data: EC-MC Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas of Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1f &amp; g</td>
<td>• 1b, c, d, &amp; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NA</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NA</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4e &amp; f</td>
<td>• 4g &amp; h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5b</td>
<td>• 5a &amp; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6e</td>
<td>• 6g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7a, b, &amp; c</td>
<td>• 7d &amp; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8d &amp; f</td>
<td>• 8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 9a &amp; b</td>
<td>• 9f &amp; g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10e &amp; f</td>
<td>• 10b &amp; c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of Student Teaching Data: MC-EA Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas of Strength</th>
<th>Areas of Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 1f &amp; g</td>
<td>• 1b, d, &amp; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2c</td>
<td>• 2a &amp; b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NA</td>
<td>• NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4e &amp; f</td>
<td>• 4d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5b</td>
<td>• 5a &amp; c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 6e</td>
<td>• 6f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 7a, b, &amp; c</td>
<td>• 7d &amp; e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 8d &amp; f</td>
<td>• 8e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 9d &amp; e</td>
<td>• 9f &amp; g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 10e &amp; f</td>
<td>• 10 b &amp; c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary of Student Teaching Data: EA-A Certification

### Areas of Strength
- 1c
- 2c
- NA
- 4e & f
- 5b
- 6e
- 7a, b, & c
- 8d & f
- 9d & e
- 10e & f

### Areas of Weakness
- 1b
- 2a & b
- NA
- 4d
- 5a & c
- 6f
- 7d & e
- 8e
- 9f & g
- 10b & c
Issues with Reporting on Student Teaching Evaluations

• The above discussion of student performance is based on all reported data from the rubrics filled out by cooperating teachers. However, some cooperating teachers do not respond to particular items on the rubric. Failure to respond is generally attributed to one of three factors.
  – The cooperating teacher does not understand the substandard
  – The cooperating teacher does not think the substandard is relevant
  – The situation did not allow the student teacher to demonstrate competence on that particular substandard

• Examination of the number of cases where teachers failed to respond to a substandard provides an indication of areas for further investigation and possible revision of the rubric or the directions to teachers.
08 Cohort: Sub-Standards with Unreported Responses (Percent Unreported Beyond a Single Case) on Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teachers for EC-MC Student Teachers
08 Cohort: Sub-Standards with Unreported Responses (Percent Unreported Beyond a Single Case) on Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teachers for MC-EA Student Teachers
08 Cohort: Sub-Standards with Unreported Responses (Percent Unreported Beyond a Single Case) on Student Teaching Evaluations by Cooperating Teachers for EA-A Student Teachers
Patterns in Failure to Respond

- Different substandards seem to be at issue for each certification tract. For the EC-MC group most of the gaps in responding by cooperating teachers came on the substandards associated with standard 3 and 4. Failure to report is around 17% in these areas.
- For the MC-EA group the issues center around the substandards associated with standard 1, about a quarter to a third of teachers did not respond to standards 1a, c, and d.
- While for the EA-A group the biggest gap was on 9g; however, the responding rate was generally stronger for this group, with fewer items at issue and a generally lower rate of omissions than the other two groups.
Patterns in Failure to Respond

- It seems likely that there are one or more issues at work when teachers fail to respond to an item on the rubric.
- First, it may be that the teacher does not understand the substandard or the verbiage associated with the rubric and thus chooses not to respond. Given the number of teachers involved this is bound to happen to some degree; when a significant number fail to respond then we may need to modify the rubric or develop or train supervisors to discuss these items with cooperating teachers.
- A second possibility is that the teaching learning environment did not provide the opportunity for the student teacher to demonstrate his or her competence in this particular area. This also likely to happen on occasion, for example substandard 7e focuses on planning interdisciplinary units. It may be that some teachers, particularly at the high school level do not use interdisciplinary units. Consequently a student teacher in that classroom would not be able to demonstrate competence in the standard. This issue may be unavoidable for some substandards.
- Thirdly, it could be that the teacher simply tired of filling out such a lengthy and detailed evaluation. If this were the case it would seem the items near the end of the rubric would have the highest levels of failure to respond. However, this is not the case. So fatigue would not seem to be the issue.
Patterns in Failure to Respond

• An additional issue may be at work in regard to standard three, which saw the most failure to respond across all three certifications.
• This particular standard includes a relatively large number of substandards that attempt to encompass a range of individual difference categories. The level of specificity in these items may increase the possibility that the teacher may not observe the student teachers behavior relative to some, but not all, of these categories. This possibility warrants further investigation.
• That being said, these patterns still warrant further investigation to consider if the rubric should be modified or the directions clarified.
Portfolio

• The Teacher Education program at SNC employs a four-year developmental portfolio as a major assessment tool to examine student learning outcomes across the breadth of the program.

• In 2006 the teacher education program began the transition to a new “second generation” portfolio system. The original version of the portfolio was a somewhat flexible and open-ended document that was only loosely connected to specific courses within the program. The relatively autonomous nature of this document proved difficult both for the students to conceive and manage and for the faculty to shepherd. The resulting documents frequently did not meet the faculties expectations. However, because the 06 and 07 cohorts began the program under the “first generation” portfolio, they need to be completed in this format.

• Beginning with the 2008 cohort the program moved to a more structured portfolio that embedded specific elements, called “building blocks,” within each Education course. This structure allowed the faculty to provide greater guidance and support to students.
Portfolio

• The original portfolio employed a three point rubric with proficiency as the middle point in the scale.

• If these points are converted to numerical values we can calculate the average level of performance on each standard as an indicator of relative strength.

• Because students needed to pass all of the standards on the portfolio the scores on each standard generally varied between 2 and 3 creating limited variance.
08 Cohort: Mean Portfolio Scores for All Program Completers (Generation 2 Rubric- 3 = Proficient & 4 = Advanced)
Portfolio Data

• Standard 4 is strongest at 2.26.
• Standards 6 and 7 are the weakest at 2.17.
• However, the limited variance between these scores restricts our ability to draw broad generalizations about the student learning outcomes other than to say that student performance was relatively consistent across standards.