UNIVERSITY OF
MONTANA

Department of Teaching and Learning
2022 Assessment Report

MISSION STATEMENT

The Department of Teaching and Learning of the Phyllis J. Washington College of Education prepares university students to become quality educators who make positive contributions to their communities through teaching, service, and leadership. Our curriculum pathways and extensive clinical experiences are designed to enable candidates to foster the academic, cognitive, social, and ethical development of children and youth, and to address and appreciate the unique characteristics and varied skills and abilities of *all* children and youth. These include varied socioeconomic, linguistic, and ethnic backgrounds, with a special emphasis on American Indian tribes in Montana. The broad goal of our program is for our graduates to be prepared to effectively teach children and youth in Montana, the United States, and in international settings.

DEPARTMENT ALIGNMENT WITH PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

1. **Place student success at the center of all we do**
    We are a department of professionals that clearly strive to put our students (and *their* current and future students) first in everything we do. We are intensely focused on continuous improvement of all aspects of our programs, and meet regularly as a group (at least twice monthly), and as often in subcommittees, to examine student data and systematically make program adjustments changes based on student feedback, performance and assessment data. We are focused also on student retention, persistence, and support through and beyond graduation. We actively seek student feedback at regular intervals and follow up with our graduates as they become professional educators to seek their input. In addition, we collect feedback from *their* employers on the quality of our educator preparation program. We are also focused on supports for historically underserved populations, through outreach and support to our distance students (who often face economic and other constraints which prevent them from attending UM in Missoula in person), American Indian students, and students with disabilities.

2. **Drive excellence and innovation in teaching, learning, and research**
    We have developed a number of curricular innovations in recent years. For example, we have long recognized that our students have, at least on the surface, perhaps less diverse student populations with whom to work in clinical field settings than their countertops in large urban areas in other states. As a result, we have developed the opportunity for all our elementary education students to work with multilingual learners in a supervised field setting in Level 2 of our elementary education program. We also offer supervised field experiences for all our teacher licensure candidates in every semester of their coursework (in addition to student teaching and internship terms) and in Level 3, run seminars in local

schools with faculty members for students in the field to discuss their field work challenges and highlights. (Level 1 and 2 students meet every other day in classes on alternate days from field placements, so have access to in-class discussions and instructors a couple times per week.) Several of our faculty members are involved with regional tribal members and communities in collaborating on student support and scholarly activities (publication citations available on request) and we have collaborative relationships with numerous partners across western Montana in our field-based practicum settings. We also partner with Flathead Valley Community College and Helena College in 2+2 programs to train elementary teachers in their home communities, and have just partnered with Bitterroot College to offer a place-based M.A. program. We are currently seeking partners across the state to expand our secondary education offerings.

3. **Embody the principle of "Mission First, People Always"**

Our department is made up of individuals with unique talents and abilities. Hiring freezes and other fiscal constraints have prevented us from adding to our pool of tenure-track faculty though we have the need for more tenure-track personnel to continue to offer all the quality programs we have in place and those in development. We definitely solicit and value input from all our stakeholders in our work, and are working to increase ethic diversity in any hires that we do make (including adjuncts), to ensure that our workforce is representative of our constituents and that we benefit from multiple perspectives and experiences. We also are working hard to support the faculty members that we do have.

4. **Partner with place**

As a department, we deeply committed to developing and nurturing relationships with the people and places of our community, state, and region. We have ongoing partnerships with numerous schools and K-12 school personnel throughout the region and are continuously and intentionally working to strengthen and sustain those relationships. In a similar vein, we have collaborative scholarship and field placement partnerships with tribal communities. We work closely with the Montana Office of Public Instruction and other Educator Preparation Programs (EPPs) from across the state to address the challenges of the lack of qualified teachers in rural areas of our state; we are participating the relatively new Montana teacher residency program. We collaborate with colleagues in all the other EPPs across the state through the Montana Council of Deans of Education meetings, the Continuous Improvement Committee of MCDE, and the Higher Education Consortium (HEC) of EPPs. We also offer field-based placements through organizations focused on place-based education and environmental education and sustainability, such as the Clark Fork Watershed Education Program, Garden City Harvest (PEAS Farm), Montana Natural History Center, and the Watershed Education Network, and are currently growing our involvement with these and other programs to increase opportunities for our students.

Many of us from Teaching and Learning actively participate on the College of Education's DEI Committee, and also on the College Advisory Board, comprised of professionals across the state and country representing different perspectives and professional disciplines.

5. **Proudly tell the UM story**

The Department of Teaching & Learning at UM just completed a rigorous national accreditation process through the [Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation](#) (CAEP), alongside a state accreditation

review through the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) based in Helena. In the process of preparing for these external reviews, as a department (and with administrative support from our new Accreditation Director and Associate Dean) we intensively studied all areas of our programs, collected and analyzed copious amounts of evidence, and produced a manuscript some 200 pages in length, with an additional 100+ pieces of evidence to demonstrate our assertions. Both national and state teams visited our programs in April of 2022 over 2-3 days. Following intensive interviews with faculty, staff, administrators, current and former students, and partners (from across campus, in our clinical sites, and on our Advisory Board), the review teams went through their own evaluative processes with all written data, evidence, and interview notes. In the fall of 2022, a small group of us (leadership team members) reconvened with the national review team and answered additional questions. In late October we received the very positive news that we passed all the CAEP standards for excellence in Educator Preparation, and likewise are fully accredited by the state of Montana. Accreditation outcomes were reviewed by the Montana Board of Public Education on January 18th, 2023. Our next external national review will be in 5 years. The 5 broad CAEP standards for quality educator preparation follow, included here because they are foundational to our professional programs.

CAEP Standards:

1. **Standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge**

   We ensure that candidates develop an understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and facilitate candidates' reflection of their personal biases to increase their understanding and practice of equity, diversity, and inclusion. We are intentional in the development of curriculum and clinical experiences for candidates to demonstrate their ability to effectively work with diverse P-12 students and their families.

2. **Standard 2: Clinical Partnerships and Practice**

   We ensure that effective partnerships and high-quality clinical practice are central to our candidates' preparation. These experiences are designed to develop candidate's knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions to demonstrate positive impact on diverse students' learning and development. High quality clinical practice offers candidates experiences in different settings and modalities, as well as with diverse P-12 students, schools, families, and communities. Partners share responsibility to identify and address real problems of practice candidates experience in their engagement with P-12 students.

3. **Standard 3: Candidate Recruitment, Progression, and Support**

   The provider demonstrates the quality of candidates is a continuous and purposeful focus from recruitment through completion. The provider demonstrates that development of candidate quality is the goal of educator preparation and that the EPP provides supports services (such as advising, remediation, and mentoring) in all phases of the program so candidates will be successful.

4. **Standard 4: Program Impact**

   The provider demonstrates the effectiveness of its completers' instruction on P-12 student learning and development, and completer and employer satisfaction with the relevance and effectiveness of preparation.

5. **Standard 5: Quality Assurance System and Continuous Improvement**

> The provider maintains a quality assurance system that consists of valid data from multiple measures and supports continuous improvement that is sustained and evidence-based. The system is developed and maintained with input from internal and external stakeholders. The provider uses the results of inquiry and data collection to establish priorities, enhance program elements, and highlight innovations.

InTASC Core Teaching Standards

In addition to adopting the CAEP standards as a framework for program outcomes, we have also adopted the **CCSSO's *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC)* Core Teaching Standards** for quality educator preparation (CCSSO stands for *Council of Chief State School Officers).* The InTASC and CAEP standards are aligned, and in many ways the InTASC standards offer more detailed learner objectives. These as used in the following table and **guide our professional practices**. The 10 standards are divided into 4 broad categories, below: 1.) The Learner and Learning, 2.) Content, 3.) Instructional Practice, and 4.) Professional Responsibility.

Summary of Updated InTASC Core Teaching Standards (Excerpted directly from: *InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0 9)*

The Learner and Learning

Teaching begins with the learner. To ensure that each student learns new knowledge and skills, teachers must understand that learning and developmental patterns vary among individuals, that learners bring unique individual differences to the learning process, and that learners need supportive and safe learning environments to thrive. Effective teachers have high expectations for each and every learner and implement developmentally appropriate, challenging learning experiences within a variety of learning environments that help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential. Teachers do this by combining a base of professional knowledge, including an understanding of how cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development occurs, with the recognition that learners are individuals who bring differing personal and family backgrounds, skills, abilities, perspectives, talents and interests. Teachers collaborate with learners, colleagues, school leaders, families, members of the learners' communities, and community organizations to better understand their students and maximize their learning. Teachers promote learners' acceptance of responsibility for their own learning and collaborate with them to ensure the effective design and implementation of both self-directed and collaborative learning.

Standard #1: Learner Development. The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
Standard #2: Learning Differences. The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.
Standard #3: Learning Environments. The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Content

Teachers must have a deep and flexible understanding of their content areas and be able to draw upon content

knowledge as they work with learners to access information, apply knowledge in real world settings, and address meaningful issues to assure learner proficiency in the content. Today's teachers make content knowledge accessible to learners by using multiple means of communication, including digital media and information technology. They integrate cross-disciplinary skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, creativity, communication) to help learners use content to propose solutions, forge new understandings, solve problems, and imagine possibilities. Finally, teachers make content knowledge relevant to learners by connecting it to local, state, national, and global issues.

Standard #4: **Content Knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
Standard #5: **Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Instructional Practice
Effective instructional practice requires that teachers understand and integrate assessment, planning, and instructional strategies in coordinated and engaging ways. Beginning with their end or goal, teachers first identify student learning objectives and content standards and align assessments to those objectives. Teachers understand how to design, implement and interpret results from a range of formative and summative assessments. This knowledge is integrated into instructional practice so that teachers have access to information that can be used to provide immediate feedback to reinforce student learning and to modify instruction. Planning focuses on using a variety of appropriate and targeted instructional strategies to address diverse ways of learning, to incorporate new technologies to maximize and individualize learning, and to allow learners to take charge of their own learning and do it in creative ways.

Standard #6: Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.
Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Professional Responsibility
Creating and supporting safe, productive learning environments that result in learners achieving at the highest levels is a teacher's primary responsibility. To do this well, teachers must engage in meaningful and intensive professional learning and self-renewal by regularly examining practice through ongoing study, self-reflection, and collaboration. A cycle of continuous self-improvement is enhanced by leadership, collegial support, and collaboration. Active engagement in professional learning and collaboration results in the discovery and implementation of better practice for the purpose of improved teaching and learning. Teachers also contribute to improving instructional practices that meet learners' needs and accomplish their school's mission and goals. Teachers benefit from and participate in collaboration with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members. Teachers demonstrate leadership by modeling ethical behavior, contributing to positive changes in practice, and advancing their profession.

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts

practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

Department of Teaching & Learning

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES and MEASUREMENT TOOLS

Student Learning Outcomes (Adopted by our unit from national CAEP and InTASC standards for Educator Preparation)	Course goals and assessments	Level One Capstone	Ethics Case Study	GPA	National Praxis Tests in different content and licensure areas	Danielson Framework for teaching in all field work and student teaching settings	Applied Research and Reflective Practice (ARRP)
1.) **Learner Development.** The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X		X to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X
2.) **Learning Differences.** The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X	X	X to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X
3.) **Learning Environments.** The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X	X		X	X	X
4.) **Content Knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X	X	X, to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X
5.) **Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)		X	X, to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X

6.) Assessment. The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X		X, to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X
7.) Planning for Instruction. The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)			X (in FW scores)	X	X	X
8.) Instructional Strategies. The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)			X, to some extent, especially grades in particular courses measuring these competencies	X	X	X
9.) Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.	X (see curriculum map in Appendix for particular courses)	X	X		X	X	X
10.) Leadership and Collaboration. The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.	Adding focus on this to particular courses.					Definitely in student teaching and internship placements; in some additional FW settings as well.	X

RESULTS and MODIFICATIONS

CAEP recommends that Educator Preparation Programs adopt a continuous improvement model toward their work. Certainly, we have benefitted from our review process in identifying and prioritizing particular programmatic areas needing more immediate refinement, and as well, developing a systematic process for ongoing, comprehensive program review in each of several areas over a two-year cycle with routine data collection, analysis, and ongoing program adjustments and improvements. In this section I have highlighted some areas for improvement we are currently focused on as a unit. **This is followed by an excerpt from our self-study with results from all of our data sources.**

Student Learning Outcomes results	Modifications made to enhance learning
Ongoing improvements in collaboration with field Partners	Improving foci and tasks of Fieldwork Committee (previously only largely focused on student exception forms): Multidisciplinary task force formed and now meeting biweekly, tasked with improving our system for collaboration and placement with different partners for different levels of field work, and increasing partner input, identifying and supporting a professional liaison at each school, clarifying course assignments and co-designing student active engagement at field sites, etc. Planning a June 2023 workshop on campus with partners from across the region.
Completer survey data, program needs are included in program outcomes document. Improving our employer survey instrument.	Previously could not disaggregate UM data from other EPPs in state; worked intensively with CIC of MT Council of Deans of Education to change this and update and refine the survey; new survey soliciting UM program specific data going gout in spring of 23.
CAEP assessment called for further development and refinement of our *System for Ongoing Data Collection and Analysis*	In the fall of 22, a college data review committee was formed. As a department, we shared with faculty our review cycle for data collection, analysis, and refinement (two-year cycle). We began follow up work to our accreditation review in earnest, along with reviewing new data in the fall of '22 at department faculty meetings (also in subcommittee meetings). We started with a review of current Completer Survey data, efforts to create a common lesson plan in all our methods courses, and worked to incorporate more specificity in each course syllabus about particular learning outcomes actually taught and measured in the course and aligned with particular InTASC (and CAEP) standards/learning outcomes. Also piloted changes to the ARRP rubrics and course offering, and made changes to our technology courses to align with national technology standards.
Limited reliability and validity on some of our assessment instruments	Refining all tools to improve quality of assessment: examples: Level One capstone revisions; revisions to ARRP rubric to teach literature review process and differentiate grad/undergrad expectations for narrative synthesis vs. bibliographic table for citations; changing Level 2 capstone, piloted in fall of 22; changing Level 3 capstone, piloted in fall of 22. Working on a common lesion plan for methods courses.
Blanket alignment of InTASC standards to individual course learning objectives (see picture of curriculum map with InTASC & CAEP standards)—we can send Excel file of this information upon request.	Group met for a week in August, followed up with whole faculty in the fall; aligned each course and assessment tool in the course to selected InTASC standards; including more specificity in all course syllabi for Spring 2023 courses.

RESULTS *excerpted from our department report for CAEP and the Montana Review Teams:*

Standard 1 - Content and Pedagogical Knowledge

This standard is the heart of UM's EPP program. It consists of three undergraduate programs: Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, and Secondary Education; as well as two graduate programs: Elementary Education and

Secondary Education. In order to relate how well candidates apply their knowledge of content at appropriate progression levels, we offer context about admission, program, and assessments. Findings cited in this narrative all but scratch the surface of the amount of data contained in some 130+ figures and 200+ tables that are referenced in evidence. Data was disaggregated by licensure area, gender, and ethnicity, but in a number of cases, the N was too small to report.

To be considered for admission, prospective candidates must have a minimum GPA, demonstrate writing competency, have some experience working with children, submit recommendations, be interviewed by a committee of faculty, and pass a background check (Evidence 22 & 38). The quality of admitted candidates is demonstrated, in part, by three-year admission GPA averages that exceed the EPP's minimum (Evidence 1).

Once admitted, candidates begin the first of three or four levels, depending on the program. Regardless of program, the concept is the same: working with K-12 students in a progression from a single student to a small group to the entire class. The professional academic program of study consists of a combination of courses (Evidence 28) plus extensive clinical experiences (Evidence 25).

While candidates are exposed to a robust combination of coursework and clinical experiences, the proof of program effectiveness lies in the data derived from multiple sources spanning over three or more collection cycles. Evidence of candidates' content knowledge is drawn from well-known measures such as GPA and Praxis® as well as EPP assessments like Danielson's Framework for Teaching, the Level 1 Capstone, the Applied Research and Reflective Practice Capstone, an exit survey, and the Ethics Case Study.

Candidates have a major GPA and a completer GPA. The major GPA consists of content coursework related to the candidate's licensure area. The completer GPA covers all coursework during university study (Evidence 10).

The Praxis® Content Knowledge for Teaching (CKT) tests are subject-specific tests designed to assess whether candidates have a sufficient range of content knowledge when entering the profession (Evidence 9).

UM uses Danielson's Framework for Teaching in clinical observations to assess four domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities. The Danielson Group developed a crosswalk to link the framework to InTASC standards. The Montana Council of Deans of Education (MCDE) aligned InTASC standards to the Danielson Framework and to Montana's Professional Education Preparation Program Standards (PEPPS) found in ARM 10, Chapter 58 (Evidence 23).

The Level 1 Capstone (Evidence 39) measures candidate performance in essential early coursework. Each candidate gives a presentation assessed on:

. Learning about Students

. Diagnostic Assessment

. Learning Goal

. Instruction

. Measuring Effectiveness of Instruction

. Reflecting on Professional Learning

. Presenting Information -Professional Communication

The Applied Research and Reflective Practice (ARRP) Capstone (Evidence 40) allows candidates to demonstrate knowledge of a teaching strategy and the ability to determine if that teaching strategy is effective by conducting applied research and engaging in professional reflection. The project provides candidates the opportunity to:

. Identify a problem involving student achievement;

. Research an evidence-based strategy to target the problem to increase learning;

. Determine effectiveness by using a pre-post design;

. Reflect on the assessment, the strategy, and results to determine the effectiveness of the strategy and modifications to make the strategy more effective in the future. Candidates complete an Exit Survey (Evidence 46) consisting of 19 items that rate program effectiveness preparing them to design and differentiate lessons, engage students, respond to negative behavior, etc.

Finally, an Ethics Case Study (Evidence 41) provides candidates an opportunity to analyze a case study featuring a genuine dilemma experienced by a practicing teacher as they have recounted it. Candidates must then react to a variety of teacher experiences and conduct an ethics analysis of the teacher's decision. With these components in mind, let's turn to findings arranged by program and component. Elementary (Undergrad)

R1.1

Clinical data indicate (Evidence 2): 1.   Most candidates are PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED on learner development, learning differences, and learning environment (InTASC 1)

2.   80% exceed a BASIC rating (InTASC 2-3)

The Level 1 Capstone indicates 75% demonstrate proficiency sharing information about student background; showing they tried to learn about a student's life, academic strengths, and weaknesses. It also illustrates they can draw upon theories of cognitive development. The remaining 25% scored in the BASIC range, still acceptable. Males and females scored similarly (Evidence 6).

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Design instruction based on a learner's development (InTASC 1) 82% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 1)

2.   Differentiate instruction for English Language Learners (ELL) (InTASC 2) 70%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 2)

3.   Collaborate to meet the learning needs of all students (InTASC 3) 95% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE. (p. 2)

4.   Actively engage students in learning (InTASC 3) 93% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 3)

5.   Respond productively to negative behavior (InTASC 3) 86% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 3)

Item 2's findings concerned faculty. In response, they worked with school partners to include diversity activities in a methods course along with a clinical experience with ELL students.

R1.2

Candidates scored a mean of 177 on the CKT (InTASC 4). This is 14 points above the state's minimum; males and females scored similarly (Evidence 9). Moreover, the mean major GPA was 3.39 while the mean completer GPA was 3.62; females scored 3% higher than males (Evidence 10).

Clinical data suggest candidates were PROFICIENT with respect to content knowledge, pedagogy, and an ability to design coherent instruction. Fewer than 3%failed to meet the BASIC level. Ability to engage students in learning was rated similarly (Evidence 3).

Exit Survey results (Evidence 11) rate candidate preparation to

1.   Demonstrate accurate content knowledge (InTASC 4) 96% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 4)

2.   Implement instruction aligned with state content standards (InTASC 4) 97%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 6)

3.   Accurately incorporate the 7 understandings of Indian Education for All (IEFA)

(InTASC 4) - 78% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 10)

4.   Encourage critical thinking for problem solving (InTASC 5) 93% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 5)

IEFA warrants attention since 25% believe they were NOT EFFECTIVELY prepared to teach this material (Evidence 26).

R1.3

A review of clinical data at student teaching (Evidence 4) suggest with regard to:

1.   Understanding and using multiple methods of assessment to engage learners, monitor their progress, and guide decisions (InTASC 6), 90% were PROFICIENT

2.   Planning for instruction by drawing upon content knowledge, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy (InTASC 7), 90% were PROFICIENT

3.   Understanding of instructional strategies to deepen student understanding of content and application (InTASC 8), 80% of candidates were PROFICIENT

On the Level 1 Capstone, 100% demonstrate BASIC or PROFICIENT performance using a diagnostic assessment to engage learners in their own growth (InTASC 6) and BASIC or PROFICIENT measuring effectiveness of instruction (InTASC 7)

(Evidence 6).

Based upon ARRP projects; 93% can design an evidence-based intervention or strategy to effectively address a problem using a pre/post test design (InTASC 7); males and females performed similarly (Evidence 7).

According to the exit survey (Evidence 11):

1.   82% believe they were prepared to effectively analyze assessments to improve instruction (InTASC 6) (p. 5)

2.   88% believe were effectively prepared to plan instruction based on knowledge of students within their community's context (InTASC 7) (p. 6)

3.   98% believe they were effectively prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC 8) (p. 7)

Technology stood out, only 66% believe the EPP was EFFECTIVE in preparing them to using technology while 26% believe the EPP was SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE (p. 4). Clearly, there is room for improvement. Some suggestions include:

> . Working with the Advisory Council to identify essential technology content, including remote and online instruction,

> . Reviewing the technology course objectives and outcomes, and

> . Developing a measure of candidate mastery.

R1.4

Clinical data (Evidence 5) found:

1.   By student teaching, 90% PROFICIENT in engaging ongoing professional learning and evaluating their practice with particular concern to how their choices affect students, families, and others in the community (InTASC 9).

2.   InTASC 10 is similar by student teaching with 94% PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED in collaborating with colleagues and community members to ensure learner growth.

The ARRP shows 87% of completers engage in insightful and critical reflection of their teaching (InTASC 9) (Evidence 7). In the Ethics Case Study (InTASC 9), 91% scored PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED when asked to respond appropriately to an ethical dilemma (Evidence 8).

Finally, the exit survey (Evidence 11) found that:

1.   78% believe they were effectively prepared to participate in ongoing professional development (InTASC 9) (p. 7)

2.   84% report were effectively prepared to reflect on how their instructional choices affect students (InTASC 9) (p. 8)

3.   89% believe that were prepared with the skills necessary to respect the beliefs, norms, and expectations of families (InTASC 10) (p. 8)

Early Childhood

R1.1

Clinical data (Evidence 17) note by student teaching:

1.   All are PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED in Learner Development (InTASC 1)

2.   All but one, were PROFICIENT in the three InTASC standards for component R1.1. According to the Level 1 Capstone, 89% were PROFICIENT in sharing key information about a student's background. The remaining 11% scored BASIC; still acceptable

(Evidence 6).

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Design instruction based on a learner's development (InTASC 1) 80% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 21)

2.   Differentiate instruction effectively for ELL (InTASC 2) 50% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 22)

3.   Collaborate to meet the learning needs of all students (InTASC 3) 90% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 22)

4.   Actively engage students in learning (InTASC 3) 100% of respondents EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 23)

5.   Respond productively to negative behavior (InTASC 3) 80% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 23)

ELL was a concern here was well and the faculty response was detailed earlier. R1.2

Candidates scored a mean of 176 on the ECE CKT (InTASC 4), 20 points above the state's minimum (Evidence 9). Moreover, the mean major GPA was 3.39 while mean completer GPA was 3.65 (Evidence 10).

A review of clinical data found 96% demonstrate PROFICIENT knowledge about pedagogy and the ability to design coherent instruction. Similarly, candidates were PROFICIENT engaging students in learning (Evidence 18).

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Demonstrate accurate content knowledge (InTASC 4) 90% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 24)

2.   Implement instruction aligned with state content standards (InTASC 4) 90%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 26)

3.   Accurately incorporate the seven understandings of IEFA (InTASC 4) 50%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 30)

4.   Encourage critical thinking for problem solving (InTASC 5) 100% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 25)

IEFA warrants attention since 50% do not believe they were effectively prepared to teach this required content (Evidence 26).

R1.3

Clinical data suggest candidates' ability to assess students and plan for instruction improves significantly throughout the program (Evidence 19). The Level 1 Capstone project indicates all candidates demonstrate BASIC to PROFICIENT performance using a diagnostic assessment to engage learners in their own growth (InTASC 6). Additionally, 100% were rated BASIC or above in measuring effectiveness of instruction (InTASC 7) (Evidence 6).

The ARRP found that 90% were able to design an evidence-based intervention or strategy that effectively addressed an identified problem using a pre/post test design to measure the impact of the intervention (InTASC 7) (Evidence 7).

In exit survey data (Evidence 11):

1.   70% believe they were prepared to effectively analyze assessments to improve instruction (InTASC 6) (p. 25)

2.   90% believe they were effectively prepared to plan instruction based on knowledge of students within their community's context (InTASC 7) (p. 26)

3.   90% believe they were prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies

(InTASC 8) (p. 27)

Again, technology deserves special consideration as only 60% of candidates believe the program prepared them to use it effectively to improve student performance (p. 24).

R1.4

Clinical data (Evidence 20) indicate:

1.   Approximately 90% rated PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED evaluating practice and actions on others in the community (InTASC 9)

2.   More than 90% take responsibility for student learning and collaborating with the professional community (InTASC 10)

ARRP data show 90% engage in insightful and critical reflection of their teaching

(InTASC 9) (Evidence 7). The Ethics Case Study indicates 89% PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED when asked to identify and respond appropriately to an ethical dilemma (InTASC 9) (Evidence 8). Finally, in exit surveys (Evidence 11):

1.   60% believe they were prepared to effectively participate in ongoing professional development activities (InTASC 9) (p. 27)

2.   80% were prepared to effectively reflect on how their instructional choices affect students (InTASC 9) (p. 28)

3.   100% believe they were prepared with the skills necessary to respect the beliefs, norms, and expectations of families (InTASC 10) (p. 28)

Elementary (Grad)

R1.1

Clinical data show steady improvement on how learners grow and develop, understanding individual differences, and creating positive learning environments. While 50% are BASIC in Level 1 (acceptable); performance increases, so that by student teaching, 95% are PROFICIENT (Evidence 13). On the Level 1 Capstone, 71% were PROFICIENT at drawing upon theories of cognitive development that highlight important learning considerations for students (Evidence 6).

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Design instruction based on a learner's development (InTASC 1) 100% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 11)

2.   Differentiate instruction effectively for ELL (InTASC 2) 54% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 12)

3.   Collaborate to meet the learning needs of all students (InTASC 3) 91% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 12)

4.   Actively engage students in learning (InTASC 3) 84% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 13)

5.   Respond productively to negative behavior (InTASC 3) 59% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 13)

Results from #2 reiterated earlier findings about ELL and the faculty response was detailed previously.

R1.2

Candidates scored a mean of 179 on the Praxis® CKT (InTASC 4), 15 points above the state's minimum (Evidence 9). Moreover, the mean major GPA was 3.62 while mean completer GPA was 3.91 (Evidence 10).

Clinical data indicate 95% of candidates are PROFICIENT with respect to their content knowledge, pedagogy, and their ability to design coherent instruction and engage children in learning. (Evidence 14).

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Demonstrate accurate content knowledge (InTASC 4) - 85% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 14)

2.   Implement instruction aligned with state content standards (InTASC 4) 92%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 16)

3.   Accurately incorporate the seven understandings of IEFA (InTASC 4) 69%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 20)

4.   Encourage critical thinking for problem solving (InTASC 5) 92% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 15)

IEFA warrants attention here as well (Evidence 26).

R1.3

Clinical data show candidates' ability to assess students and plan for instruction improves significantly throughout the levels of the program (Evidence 15). Based on the Level 1 Capstone, all candidates demonstrate BASIC to PROFICIENT performance with respect to using a diagnostic assessment to engage learners in their own learning (InTASC 6) and measuring effectiveness of instruction (InTASC 7). Additionally, 100% were rated as BASIC or PROFICIENT in measuring effectiveness of instruction (InTASC 7) (Evidence 6).

The ARRP found that 100% of candidates could design an evidence-based intervention or strategy that effectively addressed an identified problem using a pre/post test design to measure the impact of the intervention (InTASC 7) (Evidence 7).

The exit survey (Evidence 11) found:

1. 85% believe they were effectively prepared to analyze assessments to improve instruction (InTASC 6) (p. 15)

2. 76% believe they were effectively prepared to plan instruction based on knowledge of students within their community's context (InTASC 7) (p. 16)

3. 92% believe they were effectively prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC 8) (p. 17)

Technology again deserves consideration as 31% indicate there is room for improvement in this area.

R1.4

Clinical data (Evidence 16) found: 92% of candidates are PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED with respect to engaging in professional learning and professionalism (InTASC 9)

2. All are PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED in taking responsibility for student learning and collaborating with the professional community (InTASC 10)

According to the ARRP, all candidates can engage in insightful and critical reflection of teaching methods and results (InTASC 9) (Evidence 7). The Ethics Case Study found 100% as PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED when asked to identify and respond appropriately to an ethical dilemma (Evidence 8). Finally, the exit survey (Evidence 11) found that:

1. 62% believe they were effectively prepared to participate in ongoing professional development activities (InTASC 9) (p. 17)

2. 85% were effectively prepared to reflect on how their instructional choices affect students (InTASC 9) (p. 18)

3. 84% were prepared with the skills necessary to respect the beliefs, norms, and expectations of families (InTASC 10) (p. 18)

Secondary (Undergrad)

R1.1

Two themes emerge from clinical data (Evidence 29):

1. 80% rated PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED with respect to learner development, learning differences, and learning environment

2. When disaggregated by content area, 18% of art candidates are in the BASIC rating. Across all content areas, most scored PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED on InTASC Standards 1, 2, and 3.

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1. Design instruction based on a learner's development (InTASC 1) 75% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 31)

2. Differentiate instruction effectively for ELL (InTASC 2) 41% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 32)

3. Collaborate to meet the learning needs of all students (InTASC 3) 79% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 32)

4. Actively engage students in learning (InTASC 3) 86% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 33)

5.   Respond productively to negative behavior (InTASC 3) 65% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 33)

Again, ELL is concerning; faculty response was detailed earlier.

R1.2

Passing scores vary depending upon the content area, but all means are above the state's passing scores (InTASC 4) (Evidence 9). Mean major GPA was 3.52 (Evidence 10). The males' mean GPA was 3.44 while the females' was 3.57. Across all content areas, mean GPA ranges from a low of 3.23 to a high of 3.97 - still all above CAEP's 3.0 minimum and UM's 2.75 minimum. The completer GPA was 3.58, males was 3.47 and females was 3.65. Across all content areas, the mean completer GPA ranges from a low of 3.34 to a high of 3.88 (Evidence 10).

A review of clinical data found 95% demonstrate PROFICIENT knowledge about pedagogy and ability to design coherent instruction. Similarly, candidates were PROFICIENT engaging students in learning. There are similar results related to ability to engage students in learning (Evidence 31). Of the content areas we were able to disaggregate; most scored as PROFICIENT or above. Art, math, and music are where BASIC performance could improve, still percentages are not high enough to suggest a problem. The exit survey (Evidence 11) offers perceptions of content preparation concerning ability to:

1.   Demonstrate accurate content knowledge (InTASC 4) 95% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 34)

2.   Implement instruction aligned with state content standards (InTASC 4) 79%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 36)

3.   Accurately incorporate the seven understandings of IEFA (InTASC 4) 52%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 40)

4.   Encourage critical thinking for problem solving (InTASC 5) 79% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 35)

IEFA again stands out as warranting attention (Evidence 26).

R1.3

A review of clinical data (Evidence 32) suggests the following:

1.   Understanding and using multiple methods of assessment to engage learners, monitor their progress, and guide decisions (InTASC 6) all are rated BASIC level or above and by the time they student teach, a larger percentage are PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED. Content areas performed similarly.

2.   Planning for instruction by drawing upon content knowledge, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy (InTASC 7) all rated at the BASIC level or above

3.   Understanding of instructional strategies to deepen student understanding of content and application (InTASC 8) indicate 70% are PROFICIENT or DISTGINGUISHED while NOT OBSERVED ratings rose to 30% in 2020-21.

On the ARRP, 99% could design an evidence-based intervention or strategy that effectively addressed an identified problem using a pre/post-test design to measure the impact of the intervention (InTASC 7). Males were rated 87% PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED compared to 74% of females (Evidence 7).

According to the exit survey (Evidence 11):

1.   74% believe they were effectively prepared to analyze assessments to improve instruction (InTASC 6) (p. 35)

2.   74% believe they were effectively prepared to plan instruction based on knowledge of students within the community's context (InTASC 7) (p. 36)

3.   82% believe they were effectively prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC 8) (p. 37)

Technology again deserves consideration as 36% believe preparation was SOMEWHAT EFFECTIVE (p. 34).

R1.4

Clinical data (Evidence 33) indicate: 1.   From the initial experience through student teaching almost all candidates rated either PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED. This holds true for all content areas (InTASC 9).

2.   (InTASC 10) The number rated NOT OBSERVED is greater than in other programs. However, for most candidates, increased opportunities to work with families or colleagues during student teaching, increases ratings to PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED.

The ARRP shows 70% engage in insightful and critical reflection (InTASC 9). Males performed somewhat better than females. (Evidence 7). The Ethics Case Study found 90% scored PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED when asked to identify and respond appropriately to an ethical dilemma (Evidence 8). Finally, the exit survey (Evidence 11) indicated:

1.   69% of believe they were effectively prepared to participate in ongoing professional development activities (InTASC 9) (p. 37)

2.   87% report they were effectively prepared to reflect on how their instructional choices affect students (InTASC 9) (p. 38)

3.   82% believe they were prepared with the skills necessary to respect the beliefs, norms, and expectations of families (InTASC 10) (p. 38)

Secondary (Grad)

R1.1

Clinical data (Evidence 34) show all are rated PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED with respect to learner development, learning differences, and learning environment. Candidates rated the EPP's preparation on the exit survey (Evidence 11) to:

1.   Design instruction based on a learner's development (InTASC 1) 73% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 42)

2.   Differentiate instruction effectively for ELL (InTASC 2) 40% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 43), a continued concern.

3.   Collaborate to meet the learning needs of all students (InTASC 3) 73% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 43)

4.   Actively engage students in learning (InTASC 3) 73% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 44)

5.   Respond productively to negative behavior (InTASC 3) 46% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 44)

R1.2

With the exception of math and Spanish, CKT scores exceed the state's minimum. It's difficult to draw any conclusions from this finding because the Ns are three and two respectively (Evidence 9). The mean major GPA was 3.53. Across all content areas the mean major GPAs range from a low of 3.03 to a high of 3.74 - all above minimum. In the same 3-year period, the completer GPA was 3.86. Across all content areas, the mean completer GPA ranged from a low of 3.63 to a high of 3.90

(Evidence 10). Clinical data suggest candidates are PROFICIENT with respect to content knowledge, pedagogy, and ability to design coherent instruction. (Evidence 35). These data yield similar results related to candidates' ability to

engage students in learning (Evidence 35). Of the content areas that we were able to disaggregate - science and social studies, all are in the PROFICIENT range or above.

On exit surveys (Evidence 11), candidates rated preparation to:

1.   Demonstrate accurate content knowledge (InTASC 4) 73% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 45)

2.   Implement instruction aligned with state content standards (InTASC 4) 86%FFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 47)

3.   Accurately incorporate the seven understandings of IEFA (InTASC 4) 60%EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 51)

4.   Encourage critical thinking for problem solving (InTASC 5) 67% EFFECTIVE or VERY EFFECTIVE (p. 46)

Again, IEFA stands out as warranting attention (Evidence 26).

R1.3

According to clinical data (Evidence 36): 1. Understanding and using multiple methods of assessment to engage learners, monitor their progress, and guide decisions, (InTASC 6) all rated BASIC or above. Content areas perform similarly. 2. Understanding of instructional strategies to deepen student understanding of content and application (InTASC 8) most are PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED. ARRP data indicated 79% were able to design an evidence-based intervention or strategy that effectively addressed an identified problem using a pre/post test design to measure the impact of the intervention (InTASC 7) (Evidence 7). Finally, the exit survey (Evidence 11) offers insight into preparation. Here:

1.   73% believe they were effectively prepared to analyze assessments to improve instruction (InTASC 6) (p. 46)

2.   80% believe they were effectively prepared to plan instruction based on knowledge of students within the community's context (InTASC 7) (p. 47)

3.   73% believe they were effectively prepared to use a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC 8) (p. 48)

R1.4

Clinical data (Evidence 37) found:

1.   From the initial experience through student teaching most candidates rated PROFICIENT and DISTINGUISHED (InTASC 9)

2.   InTASC 10, the number of candidates rated NOT OBSERVED is greater than in other programs. This pattern changes when candidates have more opportunities to work with families or colleagues during student teaching (Evidence 37).

According to the ARRP, 85% of candidates engage in insightful and critical reflection (InTASC 9) (Evidence 7). The Ethics Case Study (InTASC 9) found 86% of candidates as PROFICIENT or DISTINGUISHED when asked to identify and respond appropriately to an ethical dilemma (Evidence 8).

Finally, on the exit survey (Evidence 11):

1.   74% believe they were effectively-prepared to participate in ongoing professional development activities (InTASC 9) (p. 48)

2.   67% report they were effectively-prepared to reflect on how their instructional choices affect students (InTASC 9) (p. 49)

3.   66% were prepared with the skills to respect the beliefs, norms, and expectations of families (InTASC 10) (p. 49)

FUTURE PLANS FOR CONTINUED ASSESSMENT

As mentioned, we have adopted and are continuing to refine and pilot our new system for systematic review of all programs and activities in a two-year cycle. We collect data every semester on all indicators in the table, above, these go first to the Accreditation Director and are analyzed by the data review team each term. The records and shared are reviewed with faculty in our department at regularly scheduled meetings, and time is devoted to address needed changes.

Appendices
Image of Curriculum Map (Excel file available on request)

Assessments:

1. ARRP Rubric
2. Ethics Case Study Analysis Guidelines Rubric
3. Clinical Experiences Rubric
4. Employer Survey Summary
5. Level One Capstone Rubric

State Documents & Curriculum Info

1. Teaching Standards Elem. Undergrad
2. Teaching Standards Sec. Undergrad
3. Early Childhood Education undergrad