PROGRAM DATA CHARTS & ANALYSIS

The Learner and Learning = Green (INTASC 1-3)
Content = Pink (INTASC 4-5)
Instructional Practice = Yellow (INTASC 6-8)
Professional Responsibility = Orange (INTASC 9-10)

Technology Proficiency (Print)
Diversity/Culturally Responsive Teaching (Print)

SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Key Assessment						
ELEMENTARY ED.	FALL 2022 FORTHCOMING		SPRING 2022 N=10		FALL 2021 N=3	
1.1. Community and school information The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics). CAEP 1.1; INTASC 2; TGR 7			**MEAN**	2.2	**MEAN**	1.666667
			MODE	2	**MODE**	1
			RANGE	1--3	**RANGE**	1--3
1.2. Classroom Information The teacher candidate (TC) describes classroom factors including physical features, technology resources, parental/guardian involvement, and grouping practices (whole group, small group, pairs, etc.) CAEP 1.1,1.5; INTASC 3; TGR 7			**MEAN**	2.1	**MEAN**	1.666667
			MODE	2	**MODE**	1
			RANGE	1--3	**RANGE**	1--3
1.3. Student Characteristics The teacher candidate (TC) describes each of the following student characteristics that impact students and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, race/ethnicity/ culture, special needs, achievement levels, language, interests, and learning differences CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1.k, 2; TGR 2			**MEAN**	2.1	**MEAN**	1.333333
			MODE	2	**MODE**	1
			RANGE	1--3	**RANGE**	1--3
1.4. Accommodations /Modifications for Planning, Instruction, and/or Assessment The teacher candidate (TC) describes his/her rationale for accommodations/modifications that he/she would make to instructional plans, instruction, and assessment based on classroom and student characteristics. A chart is provided that identifies the student characteristics and accommodations/modifications. CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1; TGR 2			**MEAN**	2.3	**MEAN**	1
			MODE	2	**MODE**	0
			RANGE	1--3	**RANGE**	1--3

SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Key Assessment				
MUSIC ED.	FALL 2022 FORTHCOMING		SPRING 2022 N=2	FALL 2021 N=1
1.1. Community and school information The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics). CAEP 1.1; INTASC 2; TGR 7			MEAN — 2.5 MODE — N/A RANGE 2-3	3
1.2. Classroom Information The teacher candidate (TC) describes classroom factors including physical features, technology resources, parental/guardian involvement, and grouping practices (whole group, small group, pairs, etc.) CAEP 1.1,1.5; INTASC 3; TGR 7			MEAN — 2.5 MODE — N/A RANGE 2-3	3
1.3. Student Characteristics The teacher candidate (TC) describes each of the following student characteristics that impact students and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, race/ethnicity/ culture, special needs, achievement levels, language, interests, and learning differences CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1.k, 2; TGR 2			MEAN — 2 MODE — N/A RANGE N/A	3
1.4. Accommodations /Modifications for Planning, Instruction, and/or Assessment The teacher candidate (TC) describes his/her rationale for accommodations/modifications that he/she would make to instructional plans, instruction, and assessment based on classroom and student characteristics. A chart is provided that identifies the student characteristics and accommodations/modifications. CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1; TGR 2			MEAN — 2.5 MODE — N/A RANGE 2-3	2

SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Key Assessment				
SOCIAL SCIENCE	FALL 2022 FORTHCOMING	SPRING 2022	FALL 2021 N=3	
1.1. Community and school information The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics). CAEP 1.1; INTASC 2; TGR 7			MEAN	1.333333
			MODE	1
			RANGE	1--3
1.2. Classroom Information The teacher candidate (TC) describes classroom factors including physical features, technology resources, parental/guardian involvement, and grouping practices (whole group, small group, pairs, etc.) CAEP 1.1,1.5; INTASC 3; TGR 7			MEAN	1.333333
			MODE	1
			RANGE	1--3
1.3. Student Characteristics The teacher candidate (TC) describes each of the following student characteristics that impact students and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, race/ethnicity/ culture, special needs, achievement levels, language, interests, and learning differences CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1.k, 2; TGR 2			MEAN	1.333333
			MODE	1
			RANGE	1--3
1.4. Accommodations /Modifications for Planning, Instruction, and/or Assessment The teacher candidate (TC) describes his/her rationale for accommodations/modifications that he/she would make to instructional plans, instruction, and assessment based on classroom and student characteristics. A chart is provided that identifies the student characteristics and accommodations/modifications. CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1; TGR 2			MEAN	1
			MODE	#N/A
			RANGE	0--3

SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Key Assessment			
SPECIAL ED.	FALL 2022 FORTHCOMING	SPRING 2022 N=1	FALL 2021 N=0
1.1. Community and school information The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics). CAEP 1.1; INTASC 2; TGR 7		2	
1.2. Classroom Information The teacher candidate (TC) describes classroom factors including physical features, technology resources, parental/guardian involvement, and grouping practices (whole group, small group, pairs, etc.) CAEP 1.1,1.5; INTASC 3; TGR 7		3	
1.3. Student Characteristics The teacher candidate (TC) describes each of the following student characteristics that impact students and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, race/ethnicity/ culture, special needs, achievement levels, language, interests, and learning differences CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1.k, 2; TGR 2		3	
1.4. Accommodations /Modifications for Planning, Instruction, and/or Assessment The teacher candidate (TC) describes his/her rationale for accommodations/modifications that he/she would make to instructional plans, instruction, and assessment based on classroom and student characteristics. A chart is provided that identifies the student characteristics and accommodations/modifications. CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1; TGR 2		3	

SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Key Assessment					
PHYSICAL ED.	FALL 2022 FORTHCOMING		SPRING 2022 N=4		FALL 2021 N=0
1.1. Community and school information The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics). CAEP 1.1; INTASC 2; TGR 7			**MEAN**	2.5	
			MODE	2	
			RANGE	1--3	
1.2. Classroom Information The teacher candidate (TC) describes classroom factors including physical features, technology resources, parental/guardian involvement, and grouping practices (whole group, small group, pairs, etc.) CAEP 1.1,1.5; INTASC 3; TGR 7			**MEAN**	2.25	
			MODE	2	
			RANGE	1--3	
1.3. Student Characteristics The teacher candidate (TC) describes each of the following student characteristics that impact students and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, race/ethnicity/ culture, special needs, achievement levels, language, interests, and learning differences CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1.k, 2; TGR 2			**MEAN**	2.25	
			MODE	2	
			RANGE	1--3	
1.4. Accommodations /Modifications for Planning, Instruction, and/or Assessment The teacher candidate (TC) describes his/her rationale for accommodations/modifications that he/she would make to instructional plans, instruction, and assessment based on classroom and student characteristics. A chart is provided that identifies the student characteristics and accommodations/modifications. CAEP 1.1; INTASC 1; TGR 2			**MEAN**	**2**	
			MODE	**2**	
			RANGE	**1--3**	

	EDCI 301 Classroom Management Plan & Rationale **EPP/ELEMENTARY EDUCATION** **All candidates in the pilot were elementary education candidates. All other candidates will begin EDCI 301 in Fall 22 as a part of revised curriculum. Other majors took EDCI 401 which has a classroom management component (key assessment not given in EDCI 401)**					
	1.The classroom management plan supports a learning-focused classroom community.TGR 5, INTASC 3	2. The classroom management plan supports classroom space, time, and resources (including technology when appropriate)effectively for student learning. TGR 6, INTASC 3	3. The classroom management plan addresses maintaining a classroom of respect for all students. TGR 7, INTASC 3	4. The classroom management plan addresses classroom routines and transitions between activities INTASC 3D, CAEP K-6 4G, TGR 6	5. The classroom management plan addresses managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F, CAEP K-6 3E, TGR 7	6. Rationale Supporting Management Choices in each of the 5 standards (1. learning focused classroom community 2. use of space, time, and resources 3. respectful environment 4. routines and transitions 5. teacher's response to student behavior)
Fall 21 EDCI 301 Classroom Management Plan & Rationale Pilot N=18						
MEAN	2.777777778	2.611111111	2.666666667	2.5	2.55555556	2.5
MODE	3	3	3	2	3	3
RANGE	2--3	1--3	1--3	2--3	1--3	0--3
SPRING 22 EDCI 301 Classroom Management Plan & Rationale N=9						
MEAN	2.888888889	2.666666667	2.888888889	2.555555556	2.666666667	2.777777778
MODE	3	3	3	3	3	3
RANGE	2--3	1--3	2--3	2--3	2--3	2--3
Fall 22 EDCI 301 Classroom Management Plan & Rationale (forthcoming)						
MEAN						
MODE						
RANGE						

	1. Demonstration of Start of Lesson Behaviors INTASC 3 Learning Environments CAEP K-6 4F TGR 6_Points	2. Alignment of Instructional Activities to Lesson Objectives INTASC 7 Planning for Instruction CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1_Points	3.Facilitate & Inspire Learning & Creativity ISTE Teacher 1b INTASC 8 (Instructional Strategies) CAEP K-6 4E TGR 4	4.Facilitate & Inspire Learning & Creativity ISTE Teacher 1d INTASC 8 (Instructional Strategies) CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	5. Design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments ISTE Teacher 2a INTASC 7 (Planning for Instruction) CAEP K-6 4A TGR 3	6. Design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments ISTE Teacher 2c INTASC 2 (Learning Differences) CAEP K-6 1B TGR 4	7. Model Digital Age Work & Learning ISTE Teacher 3a (Fluency) INTASC 4 Content Knowledge CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	8. Model Digital Age Work & Learning ISTE Teacher 3c (Communicates Information) INTASC 4 Content Knowledge CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	9. Promote & Model Digital Citizenship & Responsibility ISTE Teacher 4a INTASC 9 Professional Learning & Ethical Responsibility CAEP K-6 5B TGR 7	10. Rationale Statement Engage in Professional Growth & Leadership ISTE Teacher 5b INTASC 9 Professional Learning & Ethical Responsibility CAEP K-6 5B TGR 8
FALL 21 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON PILOT N=16 ELEMENTARY EDUCATION										
MEAN	1.8125	1.875	1.6875	1.8125	1.875	1.625	1.5625	1.75	1.625	1.3125
MODE	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
RANGE	0--3	0--3	0--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	0--3	1--3	0--3	0--3
SPRING 22 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON N=17 ELEMENTARY EDUCATION										
MEAN	2.294118	2.235294	2.588235	2.176471	3	2.294118	3	2.588235	3	2.647059
MODE	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3
RANGE	0--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	N/A	0--3	N/A	2--3	N/A	1--3
SPRING 22 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON N=2 SOCIAL SCIENCE										
MEAN	1.5	3	2.5	2.5	3	1.5	3	2.5	3	3
SPRING 22 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON N=1 SPECIAL EDUCATION										
SCORE	0	1	3	1	3	3	3	3	3	3
SUMMER 22 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON ELEMENTARY EDUCATION N=8										

MEAN	2.625	1.875	2	2	1.75	1.875	1.875	2	1.875	1.75
MODE	3	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2
RANGE	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3	1--3
SUMMER 22 RE 310 TECHNOLOGY MINI LESSON N=1 SPECIAL EDUCATION										
SCORE	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1

					CUPASL Data Chart				
INDICATORS	**SPRING 22**	**FALL 21**	**SPRING 21**	**FALL 20**	**SPRING 20**	**FALL 19**	**SPRING 19**	**FALL 18**	**SPRING 18**
ELEMENTARY ED.	**N=17** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=25** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=25** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=54** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=5** **SCALE: 1-5**	**N=9** **SCALE: 1-5**	**N=9** **SCALE: 1-5**	**N=3** **SCALE: 1-5**	**N=16** **SCALE: 1-5**
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			2.56	2.53	4.5	3.93	3.8	3.86	3.73
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2.7647058823 3 0.562295715	2.88 3 1--3	2.6 1-3 3	2.61 1-3 3	4.8 4-5 5	3.78 2-5 4	3.4 3-4 3	4 2-5 5	4.31 3-5 5
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2.5294117653 0.514495755	2.88 3 1--3	2.64 1-3 3	2.38 1-3 3	4.4 4-5 4	4.2 3-5 4	4 4 4	4.3 4-5 4	3.87 3-5 4
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	2.4705882353 0.717430054	2.76 3 1--3	2.8 2-3 3	2.57 1-3 3	4.4 4-5 4	3.89 3-4 4	3.8 3-5 4	4 4 4	3.6 3-4 4
4. Provides appropriate time	2.1764705882	2.72 3	2.32 0-3	2.53 1-3	4.4 3-5	3.89 3-4	3.8 3-5	4 3-5	3.5 2-5

NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	0.727606875	1--3	2	3	5	4	4	n/a	3
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2	1.705882353 2 0.587867532	2.64 3 0--3	2.44 0-3 3	2.57 1-3 3	4.4 4-5 4	3.56 2-5 3,5	4 2-5 3	3 3 3	3.37 3-5 3
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**2.17**	**1.83**	**3.93**	**3.26**	**3.73**	**4**	**3.66**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3	2.411764706 3 0.795206226	2 2 1--3	2.16 0-3 3	1.75 1-3 1	4.2 3-5 2 & 3	3.11 2-4 2	3.4 3-5 3	3.67 2-5 n/a	3.68 2-5 4
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E	2 2 0.5	1.84 2 1--3	2.32 1-3 3	2.12 1-3 2	4.2 4-5 4	3.56 2-5 4	3.6 3-4 4	4.33 4-5 4	3.43 3-5 3

Criterion	Col1	Col2	Col3	Col4	Col5	Col6	Col7	Col8	Col9
CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3									
8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.1764705882 0.727606875	2 2 1--3	2.04 0-3 2	1.61 0-3 2	3.4 3-4 3	3.11 2-4 3	4.2 3-5 4	4 3-5 n/a	3.87 2-5 4
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			COVID-19	COVID-19	COVID-19	**3.83**	**4.06**	**3.89**	**3.46**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.882352941 2 0.48507125	1.48 1 0--3				3.89 3-5 4	4.2 4-5 4	4 3-5 n/a	3.19 2-5 3
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	2.176470588 2 0.727606875	1.72 2 0--3				3.67 2-5 4	4.2 3-5 4	4 3-5 n/a	3.25 2-5 4
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning	2.529411765 3 0.514495755	2 2 0--3				3.89 3-5 4	4.6 4-5 4	4 4 4	4 3-5 4

NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3							
12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.1176470592 0.48507125	1.64 2 0--3		3.89 3-5 4	3.8 2-4 4	4 3-5 n/a	3.44 2-4 4
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.1176470592 0.696630546	1.56 2 0--3		3.89 3-5 4	4 3-4 4	3.67 3-5 3	3.5 3-4 3,4
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.9411764712 0.658652814	1.76 2 0--3		3.78 2-5 4	3.6 2-4 3,4	3.67 3-5 3	3.43 2-5 3

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SPRING 20	FALL 19	SPRING 19	FALL 18	SPRING 18
MUSIC ED.	N=4 SCALE: 0-3	N=7 SCALE: 0-3	N=12 SCALE: 0-3	N=19 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 1-5	N=5 SCALE: 1-5	N=2 SCALE: 1-5	N=1 SCALE: 1-5	N=0 SCALE: 1-5
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			2.20	2.56	3.20	3.6	4	4	
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	3 3 0	1.857142857 1 1--3	2.16 1-3 3	2.58 1-3 3	2.00	3.4 2-4 4	4.5	5	
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2.75 3 0.5	2 2 1--3	2.25 1-3 2	2.52 1-3 3	4.00	3.6 2-5 4	4	4	
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	2.75 3 0.5	2.428571429 3 1--3	2.25 1-3 2	2.53 1-3 3	3.00	4 3-5 4	4	4	

Category	Col1	Col2	Col3	Col4	Col5	Col6	Col7	Col8	
4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	2.25 2 0.5	2.428571429 3 1--3	2.16 1-3 2	2.57 1-3 3	4.00	3.6 3-4 4	4	4	
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2	2.666666667 3 1.414213562	2.142857143 2 0--3	2.16 1-3 2	2.58 1-3 3	3.00	3.4 3-4 3	3.5	3	
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**1.72**	**1.11**	**4.00**	**3.4**	**3.6**	**3.6**	
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3	2 2 0.816496581	1.428571429 2 0--3	1.66 1-3 1	1.17 0-2 1	4.00	3.4 2-5 3	4.5	4	
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment	2 2 0.816496581	1.714285714 1 0--3	1.83 1-3 2	1.15 0-2 2	4.00	3.8 3-5 3,4	4	4	

NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3									
8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.25 3 0.957427108	1.714285714 2 0--3	1.66 0-2 2	1 0-2 1	4.00	3 2-4 2,4	2.5	3	
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			COVID-19	COVID-19	COVID-19	4.03	3.08	2.67	
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2 2 0.816496581	0.714285714 1 0--3				4 3-5 4	2.5	2	
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	2.25 3 0.957427108	0.714285714 1 0--3				4 3-5 4	3	3	

11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.25 3 0.957427108	1.571428571 2 0--3		3.8 3-5 3,4	4	2	
12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2 2 0.816496581	0.714285714 1 0--3		4.2 4-5 4	2.5	3	
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2.5 2 0.577350269	0.857142857 1 0--3		4 3-5 4	3	3	

14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2 2 0.816496581	0.857142857 1 0--3		4.2 3-5 4	3.5	3	

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SPRING 20	FALL 19	SPRING 19	FALL 18	SPRING 18
PHYSICAL ED.	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N= 4 SCALE: 0-3	N=6 SCALE: 0-3	N=5 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 1-5	N=1 SCALE: 1-5	N=2 SCALE: 1-5	N=2 SCALE: 1-5	N=3 SCALE: 1-5
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			2.10	1.92		3	3.08	3.3	3.2
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2.5	2 3 1--3	2 0-2 2	1.6 1-3 1		2	3.5	4	3.33 3-4 3
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	3	2.5 3 2--3	2.5 1-3 3	1.8 1-2 2		3	4	3	3.33 3-4 3
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	2.5	2.75 3 2--3	2.33 2-3 2	2 1-3 2		3	4	4	3.33 3-4 3

4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	2	2.75 3 2--3	2.5 2-3 --	1.8 1-3 1		3	4	4	3 3 3
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2	2	2 2 1--3	1.16 0-2 2	2.4 1-3 3		4	3	1.5	3 3 3
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**1.55**	**1.13**		**2.66**	**2.66**	**2.16**	**3**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3	2	1.75 1 1--3	1.66 0-2 2	1 0-3 1		3	2	2	3 2-4 n/a
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment	2	1.25 2 0--3	1.83 1-2 2	1.2 0-3 0		2	3	2.5	3.67 3-4 4

NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3									
8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1	1.5 #N/A 0--3	1.16 0-2 1	1.2 0-3 0		3	3	2	2.33 2-3 2
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**		**3.2**	**2.67**	**2.08**	**3.72**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.5	1.5 2 1--3				4	2.5	2	3.33 3-4 3
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	1.5	1.25 2 0--3				3	2.5	2	3.67 3-4 4

11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.5	1.75 2 1--2		4	2.5	2.5	4.33 4-5 4
12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1	1.5 2 1--2		3	2.5	2	3.67 3-4 4
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.5	1.5 2 1--2		3	3	2	3.67 3-4 4

14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2	1.75 2 1--2		2	3	2	3.67 3-4 4

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SPRING 20	SP18-F19
Special Education	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=5 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 1-5	N=2 SCALE: 1-5
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			1.60	2.08	4	3.5
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1		3	2 1-3 --	2.8 2-3 3	3	3
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1		3	2 1-3 --	2 1-3 3	4	4
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4		3	1.5 0-3 --	2 1-3 2	5	4
4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6		3	.5 0-1 --	2 1-3 2	5	3.5

5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2		3	2 1-3 --	1.6 0-3 3	3	3
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**1.16**	**2**	**4.66**	**3.5**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3		3	1 0-2 --	2.2 1-3 3	5	3.5
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		3	1.5 0-3 --	2 -- 2	5	3
8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		2	1 0-2 --	1.8 1-2 2	4	4
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**3.67**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		**1**				3.5

10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		**2**		3.5
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		**2**		4.5
12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		**2**		3.5
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		**1**		3.5

14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1		3.5

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SP18-SP20
Social Science	**N=0** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=4** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=2** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=1** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=2** **SCALE: 1-5**
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			**2.6**	**1.6**	**3.8**
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1		2.25 3 1--3	3 -- 3	2	3.5
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1		2 2 1--3	2.5 2-3 --	2	4
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4		2.5 2 2--3	2.5 2-3 --	2	4

Standard					
4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6		2 2 1--3	2.5 2-3 --	1	4
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2		1.25 0 0--3	2.5 2-3 --	1	3.5
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**1.83**	**0**	**3.67**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3		1.25 1 1--2	2 1-3 --	0	3.5
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		1.25 1 1--2	2 1-3 --	0	3.5

8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		2 2 1--3	1.5 1-2 --	0	4
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			COVID-19	COVID-19	**3.83**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1 2 0--2			4
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		1.25 2 0--2			3.5
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1.75 2 0--3			5

12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1.25 2 0--2		3.5
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1.25 2 0--2		3.5
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1.25 2 0--2		3.5

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SP18-SP20
Health Education	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=3 SCALE: 0-3	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 1-5
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			2.40	1.8	
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2.5	2.5 N/A 2--3	2.66 2-3 3	2 --	
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	2	3 N/A N/A	2.66 2-3 3	1 --	
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	2	2.5 N/A 2--3	2.33 2-3 2	1.5 1-2	

4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	1	2 N/A N/A	2 1-3 2	2 --
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2	1.5	2.5 N/A 2--3	2.33 2-3 2	2.5 2-3
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**1.66**	**1.16**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3	1	0.5 N/A 0--1	2.33 2-3 2	1 --
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	1	1.5 N/A 1--2	1.66 1-2 2	1.5 1-2

8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1	2.5 N/A 2--3	1 0-2 --	1 --
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1	1 N/A N/A		
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	1.5	1 N/A N/A		
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2	2 N/A N/A		

12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.5	1 N/A N/A
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	1.5	1 N/A N/A
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2	1 N/A N/A

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SP18-F19
Physics Education	**N=0** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=0** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=0** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=1** **SCALE: 0-3**	**N=1** **SCALE: 1-5**
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING				**2.4**	**2.8**
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1				3	2
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1				3	3
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4				3	3

4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6		1	4
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2		2	2
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN		**1.66**	**3**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3		2	3
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		2	3

8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3			1	3
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING		**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**3.33**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3				3
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3				3
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3				5

12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		3
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		3
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		3

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SP18-SP20
Mathematics Education	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 1-5
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING				2.8	4.2
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1				3	5
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1				2	4
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4				3	4

4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6		3	4
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2		3	4
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN		**.67**	**4.33**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3		0	5
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3		1	4

8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		1	4
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING	**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**3.33**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3			3
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3			3
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3			5

12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		3
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		5
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3		4

INDICATORS	SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21	FALL 20	SPRING 20	SP18-F19
English Education	N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=3 SCALE: 0-3	N=1	N=2
INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT PLANNING			1.6	2.40	3.2	3.5
1.Goals Aligned to State Content Standards NIET Instructional Plans (Alignment) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	3		1	2.66 2-3 3	2	4
2. Activities & materials support instructional plans NIET Activities & Materials (Support) INTASC 7A CAEP K-6 3C TGR 1	3		2	2.33 1-3 3	3	4
3.Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Assignments and Resources NIET Activities & Materials (Variety) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4C TGR 4	3		3	2.66 2-3 3	5	4

4. Provides appropriate time NIET Lesson Structure & Pacing (Time Management) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4E TGR 6	2		2	1.66 1-3 1	3	3
5. Accommodates Individual Student Needs NIET Instructional Plans (Individual Student Needs) INTASC 7B CAEP K-6 4G TGR 2	2		0	2.66 2-3 3	3	2.5
ASSESSMENT PLAN & ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT DESIGN			**2**	**2.44**	**3.33**	**3.33**
6. Alignment with State Standards & Objectives NIET Assessment (Alignment) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3C TGR 3	3		1	2.33 2-3 2	3	3.5
7.Multiple Modes and Approaches of Assessment NIET Assessment (Variety) INTASC 6E CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	3		2	2.66 2-3 3	4	3.5

8.Technical Soundness of Assessment Instruments NIET Assessment (Validity) INTASC 6B CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	3		3	2.33 2-3 2	3	3
ANALYSIS OF STUDENT LEARNING			**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**COVID-19**	**3.33**
9. Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6G CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	3					3.5
10. Interpretation of Data NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #2) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3A TGR 3	3					3
11. Evidence of Impact on Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #3) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2					4

12. Interpretation of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #4) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	3		3.5
13. Insights on Effective Instruction and Assessment NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #5) INTASC 6C CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	3		4
14.Modifications Based on Analysis of Student Learning NIET Academic Feedback (Monitor & Adjust #1) INTASC 6H CAEP K-6 3B TGR 3	2		3

HISTORY EDUCATION

No History Education students have completed or been admitted in the last three (3) years.

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION	SPRING 22 N=17	FALL 21 N=25	N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21	FALL 19 N=9 SCALE 1-5
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C	2.29	2.4		4
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E	2.29	2.44		3.8
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6	2.11	2.2		4
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3	2.23	2.2		3.4
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6	2.29	2.32		4
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7	2.17	2.4		3.9

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
MUSIC EDUCATION	**SPRING 22 N=4**	**FALL 21 N=7**	**N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21**	**FALL 19 N=5 SCALE 1-5**
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C	2.75	**2**		**3.8**
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E	**2.75**	**2**		**3.4**
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6	**2.5**	**2**		**3.6**
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3	**2.5**	**2**		**3.2**
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6	**2.5**	**2**		**3.6**
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7	**2.75**	**2**		**3.4**

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	**SPRING 22 N=2**	**FALL 21 N=4**	**N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21**	**FALL 19 N=1 SCALE 1-5**
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C	2.5	3		3
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E	2.5	2		3
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6	2.5	2		3
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3	2.5	1		3
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6	2.5	3		3
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7	2.5	2		3

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
HEALTH EDUCATION	SPRING 22 N=2	FALL 21 N=2	N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21	FALL 19 N=0 SCALE 1-5
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C	2	3		
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E	2	3		
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6	1.5	3		
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3	2.5	3		
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6	1.5	3		
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7	2	3		

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION	SPRING 22 N=0	FALL 21 N=4	N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21	FALL 19 N=1 SCALE 1-5
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C		3		5
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E		3		5
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6		2.5		5
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3		3		5
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6		3		5
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7		3		5

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
SPECIAL EDUCATION	**SPRING 22 N=0**	**FALL 21 N=1**	**N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21**	**FALL 19 N=1 SCALE 1-5**
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C		3		5
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E		3		5
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6		3		5
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3		3		5
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6		3		5
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7		3		5

EDCI 401 CUPASL upervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
ENGLISH EDUCATION	**SPRING 22 N=1**	**FALL 21 N=0**	**N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21**	**FALL 19 N=1 SCALE 1-5**
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C	3			**5**
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E	**3**			**5**
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6	**2**			**5**
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3	**3**			**5**
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6	**3**			**5**
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7	**3**			**5**

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
MATH EDUCATION	SPRING 22 N=0	FALL 21 N=0	N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21	FALL 19 N=1 SCALE 1-5
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C				4
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E				4
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6				5
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3				3
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6				5
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7				4

EDCI 401 CUPASL Supervising Teacher Evaluation of Candidate No Field Placement due to Covid in Fall 20 and Spring 21) 26, 46, 20				
PHYSICS EDUCATION	SPRING 22 N=0	FALL 21 N=0	N/A FALL 20 & SPRING 21	FALL 18 N=1 SCALE 1-5
15.Presenting Instructional Content (Communication) INTASC 4A,H CAEP K-6 4C				5
16. Presenting Instructional Content (Modeling) INTASC 4A CAEP K-6 4E				5
17.Presenting Instructional Content (Pacing, Routines, & Transitions) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 4G TGR 6				5
18.Academic Feedback INTASC 8B CAEP K-6 4D TGR 3				5
19.Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques) INTASC 3D CAEP K-6 3E TGR 6				5
20. Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior) INTASC 3F CAEP K-6 3E TGR 7				5

Measure #2: TIAI Program Assessment Charts

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21 Scale 0-3	Fall 20 Scale 0-3	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=26 SCALE: 0-3	N=25 SCALE: 0-3	N=46	N=5	N=14	N=4	N=6	N=15
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		2.59	2.685384615	2.78	2.48	2.3	3	2.33	2.06
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	2.653846154 3 0.485164524	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.57	2.6	2.35	3	2.32	2.25
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	2.576923077 3 0.503831474	2.8 3 0.67936622	2.57	2.2	2.28	3	2.2	2.08
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	2.538461538 3 0.508391127	2.8 3 0.67936622	2.5	2.6	2.35	3	2.38	1.96
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.576923077 3 0.503831474	2.76 3 0.68948141	--	--	--	--	---	2.0

5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	2.692307692 3 0.470678724	2.72 3 0.697247335	2.68	2.2	2.35	3	2.42	2.04
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	2.538461538 3 0.581774474	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.63	2.8	2.14	3	2.35	2.04
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		**2.55**	**2.557692308**	**2.38**	**2.3**	**2.25**	**3**	**2.10**	**1.85**
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.538461538 3 0.508391127	2.68 3 0.702741883	2.45	2.4	2.21	3	2.05	1.83
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.576923077 3 0.577794214	2.64 3 0.706018086	2.43	2.2	2.28	3	2.13	1.88
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**2.57**	**2.66**	**2.58**	**2.63**	**2.26**	**3**	**2.3**	**2.06**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.538461538 3 0.508391127	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.63	2.8	2.43	3	2.5	2.21

10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.6538461543 0.485164524	2.8333333333 0.852146611	2.66	2.5	2.43	3	2.28	2.13
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	2.6153846153 0.496138938	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.66	2.8	2.28	3	2.79	2.29
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	2.6153846153 0.496138938	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.72	2.8	2.42	3	2.71	2.25
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	2.6538461543 0.485164524	2.8 3 0.67936622	2.51	2.6	2.35	3	2.22	2.04
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5769230773 0.503831474	2.76 3 0.68948141	2.70	2.6	2.28	3	2.46	2.04
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	2.5769230773 0.503831474	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.62	2.6	2.28	3	2.5	2.08
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.5384615383 0.508391127	2.64 3 0.706018086	2.36	2.4	2.21	3	2	1.88
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5384615383 0.581774474	2.8 3 0.67936622	2.69	2.8	2	3	2.29	2.08

18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	2.538461538 3 0.508391127	2.68 3 0.757526339	2.63	2.4	2.21	3	1.91	1.83
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 3 0.509901951	2.56 3 0.706018086	2.33	2.75	2.07	3	1.76	1.92
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**2.58**	**2.634615385**	**2.38**	**2.72**	**2.21**	**3**	**2.34**	**2.12**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.576923077 3 0.577794214	2.833333333 3 0.852146611	2.54	3	2.21	3	2.25	2.17
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	2.576923077 3 0.503831474	2.68 3 0.702741883	2.5	2.75	2.38	3	2.48	2.08
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.538461538 3 0.581774474	2.6 3 0.761577311	2.33	2.8	2.07	3	2.21	2.04
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	2.615384615 3 0.496138938	2.84 3 0.666794859	2.45	3	2.25	3	2.42	2.22
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	2.615384615 3 0.496138938	2.76 3 0.745241314	2.48	2.6	2.14	3	2.42	2.08
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**2.69**	**2.384615385**	**2.78**	**3**	**2.5**	**3**	**2.16**	**2.0**
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor	INTASC 10 TGR 9	2.692307692 3 0.470678724	2.48 3 0.752431955	2.78	3	2.5	3	2.16	2.0

teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.									

MUSIC EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=8 SCALE: 0-3	N=9 SCALE: 0-3	N=16	N=4	N=2	N=1	N=1	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		2.62	2.87	2.95	2.15	2.42	1.91	2.4	
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2.25	3	2	2	
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	2	2	3	
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2.25	2	2	2	
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate	INTASC 8 TGR 2	2.625 3	2.888888889 3	--	--	--	2	--	

and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	CAEP K-6 4e	0.51754917	0.333333333					
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	3	2	2
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.777777778 3 0.440958552	3	2.25	2.5	1.5	3
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		2.62	2.888888889	2.90	2	2	2	2
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	2	2	2
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.87	2	2	2	2

development of each learner in the group.*								
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**2.625**	**2.868888889**		**2.05**	**2.41**	**1.81**	**2.55**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	2.5	2	3
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2.25	2	1.5	2
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.87	2.25	2	2.5	3
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.87	2.67	2.5	2.5	3
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	3	2	2.5	2.5	3
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.777777778 3 0.440958552	3	2.25	2.5	3	3
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.777777778 3 0.440958552	2.93	2.5	2.5	2	2
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences	INTASC 1	2.625	2.888888889	2.93	1.75	2.5	2	2

Standard/Item	Codes							
are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3 0.51754917	3 0.333333333					
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.87	1.75	2.5	1.5	3
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	2.5	1	2
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	3	1	--	2	2
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**2.625**	**2.888888889**	**2.91**	**2.15**	**1.87**	**2.2**	**2.4**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	3	2.33	2	2.5	3
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	1.66	--	1.5	2
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.87	2	1.5	2	2
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes	INTASC 3 TGR 7	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	3	1.66	2	3	3

		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20	Fall 19	SP 19	F 18
fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	CAEP K-6 1b								
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	2.93	2	1.75	2	2	
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**2.625**	**2.888888889**	**3**	**2.33**	**3**	**3**	**2**	
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9	2.625 3 0.51754917	2.888888889 3 0.333333333	3	2.33	3	3	2	

PHYSICAL EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=5 SCALE: 0-3	N=1	N=1	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=2
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		**2.5**	**2.364**	**2**	**2.2**				**3**
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.4 2 0.547722558	2	2				3
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	3				3

3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.6 3 0.547722558	2	2		3
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	--	--		3
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.6 3 0.547722558	2	2		3
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2		3
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		**2.5**	**2.2**	**2**	**2**		**3**
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2		3

8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2		3
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**2.5**	**2.344**	**2**	**2.45**		**2.9**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2 2 0	2	3		3
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.4 2 0.547722558	2	2		3
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.6 3 0.547722558	2	3		3
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.6 3 0.547722558	2	3		3
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.8 3 0.447213595	2	3		3
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an	INTASC 4 TGR 4	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	3		3

understanding of how to teach the content.	CAEP K-6 3b						
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2		3
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.4 2 0.547722558	2	2		2.5
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2		2.5
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.4 2 0.547722558	2	2		3
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2 2 0	2	2		2
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**2.5**	**2.2**	**2**	**2**		**3**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	3		3

21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.6 3 0.547722558	2	2				3
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2				3
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 2 0.447213595	2	2				3
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	1.8 2 0.447213595	2	1				3
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**2.5**	**2.2**	**2**	**3**				**3**
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.2 3 0.836660027	2	3				3

SPECIAL EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=3	N=0	N=1	N=0	N=0	N=1

DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		3	2.915	2.86		2		2.16
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	3	3 3 0	2.67		2		2
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	3	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.67		2		2
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0	--		2		2
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in	INTASC 7 TGR 6	3	3 3	3		2		2.5

analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	CAEP K-6 4g		0					
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		**3**	**3**	**2.5**		**2**		**2**
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	3	3 3 0	2.33		2		2
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	3	3 3 0	2.67		2		2
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**3**	**2.95**	**2.82**		**2**		**2.18**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	2.33		2		2
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5

Standard	Code						
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0	3		2		2.5
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0	2.67		2		2
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0	2.67		2		2
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	3	3 3 0	2.67		2		2
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	3	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781	2.67		2		1.5

impact student learning and development.*							
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**3**	**3**	**2.8**		**2**	**2.5**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0	2.67		2	2.5
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0	2.67		2	2
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0	3		2	2.5
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	3	3 3 0	2.67		2	2.5
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	3	3 3 0	3		2	3
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**3**	**3**	**3**		**2**	**2.5**
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9	3	3 3 0	3		2	2.5

SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=3 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=0	N=0	N=2	N=0	N=1	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		2.66				2.1		2.6	
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269				2		2	
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269				2		2	
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269				2		3	
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269				--		---	

student learning and development.*							
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269			2		3
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269			2.5		3
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		2.66			2		2
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269			2		2
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269			2		2
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		2.66			1.96		2.64
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.6666666667 3 0.577350269			2.25		3

nonverbal communication in instruction.					
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		2.25	3
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		1.75	3
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		2	3
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		1.75	3
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		2.5	3
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		2.33	3
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	2.666666667 3 0.577350269		1.75	2
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical	INTASC 5 TGR 4	2.666666667 3		2	2

thinking through higher-order questioning.*	CAEP K-6 3e	0.577350269			
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	2.6666666667 0.577350269		1.75	2
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	2.6666666667 0.577350269		1.25	2
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**2.66**		**1.95**	**2.6**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.6666666667 0.577350269		2	3
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	2.6666666667 0.577350269		1.5	2
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	2.6666666667 0.577350269		2	2
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	2.6666666667 0.577350269		2	3
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	2.6666666667 0.577350269		2.25	3
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**2.66**		**2.25**	**2**

| 25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development. | INTASC 10 TGR 9 | 2.6666666667 3 0.577350269 | | | | | 2.25 | | 2 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

PHYSICS EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 18-20
		N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=1	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION				3	
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c			3	
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b			3	

3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a		3
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e		--
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c		3
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g		3
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT			**3**
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a		3

8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a		3	
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION			**2.7**	
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		2.5	
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		3	
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b		3	
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b		3	
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b		3	
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		2.5	
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e		3	

16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e		3
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e		3
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d		3
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e		3
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT			**3**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e		3
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e		3
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e		3
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b		3

24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a			3	
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES				3	
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9			3	

ENGLISH EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	Spring 21	Fall 20	Spring 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 19 Scale 0-3	SP 19 Scale 0-3	F 18 Scale 0 - 3
		N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=2	N=1	N=0	N=0	N=0	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		3		2	1.6				
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	3		2	0				
2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	3		2	2				
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content	INTASC 7 TGR 4	3		2	2				

82

knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	CAEP K-6 4a				
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3		--	--
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	3		2	2
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	3		2	2
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		**3**		**1.25**	**1.5**
7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	3		1.5	2
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and	INTASC 6 TGR 3	3		1	1

summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	CAEP K-6 3a				
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**3**		**1.75**	**1.9**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3		2	2
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3		2	2
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	3		2	2
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	3		2	2
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	3		2	2
14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3		1.5	2
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	3		2	2

16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3		1	1
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	3		1.5	2
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	3		1.5	2
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	3		--	--
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**3**		**2**	**2**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3		--	2
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	3		2	2
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3		--	2
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	3		2	2

fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.									
24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	3		2	2				
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		3		--	--				
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9	3		--	--				

MATHEMATICS EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21 Scale 0-3	FALL 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 17-SP 20 Scale 0-3
		N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=0 SCALE: 0-3	N=1	N=1	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION				2.2	2	
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c			2	2	

86

2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b		2	2
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a		2	2
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e		2	2
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c		--	--
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g		3	2
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT			2	2

7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a		2	2	
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a		2	2	
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION			**2.2**	**2.1**	
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		3	2	
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		3	3	
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b		2	2	
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b		2	2	
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b		2	2	

14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b		2	2
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e		2	2
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e		2	2
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e		2	2
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d		2	2
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e		--	N/A
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT			2	2
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e		2	2
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e		--	2
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e		2	2
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b		2	2

24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a			2	2	
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES				N/A	N/A	
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9			N/A	N/A	

HEALTH EDUCATION		SPRING 22	FALL 21	SPRING 21 Scale 0-3	FALL 20 Scale 0-3	Fall 17-SP 20 Scale 0-3
		N=1 SCALE: 0-3	N=2 SCALE: 0-3	N=	N=	N=0
DOMAIN I: PLANNING AND PREPARATION		3	2.915			
1. The teacher candidate develops measurable and observable grade and subject level objectives that are aligned with appropriate state curricula frameworks.	INTASC 7 TGR 1 CAEP K-6 3c	3	3 3 0			

2. The teacher candidate develops meaningful and authentic learning experiences that accommodate developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4b	3	3 3 0
3. The teacher candidate integrates core content knowledge across and within subject areas in lessons when appropriate.	INTASC 7 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4a	3	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781
4. The teacher candidate plans appropriate and sequential teaching procedures that include innovative introductions and closures. Teaching procedures incorporate different teaching strategies that positively impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0
5. The teacher candidate's plans indicate use of appropriate assessments that effectively evaluate student learning and development.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3c	3	3 3 0
6. The teacher candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences to improve student growth, development, and understanding.*	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4g	3	3 3 0
DOMAIN II: ASSESSMENT		3	3

7. The teacher candidate communicates assessment criteria and performance standards to the students and provides feedback to students about academic performance.	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	3	3 3 0
8. The teacher candidate uses formative and summative assessments to differentiate learning experiences that accommodate the learning and development of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 6 TGR 3 CAEP K-6 3a	3	3 3 0
DOMAIN III: INSTRUCTION		**3**	**2.95**
9. The teacher candidate uses standard written, oral, and nonverbal communication in instruction.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0
10. The teacher candidate provides explicit written and oral directions for instructional activities.	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0
11. The teacher candidate communicates positive expectations for learning for all students.	INTASC 2 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0
12. The teacher candidate conveys enthusiasm for teaching and learning for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0
13. The teacher candidate provides opportunities for all students to cooperate, communicate, and interact with each other to enhance learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0

14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.	INTASC 4 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3b	3	3 3 0
15. The teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0
16. The teacher candidate planned learning experiences are implemented that accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs of each learner in the group.*	INTASC 1 TGR 2 CAEP K-6 4e	3	3 3 0
17. The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.*	INTASC 5 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0
18. The teacher candidate adjusts instruction as needed based on student input, cues, and individual/group responses.	INTASC 8 TGR 4 CAEP K-6 4d	3	3 3 0
19. The teacher candidate uses family and/or community resources in instruction to impact student learning and development.*	INTASC 10 TGR 9 CAEP K-6 3e	3	2.5 #N/A 0.707106781
DOMAIN IV: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT		**3**	**3**
20. The teacher candidate adjusts the classroom environment to enhance positive peer relationships, motivation, and learning.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0
21. The teacher candidate attends to and delegates routine tasks.	INTASC 3 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0
22. The teacher candidate uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate student behavior according to individual and situational needs.	INTASC 3 TGR 5 CAEP K-6 3e	3	3 3 0
23. The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students.	INTASC 3 TGR 7 CAEP K-6 1b	3	3 3 0

24. The teacher candidate maximizes instructional time.	INTASC 7 TGR 6 CAEP K-6 4a	3	3 3 0	
DOMAIN V: PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES		**3**	**3**	
25. The teacher candidate collaborates with professional colleagues (classroom mentor teacher and/or university supervisor) to communicate with families about student learning and development.	INTASC 10 TGR 9	3	3 3 0	

*There have been no History Education completers in the last 3 years.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Elementary education candidate assessment data show that our candidates are steadily meeting performance expectations in competencies related to the *Learning and Learning* as they matriculate through the Elementary Education Program. Elementary candidates perform at or above "meets standard" (2.0 mean score) on multiple assessments with components evaluating knowledge and skills associated with *learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments* (with the exception of the 1st pilot semester of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment and RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson Assessment)*. We believe the fall 21 scores on the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* to be an anomaly as they are considerably lower than all other assessment indicators dealing with *the Learning and Learning*. Assessment scores in all four areas assessed relating to the *Learner and Learning* had mean scores below the 2.0 "meets standard" criteria ranging

from **1** on items 1.3 and 1.4 dealing with *learner development* to **1.66** on items 1.1 and 1.2 dealing with *learner differences and learning environment*. We believe these scores to be an anomaly as it was the first semester of piloting this assessment. Also the assessment was designed to be done while observing in a classroom, but due to a spike in Covid-19 during the semester candidates had to complete the assignment by researching schools and watching teaching videos. Scores during the spring 22 semester were on par with the pattern of candidate performance recorded across the multiple assessments addressing the *Learner and Learning*.

In terms of learner development the elementary candidates completing the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* during the spring 22 exhibited competency by **averaging a 2.1** on the portion of the assessment where they described *student characteristics impacting learning and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, and other pertinent factors*. Candidates performed even better on this assessment, **mean of 2.3**, when describing their rationales for accommodations/modifications that they would make based on their *knowledge of the student characteristics*. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also supports candidates' ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Candidates performed at or above "meets standard" seven out of eight semesters with mean scores ranging from a low of **1.88** (one semester below 2.0) in fall 2018 to a high of **2.64** in fall 21.

In terms of *learning differences,* elementary candidates **averaged a 2.2** on item #1.1 on the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* where candidates discuss *community and school information related to geographic location, community/school population, socio-economic status, and other pertinent characteristics*. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidate averages exceeded "meets standard" each of the last eight semesters with scores ranging from **2.08** in fall 2018 to a high of **3.0** in fall 19. Candidate mean scores were also consistently high on *TIAI item #11*, *communicates positive expectations for learning for all students*. All cohort means exceeded **2.0** and five of eight means exceeded **2.5** on 3.0 scale.

In terms of *creating safe and supportive learning environments*, our candidates have consistently performed at a high level across multiple assessments. On item #1.2 of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* focusing on the *description of classroom factors including physical features, technology, etc.*, elementary candidates averaged a **2.1 mean score** during the spring 2022 semester. Candidates approached "meets standard" **averaging a 1.81** during the fall 2021 semester on item #1 of the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* which focused on *start of lesson behaviors when preparing to teach incorporating technology*. Scores rose considerably during the second administration of the assessment during summer 2022, where candidates **averaged 2.62** with a mode of **3**. Elementary candidates have performed extremely well on the *EDCI 301 Classroom Management Plan and Rationale* where all six assessed items deal with *creating safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidate means for both the fall 21 and spring 22 semesters are all at **2.5 or above** on a 3.0 scale, showing that our candidates have the ability to develop a classroom management plan that will support student learning, address resources, respectful attitudes towards students, routines and transitions, response to student behavior, and explain the rationale behind their plan choices. The *EDCI 401 Clinical Unit Plan and Assessment of Student Learning (EDCI 401 CUPASL)* item #4 *addressing time management* further supports candidate ability to create *safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates have consistently performed above meets standard on the assessment item with scores ranging from **2.17** in spring 22 to **2.72** in fall 21. Candidates have also been highly rated by supervising teachers on items 19 and 20 dealing with *managing student behavior*. On item #19 dealing with *implementation of routines and techniques* candidates were rated **4.0 on a 5.0** scale in fall 19, **2.28 on a 3.0** scale in fall 21, and **2.29 on a 3.0** scale in spring 22 (not completed during fall 20 and spring 21 semesters due to Covid). Items 12, 13, 20, 21, and 22 on the *TIAI* further support that one of our strengths is preparing candidates that can *create safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates consistently perform above meets standard in *conveying enthusiasm and providing opportunities for meaningful interactions that enhance learning*.

Mean scores on items 12 and 13 range from a low of **2.04** on item #13 during the fall 18 semester to a high of **2.84** on #12 during the fall 21 semester. Items 20-22 (*20. candidate adjusts classroom environments, 21. attends to and delegates routine tasks, and 22. uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate behavior*) further support our candidates' ability to *effectively manage classrooms*. Mean scores range from a low **2.04** in fall 18 on item #22 to a high of **2.83** on item #20 in fall 21.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Elementary education candidates consistently perform near or above 2.0 "meets standard" criteria across multiple assessments addressing *knowledge of central concepts in content area* and *ability to apply content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences.* Candidates only scored below the meets standard criteria on item #8 on the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* during the fall 21 pilot semester, which addresses *candidates' ability to communicate information while teaching and incorporating technology*. Candidates averaged a **1.75** that semester, but **2.0** was still the most common score among candidates as indicated by the mode for the item. The summer 22 cohort mean was **2.0**, however elementary candidates in this cohort performed less consistently as indicated by the **mode (1)** and **range (1-3).** Candidate performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication, 16. Modeling, 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions*) indicates that candidates know central concepts and possess the pedagogical skills to teach them. In terms of *communicating ideas, modeling, and appropriate pacing* candidate scores ranged from a low **2.12** during the spring 22 semester in *pacing, routines, and transitions* to a high of **2.39** in modeling during the fall 21 semester. Scores from fall 19, when we utilized a 5 point scale from 1-5 on that assessments, scores ranged from a low of **3.77** in *modeling* to **4.0** in both *communication and pacing, routines, and transitions*. TIAI item #14, *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content*, also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. Student teacher scores exceeded a **mean of 2.5** in five of the last eight data cycles. All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).* All mean scores met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Elementary education candidate performance related to *assessment* is not as consistent as we would like for it to be over time and from one assessment to another; however, it does appear that by the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in assessment. A close examination of data trends shows that candidates are largely able to develop *valid, technically sound assessments* and *utilize multiple types/modes of assessments* in their teaching. The areas where elementary candidates have been most inconsistent are associated with the *analysis of student learning*. We recognize that this is an area where instruction and/or experiences have not been as

consistent as we would like due to faculty turnover (retirement of ETEC 367 Assessment, Measurement, and Evaluation instructor) and changing in instructional modalities (online vs. face to face in ETEC 367 and work with data sets rather than actual students in EDCI 401) due to Covid-19. While we have not hired a full time faculty member to teach ETEC 367, the EPP has secured an adjunct with an extensive background in assessment data analysis and intervention. The adjunct and program faculty collaborated to redesign the course for fall 22 to provide more hands-on opportunities to work with data analysis and remediation. We anticipate that this will strengthen candidate skills heading into EDCI 401 where they will be able to delve deeper into data analysis and remediation.

Candidate's performed their lowest (since changing to a 0-3 scale) in terms of validity of assessments in Fall 20 where they averaged a **1.75** on *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #6 *alignment with state standards and objectives* and **1.61** on item #8 *technical soundness of assessment instruments*. Candidate performance on #6 *alignment* was particularly surprising as our candidates had made steady progress in this area since 2018 rising from a **3.68** on a 1-5 scale to a **4.2**. We believe that this large drop in performance this semester on both items #6 and #8 was largely due to advisement error, as the university piloted a centralized advisement process where EPP faculty were not responsible for registering candidates. We were also off campus and had less contact with candidates as we were largely teaching virtually. As a result, a large percentage of the class took the course earlier in their program than they should have providing fewer opportunities for reinforcement in coursework prior to assessment in EDCI 401. The last three semesters candidates have performed at or above meets criteria in *alignment and technical soundness* each semester. Candidates performed below meets standard once in the last three semesters on item #*7 multiples modes and approaches of assessment* where the fall 21 mean was **1.84**. Most candidates, did score a **2** in this area as indicated by the mode. Overall performance (mean of items 6-8) show that candidates consistently approach or exceed meets standard level in terms of *assessment* (spring 22 **m=2.19**, fall 21 **m=1.95**, spring 21 **m=2.17**, and fall 20 **m=1.83**). The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. Assessment mean scores since sp 19 show that candidate performance has consistently exceeded 2.0 and scores have been the highest on the last two data cycles with means of **2.66** for fall 21 and **2.55** for spring 22. Item #7 *communicating criteria* and item #8 *using formative and summative assessment to differentiate instruction* coincide with the domain averages. Performance on each of these items has been above 2.0.

Analysis of student learning trend data (items 9 – 14) on the EDCI 401 CUPASL assessment show that elementary candidates were trending upward in this assessment category prior to the onset of the pandemic. Mean scores rose from **3.46** on a 5 point scale in fall 18 to **4.06** in spring 19. Performance dipped slightly in fall 19 to **3.86**. This portion of the assessment was not assigned to candidates for three semesters during the height of the Covid pandemic due to restrictions on placements for candidates prior to student teaching. Candidate performance dropped significantly when this portion was reinstated in fall 21 where candidate mean scores on items 9 – 14 averaged **1.69.** We saw a significant improvement in performance from the spring 22 cohort where the mean score for items 9-14 was **2.12**. A closer look at trend data reveals that our candidates have consistently performed at a high level on item #11 *evidence of impact on student learning* which assesses whether or not p-12 student performance actually improved after instruction. Mean scores have met or exceeded the standard each semester that the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* has been administered. With the exception of the fall 21 semester candidate mean performance on item *# 9. Analysis of student learning, 10. Interpretation of data, 12. Interpretation of student learning, 13. Insights on effective instruction and assessment, and 14. Modifications based on analysis of student learning* all consistently approach or exceed the meet standards level with most candidates scoring a **2** (mode on 0-3 scale) or **3 or 4** (modes on 1-5 scale).

Planning for instruction and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Candidate performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI*. Elementary candidates mean scores have been at **2.5** or above three of the last four semesters showing that candidates have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and*

develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities. The only areas where candidate performance was not consistently high on both assessments in planning were the fall 18 and spring 19 *TIAI* scores on 18 *adjusts instruction* and 19 *uses community and family resources* where candidate performance approached meeting the standard; and item #5 on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* where spring 22 candidates averaged **1.7**. This can be attributed to some candidates not including accommodations in their unit plans and receiving "0" on that item, as most candidates scored a **2.0** meets standard as indicated by the **mode of 2**. Three cycles of data on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #18 completed by candidates supervising teacher also supports that elementary candidates perform above 2.0 in terms of *providing academic feedback to students* during instruction.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency has been stressed for years within the elementary education program; however, we have had few means of formally assessing candidate competency as a part of the assessment and quality assurance system until recently when we developed and piloted the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*. Prior to fall 21 versions of this assignment were assigned in classes like EDCI 401, but data wasn't collected and analyzed on candidate performance. We have traditionally formally assessed technology proficiency through *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*. Candidates have consistently been rated highly on both items, especially the last four semesters where candidate mean scores exceed **2.5**. Fall 21, Spring 22 and summer 22 pilot data on the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* are encouraging. Candidate performance during both the Spring 22 and Summer 22 semesters was higher than Fall 21 performance on nearly all ISTE components. We also noticed that Spring 22 performance was significantly higher on several assessment items (2, 3, 5,6, 7, 8, 9, and 10) than the Fall 21 or Summer 22 scores. The same instructor taught the Fall 21 and Summer 22 course. A different instructor taught the Spring 22 course, which may indicate some scoring consistency issues. We conducted reliability training during the Fall 22 semester where faculty that have taught and potentially could teach the course evaluated a common assessment and discussed expectations based on the rubric. We will continue to watch trends to see if Spring 22 was an anomaly.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson, TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. The *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* item 9. *Modeling digital citizenship and ethical responsibility* means for the spring 22 semester are slightly below meets the standard. The mean score was **1.87**. This was a significant improvement over the fall 21 pilot semester score of **1.62**. Candidate *Mid-Level* and *Professional Dispositional* mean scores are much stronger indicating that elementary candidates exhibit professional responsibility at multiple levels of matriculation. Candidate mean scores for both cohorts on the *EDCI 401 Mid-Level Dispositions* indicate that candidates exceed the "meets standard" level in every dispositional category. Dispositional scores related to *professionalism* ranged from a low of **2.05** in *regular class attendance* during the spring 22 semester to a high of **2.70** during the spring 22 semester. This indicates that our candidates *regularly attend class*, *submit assignments on time*, *exhibit confidence and poise in professional settings*, and *exhibit a professional appearance*. Candidate scores related to ethics were even higher ranging from a low on item #7 *exhibits concerns for issues of equity* of **2.28** in fall 2021 to a high of **2.92** on #8 *exhibits honesty and integrity*. Furthermore, candidates have shown that they take

responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others. Candidate mean scores on item #9 *reflexive practice,* #10 *communicates with stakeholders*, #13 *accepts constructive criticism*, and #14 *collaborates with professional colleagues to meet students' need* show that many of our candidates exceed expectations in these categories. Candidate *Professional Disposition* scores over three cycles further support the professionalism and ethics of our candidates with candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement, #3 following university and school policies*, #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, and #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students* all ranging from **2.44** to **3.0** over 3 cycles of data with more candidates rated as "3.0 exceeds expectations" than 2.0 as indicated by the modes on each item. *Professional dispositions* scores on items #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity* and #6 *provides fair and equitable opportunities* are among the highest dispositional mean scores. The *TIAI* items 19. *uses family and community resources* and 25. *Collaborates with colleagues* also show that candidates are consistently rated high in terms of professional responsibility since fall 19. Candidate means for 19 *uses family and community resources* were below 2.0 (spring 19 mean of **1.76** and fall 18 mean of **1.92**), but have consistently been above **2.0** since the fall 2019 semester. Candidate *TIAI* scores on *collaboration* (item #25) have consistently been high. Candidate means scores were **2.5** or higher five of the last eight semesters. Finally, candidate *Mid-Level Dispositions* items #11 *maintains a professional relationship with students* and #12 *demonstrates responsiveness to student needs* further show that elementary candidates meet or exceed expectations when working with students and families.

MUSIC EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Music education candidate assessment data show that our students are steadily meeting performance expectations in competencies related to the *Learning and Learning* as they matriculate through the Music Education Program. Music Education students perform at or above "meets standard" (2.0 mean score) on multiple assessments with components evaluating knowledge and skills associated with *learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments* (with the exception of the 1st pilot semester of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment and RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson Assessment*). Student scores in all four areas assessed relating to the Learner and Learning had a score of 2.0 and higher which "meets standard" requirements.

In terms of learner development the music education students completing the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* during the spring 22 exhibited competency by **averaging a 2.5** on the portion of the assessment where they described *student characteristics impacting learning and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, and other pertinent factors*. Students performed even better on this assessment, **mean of 2.5**, when describing their rationales for accommodations/modifications that they would make based on their *knowledge of the student characteristics*. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also supports students ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Students performed at or above "meets standard" seven out of eight semesters with mean scores ranging from a low of **2** (one semester below 2.0) in fall 2018 to a high of **2.88** in fall 21.

In terms of *learning differences,* music education students **averaged a 2.5** on item #1.1 on the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* where students discuss *community and school information related to geographic location, community/school population, socio-economic status, and other pertinent characteristics*. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the students' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidate averages exceeded "meets standard" each of the last eight semesters with scores ranging from **2.62** in spring 22 to a high of **3.0** in spring 19. Student mean scores were also consistently high on *TIAI item #11*, *communicates positive expectations for learning for all students*. All cohort means exceeded **2.0** and five of eight means exceeded **2.5** on 3.0 scale.

In terms of *creating safe and supportive learning environments*, our students have consistently performed at a high level across multiple assessments. On item #1.2 of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* focusing on the *description of classroom factors including physical features, technology, etc.*, music education students averaged a **2.5 mean score** during the spring 2022 semester. Students approached "meets standard" **averaging a 3** during the fall 2021 semester on item #1 of the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* which focused on *start of lesson behaviors when preparing to teach incorporating technology*. The *EDCI 401 Clinical Unit Plan and Assessment of Student Learning (EDCI 401 CUPASL)* item #4 *addressing time management* further supports candidate ability to create *safe and supportive learning environments*. Students have consistently performed above meets standard on the assessment item with scores ranging from **4** in fall 18 to **2.16** in spring 21. Students have also been highly rated by supervising teachers on items 19 and 20 dealing with *managing student behavior*. On item #19 dealing with *implementation of routines and techniques* students were rated **4.0 on a 5.0** scale in fall 19, **2.28 on a 3.0** scale in fall 21, and **2.29 on a 3.0** scale in spring 22 (not completed during fall 20 and spring 21 semesters due to Covid). Items 12, 13, 20, 21, and 22 on the *TIAI* further support that one of our strengths is preparing students that can *create safe and supportive learning environments*. Students consistently perform above meets standard in *conveying enthusiasm and providing opportunities for meaningful interactions that enhance learning*.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Music education students consistently perform near or above 2.0 "meets standard" criteria across multiple assessments addressing *knowledge of central concepts in content area* and *ability to apply content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences.* Student performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication, 16. Modeling, 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions*) indicates that students know central concepts and possess the pedagogical skills to teach them. In terms of *communicating ideas, modeling, and appropriate pacing* candidate scores ranged from a low **2** during the fall 21 semester in several categories (*pacing, routines, and transitions; response to behavior, routines and techniques, and etc.)* to a high of **2.75** in several categories (*communication, modeling, and response to behavior)* during the spring 22 semester. Scores from fall 19, when we utilized a 5 point scale from 1-5 on those assessments, scores ranged from a low of **3.2** in *academic feedback* to **3.8** in both *communication*. TIAI item #14, *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content*, also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. Student teacher scores exceeded a **mean of 2.5** in five of the last eight data cycles. All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show students' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).* All mean scores met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Music education students' performance related to *assessment* is not as consistent as we would like for it to be over time and from one assessment to another; however, it does appear that by the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in assessment. The areas where music education students have been most inconsistent are associated with the *assessment plan and assessment instrument design*. We recognize that this is an area where instruction and/or experiences have not been as consistent as we would like due to faculty turnover (retirement of ETEC 367 Assessment, Measurement, and Evaluation instructor) and changing in instructional modalities (online vs. face to face in ETEC 367 and work with data sets rather than actual students in EDCI 401) due to Covid-19. While we have not hired a full time faculty member to teach ETEC 367, the EPP has secured an adjunct with an extensive background in assessment, data analysis and intervention. The adjunct and program faculty collaborated to redesign the course for fall 22 to provide more hands-on opportunities to work with data analysis and remediation. We anticipate that this will strengthen candidate skills heading into EDCI 401 where they will be able to delve deeper into data analysis and remediation.

Students performed their lowest (since changing to a 0-3 scale) in terms of validity of assessments in Fall 20 where they averaged a **2.76** on *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #6 *alignment with state standards and objectives* and **2.39** on item #8 *technical soundness of assessment instruments*. Student performance on #6 –8 *alignment* has fluctuated downwardly in the assessment plan and instrument design area. We believe that this large drop in performance this semester on both items #6 - 8 was largely due to advisement errors, as the university piloted a centralized advisement process where EPP faculty were not responsible for registering students. We were also off campus and had less contact with students as we were largely teaching virtually. As a result, a large percentage of the class took the course earlier in their program than they should have, providing fewer opportunities for reinforcement in coursework prior to assessment in EDCI 401. The last three semesters students have performed at or above meets criteria in *alignment and technical soundness* each semester. The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. Assessment mean scores since sp 19 show that student performance has consistently exceeded 2.0 and scores have been the highest on the last two data cycles with means of **2.88** for fall 21 and **2.62** for spring 22. Item #7 *communicating criteria* and item #8 *using formative and summative assessment to differentiate instruction* coincides with the domain averages. Performance on each of these items has been above 2.0.

Analysis of student learning trend data (items 9 – 14) on the EDCI 401 CUPASL assessment show that music education students were trending upward in this assessment category prior to the onset of the pandemic. Mean scores rose from **2.67** on a 5 point scale in fall 18 to **4.03** in fall 19. This portion of the assessment was not assigned to students for three semesters during the height of the Covid pandemic due to restrictions on placements for students prior to student teaching. Students performance dropped significantly when this portion was reinstated in fall 21 where student mean scores on items 9 – 14 averaged **1.53.** We saw a significant improvement in performance from the spring 22 cohort where the mean score for items 9-14 was **2.16**. A closer look at trend data reveals that our students have consistently performed at a high level on item #11 *evidence of impact on student learning* which assesses whether or not p-12 student performance actually improved after instruction. Mean scores have met or exceeded the standard each semester that the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* has been administered. With the exception of the fall 21 semester student mean performance on item *# 9. Analysis of student learning, 10. Interpretation of*

data, 12. Interpretation of student learning, 13. Insights on effective instruction and assessment, and 14. Modifications based on analysis of student learning all consistently approach or exceed the meet standards level with most students scoring a **2** (mode on 0-3 scale) or **3 or 4** (modes on 1-5 scale).

Planning for instruction and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Students performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI*. Music education students mean scores have been at **2.5** or above three of the last four semesters showing that students have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities*. The only areas where student performance was not consistently high on both assessments in planning were the fall 18 and spring 19 *TIAI* scores on 18 *adjusts instruction* and 19 *uses community and family resources* where student performance approached meeting the standard; and item #5 on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* where spring 22 students averaged **1.7**. This can be attributed to some students not including accommodations in their unit plans and receiving "0" on that item, as most students scored a **2.0** meets standard as indicated by the **mode of 2**. Three cycles of data on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #18 completed by student supervising teachers also supports that music education students perform above 2.0 in terms of *providing academic feedback to students* during instruction.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

The TIAI, mid-level dispositions, and professional dispositions assess students' responsibility for student learning and collaboration with others. TIAI items assessed covers professional responsibility through various skill levels. Music education students consistently demonstrate high performance in the Mid-level dispositions in EDCI 401 with a mean score of **2.64** in spring 22 and **2.16** in fall 21. Students show consistent growth in this area and can be attributed to all education classes requiring code of ethics assignments. In EDCI 402 students demonstrate the same consistency in the professional dispositions with a high means score of **2.97** in spring 22, low means score of **2.96** in spring 21. In this category student *TIAI* scores on *professionalism* have consistently been high.

SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Data provided show that social science candidates have applied knowledge of learner and learning at different developmental levels. The criteria set for meeting performance for *learning and learner* is at 2.0 mean score. The social science candidates N=3 for fall 2021 performance was below the mean. There were no candidates the rest of the semesters to show different data. Multiple assessments were used to evaluate knowledge and skills that help measure understanding of concepts of learner development, learner differences, learning differences and *creating safe and supportive learning environments.* Since there were no candidates in fall and spring 2022, there is no data to demonstrate evidence on

how our candidate improved or stayed the same. Assessment scores in four areas namely: Assessment scores in all four areas assessed relating to the *Learner and Learning* had mean scores below the 2.0 "meets standard" criteria ranging from **1** on items 1.3 and 1.4 dealing with *learner development* on items 1.1 and 1.2 dealing with *learner differences and learning environment*. This can only be explained that the assessment was just introduced to candidates. There no scores in spring 2022 to compare the results in these areas.

In addressing learner development, the social science the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* during the fall 2021 had a mean below the mean of 2.0. Candidates were less competent in all four areas of learner development by averaging less than the mean of **2.0** on the portion of the assessment where they described *student characteristics impacting learning and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, and other pertinent factors*. There was no opportunity to compare candidates performed since there were no candidates in the field. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also supports candidates' ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Social Science candidates performed at or above "meets standard" in spring 2019 **(2.0)** with n=1, and spring 2022 **(2.66)** with n=3, but in spring 2020 one candidate scored 1.75 lower than the mean score of 2.0.

In terms of *learning differences,* social science candidates N=3 in fall 2021 score is below the mean of **2.0** on item #1.1 on the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* where candidates discuss *community and school information related to geographic location, community/school population, socio-economic status, and other pertinent characteristics*. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidate averages exceeded "meets standard" each of the three semesters with scores ranging from **2.0** in spring 2019 (n=1), spring 2020, n=2) to a high of **2.66** in spring 22 where n=3. Candidate mean scores were also consistently high in two semesters spring 2022 **(2.66)** and spring 2019 **(3.0)** on *TIAI item #11, communicates positive expectations for learning for all students*. All cohort means met the mean score of 2.0 and one semester means exceeded the mean to score **3.0**. on a 3.0 scale.

In terms of *creating safe and supportive learning environments*, social science candidates have consistently performed at a low level across multiple assessments. On item #1.2 of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* focusing on the *description of classroom factors including physical features, technology, etc.* social science candidates (n=3) averaged score of less than the mean of 2.0. The rest of the semester under this submission there were no social science candidates. The *EDCI 401 Clinical Unit Plan and Assessment of Student Learning (EDCI 401 CUPASL)* item #4 *addressing time management* further supports candidate ability to create *safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates have performed above meets standard on the assessment item with scores ranging from **4.0** (on a scale of **5.0**) in spring 2020 with n-2 and scored above meets the standard in spring 2021 **(2.5)** with n=2 and in the fall 2021 **(2.0)** on a scale of **3.0 and n=4.** Whereas the majority of the candidates meet or exceed the mean score, there was **one** candidates performed below the mean in fall 2020 **(1.0).** Social science candidates have also been highly rated by supervising teachers on items 19 and 20 dealing with *managing student behavior*.

On item #19 dealing with *implementation of routines and techniques* candidate (n=1) were rated **5.0 on a 5.0** scale in spring 2019 (n=1), and **3.0 on a 3.0** scale in spring 21 (not completed during fall 20 and spring 21 semesters due to Covid). Items 12, 13, 20, 21, and 22 on the *TIAI* further support that one of our strengths is preparing candidates that can *create safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates consistently perform above meets standard (except one semester) in *conveying enthusiasm and providing opportunities for meaningful interactions that enhance learning*. Mean scores on items 11 ranged from 2.25 to 3.0, item #12 scores ranged from 2.0 to 3.0, in item #13 spring 2019 (n=1) mean score was 3.0, spring 2020 low score of 1.75 in (n=2) and in spring 2022 scores went up again to 2.66 in (n=3). Items 20-22 (*20. candidate adjusts classroom*

environments, 21. attends to and delegates routine tasks, and 22. uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate behavior) further support our candidates' ability to *effectively manage classrooms*. Mean scores range from a low **1.5** in spring 2020 with (n=2) on item #21 to a high of **3.0** on item #20 in spring 19 (n=1).

R1.2 Content: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Social science candidate performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication, 16. Modeling, 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions*) indicates that candidates know central concepts and possess the pedagogical skills to teach them. In terms of *communicating ideas and modeling* scores were 3.0. In pacing, Routine, & Transitions the average score was 2.5. Even thought it was lower in this category it still scores higher the 2.0 (meets requirement). TIAI item #14, *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content*, also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. Student teacher (n=1) mean scores for spring 19 (3.0), in spring 20 with (n=2) m= (2.5) and fall 22 (2.66) exceeded a **mean of 2.0.** The rest of the semester there were candidate. All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).* All mean scores in spring 20 and fall 22 met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components. In spring 20 with (n=2) the scores were slightly below the mean at **1.96**. This was improved to **2.66** (n=3) in spring 22 when the next candidates came along.

R1.3 Instructional Practice: The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Social science education candidate performance related to *assessment* is not as consistent as we would like for it to be over time and from one assessment to another; however, it does appear that by the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in assessment. A close examination of data trends shows that candidates are largely able to develop *valid, technically sound assessments* and *utilize multiple types/modes of assessments* in their teaching. The areas where social studies candidates have been most inconsistent are associated with the *analysis of student learning*. We recognize that this is an area where instruction and/or experiences have not been as consistent as we would like due to faculty turnover (retirement of ETEC 367 Assessment, Measurement, and Evaluation instructor) and changing in instructional modalities (online vs. face to face in ETEC 367 and work with data sets rather than actual students in EDCI 401) due to Covid-19. While we have not hired a full time faculty member to teach ETEC 367, the EPP has secured an adjunct with an extensive background in assessment data analysis and intervention. The adjunct and program faculty collaborated to redesign the course for fall 22 to provide more hands-on opportunities to work with data analysis and remediation. We anticipate that this will strengthen candidate skills heading into EDCI 401 where they will be able to delve deeper into data analysis and remediation.

Candidate's performed their lowest (since changing to a 0-3 scale) in terms of validity of assessments in **fall 2021 mean score of 3.67 on a scale of 1-5).** In *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #6 *alignment with state standards and objectives* and **1.25** (n=1) on item #8 *technical soundness of assessment instruments*. Candidate performance on #6 *alignment* was particularly surprising as our candidates had made steady progress in this area since 2018 rising from a **3.5** on a 1-5 scale. We believe that this large drop in performance this semester on both items #6 and #8 was largely due to advisement error, as the university piloted a centralized advisement process where EPP faculty were not responsible for registering candidates. We were also off campus and had less contact with candidates as we were largely teaching virtually. As a result, a large percentage of the class took the course earlier in their program than they should have providing fewer opportunities for reinforcement in coursework prior to assessment in EDCI 401. The last three semesters candidates have performed at or above meets criteria in *alignment and technical soundness* each semester. Candidates performed below meets standard once in the last three semesters on item *#7 multiples modes and approaches of assessment* where the fall 21 mean was **1.5** (n=1). Overall performance (mean of items 6-8) show that candidates consistently mixed results meets standard level and below means average in terms of *assessment* (fall 21 with n=1 **m=1.25**, spring 21 **m=2.0**. The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. **2.55** (n=3) for spring 22. Item #7 *communicating criteria* and item #8 *using formative and* Assessment mean scores since spring 2020 with n=3 and m=4.0 (on scale of 5.0), spring 2021 **m=2.0** with n=2 and spring 2020 **m=4.0 on a 5.0 scale** with n=2, that candidate performance have fluctuating scores below or exceeded 2.0 and scores have been the and *summative assessment to differentiate instruction* coincide with the domain averages. Performance on each of these items has been above 2.0.

Analysis of student learning trend data (items 9 – 14) on the EDCI 401 CUPASL assessment show that elementary candidates were trending upward in this assessment category prior to the onset of the pandemic. Mean scores rose from **3.83** on a 5-point scale in spring 2020 (n=2) to **1.29 on a 3.0 scale in fall 2021** with n=4. There was a performance dip in spring 2020. This portion of the assessment was not assigned to candidates for three semesters during the height of the Covid pandemic due to restrictions on placements for candidates prior to student teaching. Candidate performance dropped significantly when this portion was reinstated in fall 21 where candidate mean scores on items 9 – 14 averaged **1.29.** A closer look at trend data reveals that our candidates have consistently performed at a low level on item # 9-14 *evidence of impact on student learning* which assesses whether or not p-12 student performance actually improved after instruction. Mean scores were lower than mean average of 2.0 except for fall 2019 which have exceeded the standard scoring above 3.0 on a 50 scale in *EDCI 401 CUPASL* has been administered. The two semesters when there were candidates to take the assessment on scored very low fall 2021 and high scores in spring 2019. on item # *9. Analysis of student learning, 10. Interpretation of data, 12. Interpretation of student learning, 13. Insights on effective instruction and assessment, and 14. Modifications based on analysis of student learning.*

Planning for instruction and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Candidate performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI*. Social science candidates mean scores have been at **2.5** or above three of the last three semesters showing that candidates have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities* and item #5 on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* where spring 22 candidates (n=3) averaged **2.62**. Three cycles of data on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* item #18 completed by candidates supervising teacher also supports that social science candidates perform above 2.0 in terms of *providing academic feedback to students* during instruction.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency is assessed through the RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson. We had two candidates to complete the assessment in Spring 22. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in all categories related to Instructional Practice with the exception of item *#6 Design and develop digital age learning experiences and assessments* where scores averaged **1.5**. On the *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development* all three candidates over the last three cycles met or exceeded the standard.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. In addition, the program has added the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* item 9. *Modeling digital citizenship and ethical responsibility* and 10 *Engages in professional growth and leadership,* where social science candidates averaged 3.0 exceeds expectations. Our candidate's *Mid-Level* and *Professional Dispositional* mean scores are strong indicating that social science candidates exhibit professional responsibility at multiple levels of matriculation. Candidate mean scores for both cohorts on the *EDCI 401 Mid-Level Dispositions* indicate that candidates exceed the "meets standard" level in every dispositional category. Dispositional scores related to *professionalism* ranged from a low of **2.0** in *regular class attendance* during the fall 21 semester to a high of **3.0**. The rest of the semesters there were no social science candidates. This indicates that our candidates *regularly attend class*, *submit assignments on time*, *exhibit confidence and poise in professional settings*, and *exhibit a professional appearance*. Candidate scores related to ethics were even higher ranging from a low on item #7 *exhibits concerns for issues of equity* of a range of scores of **2.0 – 2.66** in fall 2021 in #8 *exhibits honesty and integrity*. Furthermore, candidates have shown that they take responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others. Candidate mean scores on item #9 *reflexive practice,* #10 *communicates with stakeholders*, #13 *accepts constructive criticism*, and #14 *collaborates with professional colleagues to meet students' need* show that many of our candidates exceed expectations in these categories. Candidate *Professional Disposition* scores over three cycles further support the professionalism and ethics of our candidates with candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement, #3 following university and school policies*, #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, and #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students* with social science candidates scoring an average of **2.0** to **2.66.** *Professional dispositions* score on items #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity* and #6 *provides fair and equitable opportunities* are among the highest dispositional mean scores. The *TIAI* items 19. *uses family and community resources* and 25. *Collaborates with colleagues* also show that candidates are consistently rated high in terms of professional responsibility since fall 19. Candidate means for 19 *uses family and community resources* were below **2.0** (spring 20 with n=2) mean of was below 2.0 with n=2) **1.25**, but in spring 2022 mean score went up to **2.66**. Social science candidate *TIAI* scores on *collaboration* (item #25) have consistently been high. Candidate means scores were **2.0** or higher in spring 2019 (2.0) with (n=1), spring 2020 was **2.25** and spring 2022 was **2.66** with (n=3). Finally, candidate *Mid-Level Dispositions* items #11 *maintains a professional relationship with students* and #12 *demonstrates responsiveness to student needs* further show that social science candidates meet or exceed expectations when working with students and families.

HISTORY EDUCATION

No Completers in recent years.

ENGLISH EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Candidates in English Education continuously meet or exceed standards in outcomes related **to The Learner and Learning**. Over the last 6 cycles of EDCI 401 CUPASL data, candidate mean scores have met or exceeded the 2.0 meets standard level on item *#4 Provides appropriate time* on all but one occasion. During fall 20, the mean score was 1.66. Both of our candidates scored at the highest levels during the Spring 22 and Spring 19 semesters on CUPASL items *#19 Managing Student Behavior (Routines & Techniques)* and *#20 Managing Student Behavior (Response to Behavior).* Candidate performance since fall 20, as measured by the TIAI, shows that our four completers have largely met or exceeded expectations in all categories related to The Learner and Learning. All candidates met or exceeded the standard on items #2, 11, 12, 13, 20, 21, and 22 which assess candidates' ability to create meaningful and authentic learning experiences, communicate expectations, convey enthusiasm, encourage cooperation, meet student needs, delegate, and mange behavior. Candidate performance was inconsistent on *item #16 Accommodate differences in developmental and individual needs*. The Spring 22 scored **3.0**, while the others scored **1.0** needs improvement.

R1.2 Content: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Assessment of **Content** on the EDCI 401 CUPASL items 15-17 is regulated only to the fall 2019 and spring 2022 years due to Covid-19 restrictions on schools and student interns. However, both internship results indicate candidates exceeded standards. The intern in spring 2022 received **3.0** scores in the *presentation of instructional content* and they ways *content was communicated and modeled*. The intern was shown to exhibit high academic performance and basic skills and content knowledge. Assessed at **3.0** respectively. Incorporating the *pace and routine of instruction* into the class met the standard with a **2.0** evaluation. The intern experience during 2019 further supports candidate proficiency, as the candidate was rated **5.0** on all three assessed content items.   Only 1 (**1.0 Needs Improvement**) of the 4 candidates scored below 2.0 meets standard on TIAI #*14. The teacher candidate demonstrates content knowledge and an understanding of how to teach the content.* The spring 22 candidate scored **3.0** and the two remaining candidates scored **2.0** meets standard. Items 9, 10, and 24 dealing with communication and written and oral directions further support that candidates meet or exceed the standard. Three of 4 candidates

met or exceeded the standard on *#17 The teacher candidate engages all students in critical thinking through higher-order questioning.* One candidate scored at the **1.0** Needs Improvement level.

R1.3 Instructional Practice: The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Assessment for the application of **Instructional Practice** reveals consistency in meeting standards in those areas. On the EDCI 401 CUPASL *development of plans and course material and variation of activities, materials, and resources* have primarily exceeded standards at 3.0 for the spring 2018, fall 2019, and spring 2020 interns. Fall 2020 and spring 2022 interns met standards. There were challenges during the spring 2021 internship, in which the intern was assessed at below standard scores *for Instructional Unit planning* and just meeting standards in *Assessment Plan and Design*. Dips in *aligning instruction to state content standards* (earning 1.0 or 2.0 assessment) correlates to Covid-19 impact on student intern experiences in fall/spring 2020 and spring 2021. There is one outliers in assessment scores: an evaluation of **1.0** for aligning instruction to state standards. There is a marked difference when assessment turns to *accommodation of instructional plans* and *varieties of assessment for diverse learners* as well as *aligning assessment strategies to state standards*. There are outliers of **0** and **1** for *accommodation and alignment during spring 2021*, which again, directly correlates with difficulties in teaching during Covid-19. In fact, Analysis of Student Learning as not assessed as a result of Covid-19 mandates during spring 2020 through spring 2021.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Standards of **Professional Responsibility** are taught for English majors in ENG 401/402 for future demonstration in classes as EDCI 401 student interns. Despite low retention of majors, evaluation results for the student intern in this study demonstrates a constancy in practice for Instructional Unit Planning. Data collected for spring 2022 reveals the student intern meets standards with a **2.0** mean score in professionalism in the areas of: *timeliness in lesson planning and execution, communication with students, collaboration with teacher mentors, and reflective practice*. The student intern exceeds standards with a **3.0** mean score in *professional poise and comportment, honesty and integrity, fairness and equity, and in accepting constructive criticism for further development.* Professional dispositions further support that English Education candidates perform consistently high in terms of Professional Responsibility. The Spring 22 candidate scored 3.0 on all dispositional categories showing the candidate *protects confidentiality, demonstrates maturity, follows policy, honest, accepts constructive criticism, is fair and equitable, and maintains a professional relationship.* The Spring 21 candidate scores **2.0** in all categories but one, *# 6 The teacher candidate provides fair and equitable opportunities for all P-12 students in a non-discriminatory manner.* The candidate received a **1.0** Needs Improvement.

HEALTH EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Health education candidate assessment data show that our candidates are steadily meeting performance expectations in competencies related to the *Learner and Learning* as they matriculate through the Health and Physical Education Program. Health education candidates perform at or above "meets standard" (2.0 mean score) on multiple assessments with components evaluating knowledge and skills associated with *learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments*. EDCI 401 CUPASL scores are consistently high in terms of classroom management. During the Fall 21 semester both candidates were rated 3.0 on items 19 and 20. During the spring 22 semester, on candidate scored at 1.0 Needs Improvement level, while the other met standards (2.0) on item 19. Both scored 2.0 on item 20. In terms of learner development the Health education candidates completing the *Assessment* during the spring 22 exhibited competency by **averaging a 3** on the portion of the assessment where they described *student characteristics impacting learning and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, and other pertinent factors*. Candidates performed highly on this assessment, **mean of 3**, when describing their rationales for accommodations/modifications that they would make based on their *knowledge of the student characteristics*. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also supports candidates' ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Candidates performed above "meets standard" eight semesters with mean scores of **3**.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Health education candidates consistently perform above 2.0 "meets standard" criteria across multiple assessments addressing *knowledge of central concepts in content area* and *ability to apply content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences*. All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9)*. All mean scores met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Health education candidate performance related to *assessment* is consistent with the other area of scores. By the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in assessment. A close examination of data trends shows that candidates are largely able to develop *valid, technically sound assessments* and *utilize multiple types/modes of assessments* in their teaching. The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. Assessment mean scores since sp 19 show that candidate performance has consistently exceeded 2.0 and scores. Item #7 *communicating criteria* and item #8 *using formative and summative assessment to differentiate instruction* coincide with the domain averages. Performance on each of these items has been above 2.0.*Planning for instruction* and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Candidate performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI*. Health Education candidates mean scores have been at **2.0** or above three of the last four semesters showing that candidates have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities*.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency has been stressed for years within the elementary education program; however, we have had few means of formally assessing candidate competency as a part of the assessment and quality assurance system until recently when we developed and piloted the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*. Prior to fall 21 versions of this assignment were assigned in classes like EDCI 401, but data wasn't collected and analyzed on candidate performance. We have traditionally formally assessed technology proficiency through *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*. Candidates have consistently been rated highly on both items, especially the last four semesters where candidate mean scores exceed **2.5**. We look forward to our candidates beginning to complete the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. Candidate *Mid-Level* and *Professional Dispositional* mean scores are strong indicating that health education candidates exhibit professional responsibility at multiple levels of matriculation. Candidate mean scores for both cohorts on the *EDCI 401 Mid-Level Dispositions* indicate that candidates exceed the "meets standard" level in every dispositional category. Dispositional scores related to *professionalism* ranged from a low of **2.05** in *regular class attendance* to a high of **3.0** during the spring 22 semester. This indicates that our candidates *regularly attend class*, *submit assignments on time*, *exhibit confidence and poise in professional settings*, and *exhibit a professional appearance*.

Furthermore, candidates have shown that they take responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others. Candidate mean scores on item #9 *reflexive practice,* #10 *communicates with stakeholders*, #13 *accepts constructive criticism*, and #14 *collaborates with professional colleagues to meet students' need* show that many of our candidates exceed expectations in these categories. Candidate *Professional Disposition* scores over three cycles further support the professionalism and ethics of our candidates with candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement, #3 following university and school policies*, #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, and #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students* all ranging from **2.0** to **3.0** over 3 cycles of data with more candidates rated as "3.0 exceeds expectations" than 2.0 as indicated by the modes on each item. *Professional dispositions* scores on items #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity* and #6 *provides fair and equitable opportunities* are among the highest dispositional mean scores. The *TIAI* items 19. *uses family and community resources* and 25. *Collaborates with colleagues* also show that candidates are consistently rated high in terms of professional responsibility since fall 19.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Physical education candidate assessment data show that our candidates are steadily meeting performance expectations in competencies related to the *Learner and Learning* as they matriculate through the Health and Physical Education Programs. Physical education candidates perform at or above "meets standard" (2.0 mean score) on multiple assessments with components evaluating knowledge and skills associated with *learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments*. In terms of learner development, the physical education candidates completing the *Assessment* during the spring 22 exhibited competency by **averaging a 3.0** on the portion of the assessment where they described *student characteristics impacting learning and the learning environment including grade/age level, gender, and other pertinent factors*. Candidates performed highly on this assessment, **mean of 2.5**, when describing their rationales for accommodations/modifications that they would make based on their *knowledge of the student characteristics*. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also supports candidates' ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Candidates performed above "meets standard" eight semesters with mean scores of **3**.

In terms of *learning differences,* physical education candidates **averaged a 2.0**. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidate averages exceeded "meets standard" each of the last eight semesters with scores ranging from **2.0** in fall 2018 to a high of **3.0** in fall 19. Candidate mean scores were also consistently high on *TIAI item #11*, *communicates positive expectations for learning for all students*. All cohort means exceeded **2.0** on a 3.0 scale.

In terms of *creating safe and supportive learning environments*, our candidates have consistently performed at a high level across multiple assessments. The *EDCI 401 Clinical Unit Plan and Assessment of Student Learning (EDCI 401 CUPASL)* item #4 *addressing time management* further supports candidate ability to create *safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates have consistently performed above meets standard on the assessment item with the exception of fall 20 where candidates approached meeting the standard with a mean score of 1.8 on item #4. CUPASL means scores assessing classroom management, #19 and #20, all meet or exceed standards over the last three cycles of data ranging from **2.0** to **3.0**.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Physical education candidates consistently perform above 2.0 "meets standard" criteria across multiple assessments addressing *knowledge of central concepts in content area* and *ability to apply content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences.* All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).* All mean scores met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components. CUPASL means further support the strength of P.E. candidates in teaching content. Scores on CUPASL items 15-17 range from **2.5** to **3.0 showing that candidates excel at** *communicating, modeling, and pacing content*.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Physical education candidate performance related to *assessment* is consistent with the other area of scores. By the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in assessment. A close examination of data trends shows that candidates are largely able to develop *valid, technically sound assessments* and *utilize multiple types/modes of assessments* in their teaching.

The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. Assessment mean scores since spring 19 show that candidate performance has consistently exceeded 2.0 and scores. Item #7 *communicating criteria* and item #8 *using formative and summative assessment to differentiate instruction* coincide with the domain averages. Performance on each of these items has been above 2.0.

Planning for instruction and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Candidate performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI* reveal that P.E. candidates mean scores have been at **2.0** or above three of the last four semesters showing that candidates have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities*.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency has been stressed for years within the elementary education program; however, we have had few means of formally assessing candidate competency as a part of the assessment and quality assurance system until recently when we developed and piloted the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*. Prior to fall 21 versions of this assignment were assigned in classes like EDCI 401, but data wasn't collected and analyzed on candidate performance. We have traditionally formally assessed technology proficiency through *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*. Candidates have consistently been rated highly on both items, especially the last four semesters where candidate mean scores exceed **2.5**. Fall 21 and summer 22 pilot data on the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* are encouraging.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. Candidate *Mid-Level* and *Professional Dispositional* mean scores are strong indicating that health education candidates exhibit professional responsibility at multiple levels of matriculation. Candidate mean scores for both cohorts on the *EDCI 401 Mid-Level Dispositions* indicate that candidates exceed the "meets standard" level in every dispositional category. According to EDCI 402 assessment, Dispositional scores related to *professionalism* ranged from a low of **2.05** in *regular class attendance* to a high of **3.0** during the spring 22 semester. This indicates that our candidates *regularly attend class*, *submit assignments on time*, *exhibit confidence and poise in professional settings*, and *exhibit a professional appearance*.

Furthermore, candidates have shown that they take responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others. Candidate mean scores on item #9 *reflexive practice,* #10 *communicates with stakeholders*, #13 *accepts constructive criticism*, and #14 *collaborates with professional colleagues to meet students' need* show that many of our candidates exceed expectations in these categories. Candidate *Professional Disposition* scores over three cycles further support the professionalism and ethics of our candidates with candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement, #3 following university and school policies*, #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, and #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students* all ranging from **2.0** to **3.0** over 3 cycles of data with more candidates rated as "3.0 exceeds expectations" than 2.0 as indicated by the modes on each item. *Professional dispositions* scores on items #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity* and #6 *provides fair and equitable opportunities* are

among the highest dispositional mean scores. The *TIAI* items 19. *uses family and community resources* and 25. *Collaborates with colleagues* also show that candidates are consistently rated high in terms of professional responsibility since fall 19.

<div align="center">

MATH EDUCATION

</div>

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

There have only been two Mathematics education candidates to complete the program in recent years. Both candidates completed coursework in SPED 311, EDCI 301, and RE 310 prior to the implementation of the new assessments. Candidate data analysis in Mathematics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI. EDCI CUPASL item #4, shows that the candidates performed well in terms of *appropriately structuring and pacing the lesson to ensure learning*. The fall 20 candidate scored **3.0** exceeds standard and the candidate prior to fall 20 scored **4.0** on a 5 point scale. Due to COVID-19, only the candidate prior to fall 20 completed CUPASL items 15-20. That candidate received **5.0** on *#19 managing student behavior (routines and techniques)* and **4.0** on item *# 20 managing student behavior (response to behavior).* Two candidates completed the mathematics education program during the 2020-2021 academic year. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidates averaged 2.0 "meets standard" both semesters. Both candidates were rated **2.0** on the remaining TIAI items (#11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 21, and 22) dealing with *expectations, enthusiasm, accommodations, classroom environment, delegating routine tasks, and managing student behavior*.

R1.2 Content: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Candidate data analysis related to content knowledge and skills in Mathematics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI of a single candidate, as one candidate did not complete this portion of the assessment due to COVID-19 limiting clinical experiences to student teaching only the semester the candidate completed the course. Mathematics **c**andidate performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication (4.0), 16. Modeling (4.0), 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions(5.0)* indicates that the candidate knew central concepts and possessed the pedagogical skills to teach them. Both candidates were evaluated on the TIAI. TIAI item #14, *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content*, also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. Student teachers (n=2) mean scores for 2020-2021 (**2.0**) were at meets standard level with a **mean of 2.0.** All means for TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 were at *2.0* and further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).*

R1.3 Instructional Practice: The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Candidate data analysis related to instructional practice in Mathematics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI of a single candidate as one candidate did not complete this portion of the assessment due to COVID-19 limiting clinical experiences to student teaching only the semester the candidate completed the course. Both mathematics candidates showed strong performance in instructional unit planning averaging a **2.8** on 3.0 scale and **4.2** on 5.0 scale, showing that candidates met or exceeded expectations in terms of *1. Alignment to state content standards, activities and materials supporting instructions, and 3. Use of a variety of instructional strategies and 5. Accommodates individual student needs*. Performance was much less consistent in terms of *assessment*. The candidate prior to fall 20 score highly in each assessment category averaging a **4.3** out of 5.0 on items including *6. Alignment with standards and objectives, 7. Multiple modes and approaches, and 8. Technical soundness of assessments*. The fall 20 candidate scored poorly in this area with scores ranging from **0** in *alignment* to a high of **1** on #7 and #8. The fall 20 candidate did not complete items 9 -20 due to COVID-19. The candidate prior to fall 20 performed at or above meets standard level on items 9-14 dealing with *analysis of student learning*. The candidate's highest performance were on items *#11 evidence of impact on student learning (**5.0**), 13. Insights on effective instruction and assessment (**5.0**), and 14. Modifications based on analysis of student learning (**4.0**)*. The candidate scored **3.0** on items *9. Analysis of student learning, 10 interpretation of data, 12 interpretation of student learning, and 18 academic feedback*. Both candidates performed at **2.0** meets standard level on items *3 integrates core content knowledge and 4 appropriate and sequential teaching procedures*. Candidates score **2.0** on both assessment items (#7 and 8) as well. Candidates also met standards on *15 variety of teaching strategies and 18 adjusts instruction*. Both math candidates met or exceeded expectations on all assessment items related to *instructional practice*. One candidate averaged a **2.3** and the other **2.0** on items 3, 4, and 6 related to *Planning and Preparation*. Both candidates averaged a **2.0** on *Assessment*, and **2.0** on items 15, 18, and 23 related to *Instruction and Learning Environment*.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency has been key in mathematics education. This led to the development of technology mini lesson assessment as a means of formally assessing candidate competency as a part of the assessment and quality assurance system to be piloted the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*. Prior to fall 21 versions of this assignment were assigned in classes like EDCI 401, but data wasn't collected and analyzed on candidate performance. We have traditionally formally assessed technology proficiency through *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*. Mathematics candidates scored a **2.0** meets standard on both assessment items.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. In addition, the program has added the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* item 9. *Modeling digital citizenship and ethical responsibility* will be implemented in the fall 2022. No data to report in this submission for mathematics candidates. On the Mid-Level dispositions and RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson as no mathematics candidates were enrolled in the courses during the reported assessment cycle. Only one mathematics candidate completed *Professional Disposition* over the last three cycles (Spring 21-Spring 22). This candidate met or exceeded expectations in every dispositional category further supporting the professionalism and ethics of our candidates. Candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement,* #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, and #6 the teacher candidate provides fair and equitable opportunities were at **2.0** meets standard. Items *#3 following university and school policies*, #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students* with social science candidates scoring an average of **2.0** to **2.66.** *Professional dispositions* score on items, #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity* and #7 *maintains a professional relationship* were **3.0** exceeds standard. TIAI items 19 and 25 were not scored by raters.

PHYSICS EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

There have only been two Physics education candidates enrolled in the program in recent years. Both candidates completed coursework in SPED 311, EDCI 301, and RE 310 prior to the implementation of the new assessments. Candidate data analysis in Physics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI. EDCI CUPASL item #4, shows that the candidate performed well (**4.0** on 5.0 scale) while one scored at needs improvement level (**1.0** on 3.0) in terms of *appropriately structuring and pacing the lesson to ensure learning.* The fall 20 candidate scored **3.0** exceeds standard and the candidate prior to fall 20 scored **4.0** on a 5 point scale. Due to COVID-19, only the candidate prior to fall 20 completed CUPASL items 15-20. That candidate received **5.0** on *#19 managing student behavior (routines and techniques)* and **5.0** on item *# 20 managing student behavior (response to behavior).* One candidate completed the physics education program during the 2020-2021 academic year. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* the candidate was rated **3.0**. The candidate was rated **3.0** on the remaining TIAI items (#11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 21, and 22) dealing with *expectations, enthusiasm, accommodations, classroom environment, delegating routine tasks, and managing student behavior.*

R1.2 Content: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Candidate data analysis related to content knowledge and skills in Physics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI. We have the scores of one candidate on the CUPASL due to a COVID-19 restricting clinical placement and the scores of a single candidate on the TIAI. Only one candidate completed student teaching. The other graduated with a B.S. in Physics. Physics candidate performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication (5.0), 16. Modeling (5.0), 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions(5.0)* indicates that the candidate knew central concepts and possessed the pedagogical skills to teach them. TIAI items also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. The candidate scored at meets or exceeds standard in every assessment category for TIAI items 9, 10, 14, and 17 further showing candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in (#14) *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking, (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).*

R1.3 Instructional Practice: The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Candidate data analysis related to instructional practice in Physics Education focuses primarily on the EDCI 401 CUPASL, and EDCI 402 TIAI. Candidate performance varies in instructional unit planning. The fall 20 candidate had strong scores (**3.0**) in terms of *1. Alignment to state content standards, activities and materials supporting instructions, and 3. Use of a variety of instructional strategies.* The candidate scored a **2.0** meets standard on *5. Accommodates individual student needs*. The candidate prior to fall 20 scored **3.0** on 5.0 scale on *2. Activities and materials and 3. Use of a variety of Instructional strategies*. The candidate scored **1.0** Needs Improvement on *1 Goals aligned to Content Standards and 5. Accommodates Individual Student needs*. In terms of *assessment*, both candidates scored at Meets Standard level in terms of *alignment and use of multiple modes of assessment*. The candidate prior to fall 20 scored at Meets Standard level *on Technical Soundness*, while the fall 20 candidate score **1.0** Needs Improvement. Only the candidate prior to fall 20 completed items 9-14 as the clinical experience portion of the assessment was not completed in fall 20 due to COVID-19 limiting access to schools. The candidate averaged a **3.3** on *Analysis of Student Learning items*. The candidate's highest performance was on item *#11 evidence of impact on student learning* (**5.0**). The candidate score **3.0** Meets Standard on all other items. The candidate also scored **5.0** on *Academic Feedback*. The Spring 21 completer was highly rated across all TIAI categories dealing with *instructional practice*. The candidate scored **3.0** Exceeds standard on *each instructional practice* assessment item showing that the candidate has the ability to *plan, assess, incorporate technology, utilize a variety of teaching strategies, adjust instruction, and create a culturally inclusive learning environment.*

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency was assessed utilizing the TIAI. The candidate scored **3.0** Exceeds standard on both *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. In addition, the program has added the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* item 9. *Modeling digital citizenship and ethical responsibility* will be implemented in the fall 2022. No data to report in this submission for physics candidates on the Mid-Level dispositions and RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson as no physics candidates were enrolled in the courses during the reported assessment cycle. Only one physics candidate completed *Professional Disposition* over the last three cycles (Spring 21-Spring 22). This candidate exceeded expectations in every dispositional category further supporting the professionalism and ethics of our candidates. Candidate mean scores on #1 *protecting confidential information, #2 demonstrating maturity and sound judgement, #3 following university and school policies,* , #4 *exemplifies honesty and integrity,* #5 *accepting constructive criticism*, #6 *the teacher candidate provides fair and equitable opportunities*, and #7 *maintaining professional relationship with students.* The candidate also exceeded standards on TIAI items 19 uses family and community resources in instruction and 25. Collaborates with professional colleagues.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

R1.1 The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Special education candidate assessment data show that our candidates are steadily meeting performance expectations in competencies related to the *Learning and Learning* as they matriculate through the program. SPED candidates perform at or above "meets standard" (2.0 mean score) on multiple assessments with components evaluating knowledge and skills associated with *learner development, learning differences, and creating safe and supportive learning environments* (with the exception of the 1st pilot semester of the *SPED newly piloted RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson Assessment)*. Assessment scores in all four areas of the SPED 311 Contextual Factors assessment related to the *Learner and Learning* had mean scores (N=1) at or above the 2.0 "meets standard" criteria ranging from **2.0** on item 1.1 *The teacher candidate (TC) discusses the following information about the community and school: Geographic location; Community/school population; Socio-economic status; and Type of school (locale, grade levels, and other pertinent characteristics)* to **3.0** on the remaining assessed items (1.2-1.4) dealing with *classroom factors, student characteristics, and modifications*. Item #16 on the *TIAI* assessment also

supports candidates' ability to meet expectations in *learner development* in terms of *accommodating differences in developmental and individual needs of learners*. Candidates performed at or above "meets standard" each of the last 5 data cycles with means ranging from **2.0** to **3.0**.

In terms of *learning differences,* special education candidates **averaged a 2.0** on item #1.1 on the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* where candidates discuss *community and school information related to geographic location, community/school population, socio-economic status, and other pertinent characteristics*. On the TIAI item #2, *examining the candidates' ability to accommodate developmental and individual needs* candidate averages exceeded "meets standard" each of the last 5 data cycles with scores ranging from **2.0** to **3.0**. Candidate mean scores were also consistently high on *TIAI item #11*, *communicates positive expectations for learning for all students* with several means at or above **2.5**.

In terms of *creating safe and supportive learning environments*, our candidates have consistently performed at a high level across multiple assessments. On item #1.2 of the *SPED 311 Early Field Experience Contextual Factors Assessment* focusing on the *description of classroom factors including physical features, technology, etc* candidates averaged a **3.0 mean score** during the spring 2022 semester. Neither of our two candidates performed as we expected on the newly piloted *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson*. Our candidates scored a 0 and 1 on item #1 which focused on *start of lesson behaviors when preparing to teach incorporating technology*. We believe this to be an anomaly and will continue to observe performance on this assessment. The *EDCI 401 Clinical Unit Plan and Assessment of Student Learning (EDCI 401 CUPASL)* item #4 *addressing time management* further supports candidate ability to create *safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidate performance has been inconsistent on assessment item with scores ranging from **0.5** in fall 21 to **3.0** spring 22 and **5.0** (on 5 point scale) in spring 20. Candidates been highly rated by supervising teachers on items 19 and 20 dealing with *managing student behavior* receiving **3.0** exceeds standard on all evaluations. Items 12, 13, 20, 21, and 22 on the *TIAI* further support that one of our strengths is preparing candidates that can *create safe and supportive learning environments*. Candidates consistently perform above meets standard in *conveying enthusiasm and providing opportunities for meaningful interactions that enhance learning* with all mean scores ranging from **2.0** to **3.0** across semesters. Items 20-22 (*20. candidate adjusts classroom environments, 21. attends to and delegates routine tasks, and 22. uses multiple strategies to foster appropriate behavior*) further support our candidates' ability to *effectively manage classrooms*. Most mean scores are at **2.5** or above.

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.

Special education candidates excel in Content Knowledge consistently exceeding the 2.0 "meets standard" criteria across multiple assessments addressing *knowledge of central concepts in content area* and *ability to apply content knowledge in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences.* The lone exception is when one candidate scored **1.0** Needs Improvement on item #8 on the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson* during the summer 22 semester, which addresses *candidates' ability to communicate information while teaching and incorporating technology*. The candidate completing this assessment during the spring 22 semester received a **3.0** rating. Candidate performance on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* instructional content items 15-17 (*15. Communication, 16. Modeling, 17. Pacing, Routines, & Transitions*) indicates that candidates know central concepts

and possess the pedagogical skills to teach them as all candidates were rated at **3.0** exceeds expectations. TIAI item #14, *candidate demonstrates content knowledge and how to teach content*, also supports candidate knowledge of central concepts and pedagogical knowledge. Student teacher scores exceeded a **mean of 2.5** in four of the last five data cycles. All means exceeded 2.0. TIAI items 9, 10, and 17 further show candidates' ability to apply knowledge and skills in *developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences* by examining *candidate ability to engage all students in critical thinking (#17), provide explicit written and oral directions (#10),* and *utilize standard communication in instruction (#9).* All mean scores met or exceeded **2.0** on each of these TIAI components.

R1.3 Instructional Practice The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students.

Special education candidate performance related to *assessment* is not as consistent as we would like for it to be over time and from one assessment to another; however, it does appear that by the time that they complete student teaching that they perform at or above 2.0 meets standard in Instructional Practice. In categories related to assessment, a close examination of data trends shows that candidates are largely able to develop *valid, technically sound assessments* and *utilize multiple types/modes of assessments* in their teaching. Candidates largely performed at the **2.0** level on these items with the exception of the fall 21 cohort where both candidates needed improvement. Our data is limited to 2 semesters with a total of 3 candidates on items 9-14 due to COVID-19 limiting clinical experiences. The areas where candidates have been most inconsistent are associated with the 9 *analysis of student learning, 13 insights on effective student learning, and 14 modifications* where the fall 21 candidate scored 1.0 and the means for the other two candidates were 3.5 on a 5.0 scale in 2018-2019. We recognize that this is an area where instruction and/or experiences have not been as consistent as we would like due to faculty turnover (retirement of ETEC 367 Assessment, Measurement, and Evaluation instructor) and changing in instructional modalities (online vs. face to face in ETEC 367 and work with data sets rather than actual students in EDCI 401) due to Covid-19. While we have not hired a full-time faculty member to teach ETEC 367, the EPP has secured an adjunct with an extensive background in assessment data analysis and intervention. The adjunct and program faculty collaborated to redesign the course for fall 22 to provide more hands-on opportunities to work with data analysis and remediation. We anticipate that this will strengthen candidate skills heading into EDCI 401 where they will be able to delve deeper into data analysis and remediation. The *TIAI Domain II: Assessment* scores further support candidate ability to assess. Assessment mean scores show that candidate performance has consistently exceeded **2.0** and at or approaching **3.0** several semesters

Planning for instruction and *utilizing a variety of instructional strategies* are strengths of our program. Candidate performance on planning on the *EDCI 401 CUPASL* and *TIAI*. Candidates mean CUPASL mean scores have been at **2.0** or above three of the last four semesters showing that candidates have the ability to *effectively construct objectives and develop and sequence appropriate instructional activities*. Candidate performance is even higher on TIAI 18 *adjusts instruction*, 19 *uses community and family resources, and 23 The teacher candidate creates a culturally inclusive environment that promotes fairness, safety, respect, and support for all students* where candidate performance approaches 3.0 across semesters.

Technology Proficiency

Technology proficiency is key in special education; however, we have had few means of formally assessing candidate competency as a part of the assessment and quality assurance system until recently when we piloted the *RE 310 Technology Mini-Lesson*. Prior to fall 21 versions of this assignment were assigned in classes like EDCI 401, but data wasn't collected and analyzed on candidate performance. We have traditionally formally assessed technology proficiency through *TIAI* items 6 *candidate's plans include technology that will engage students in analysis, creativity, and deeper learning experiences* and item 15 *teacher candidate uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies, including technology, to impact student learning and development*. Candidates have consistently been rated highly on both items, especially the last four semesters where most candidate mean scores exceed **2.5**. Spring 22 and summer 22 pilot data on the *RE 310 Technology Mini Lesson were inconsistent*. We only had two candidates. The Spring 22 candidate performed well on **3.0** *facilitate & inspire learning and creativity, 5 design and develop digital age learning experiences, 7 model digital age work, and 8 communicating information*. The candidates performance was at **1.0** on *2 alignment and 4 instructional strategies*. The summer 22 candidate scored at 1.0 on all items except for 2 alignment of instructional activities and 5 *design and develop digital age learning experiences*. We will continue to watch trends on this assessment.

R1.4 Professional Responsibility The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families.

Professional responsibility is assessed at multiple levels through the *TIAI, Mid-Level Dispositions*, and P*rofessional Dispositions*. Candidate *Mid-Level* and *Professional Dispositional* mean scores are strong indicating that candidates exhibit professional responsibility at multiple levels of matriculation. Candidate mean scores for both cohorts on the *EDCI 401 Mid-Level Dispositions* indicate that candidates exceed the "meets standard" level in every dispositional category with one exception. One Spring 22 candidate was rated **1.0** on *regular and timely attendance* and **0.0** on *regular and timely submission of assignments*. This indicates that our candidates *exhibit confidence and poise in professional settings*, and *exhibit a professional appearance*. Candidate scores related to ethics were also high ranging from 2.0 to 3.0 a low on item #7 *exhibits concerns for issues of equity* and #8 *exhibits honesty and integrity*. Furthermore, candidates have shown that they take responsibility for student learning and collaborate with others. Candidatescores on item #9 *reflexive practice,* #10 *communicates with stakeholders*, #13 *accepts constructive criticism*, and #14 *collaborates with professional colleagues to meet students' need* show that our candidates meet or exceed expectations in these categories. Candidate *Professional Disposition* scores over three cycles further support the professionalism and ethics of our candidates with candidate mean scores exceeding 2.0 for all assessed categories each of the last 3 semesters.