

NCE Program Assessment Report Template (2011-2012)

Program: **Elementary Education Master of Arts in Teaching**

Assessment Report Writer :**Ayn Keneman**

Section I: Program Overview

This section provides an overview into your programs' candidates and completers. The data needed to complete this chart will be provided to your program's identified contact person from the Office of Institutional Research by June 15, 2012.

2011-2012 (September 1, 2011 – December 31, 2012) Number of Students:

	Undergraduate	Graduate
Number of Students Admitted to the Program		34
Number of Students Enrolled in the Program		27

If deemed helpful, a brief overview of the program can be provided to assist reviewers in understanding the framework, philosophy and key elements of the program.

Section II: Relationship of Assessments to Program Outcomes and Standards

Please complete the following two charts below. In the first chart, show the alignment of the program's assessments to the NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes. In the second chart, show the alignment of the program's assessments to the program outcomes and other professional standards.

In addition, a narrative description of the alignment in these charts to supply further description can be provided.

Alignment of Program Assessments to NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes

NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes	Program Assessments
NCE Candidates:	
Envision, articulate and model democratic and progressive education	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teacher Sample
Design powerful learning environments that integrate appropriate technologies	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators
Design powerful learning environments that utilize multiple meaningful assessments	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators MAT Lesson Plan and Analysis
Design powerful learning environments that enable self-directed learning	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teacher and Instructor

Work collaboratively in diverse communities and with diverse learners to achieve learning goals	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teacher Work Sample
Advocate for democratic values, equity, access and resources to assure educational success for all	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and Students
Cultivate curiosity and excitement for learning in themselves and others	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and Instruction/Teaching and Curriculum
Respect and learn from other peoples, cultures, and points of view	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators
Demonstrate a caring attitude in recognizing the needs of others and acting to promote their growth	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and Instruction
Act with confidence and self-knowledge to assume professional leadership roles and responsibilities	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and the Profession
Use information from self and others to continuously improve	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and the Profession

Alignment of Program Assessments to Professional Standards and Program Outcomes (see attached chart)

Program Outcomes	Professional Standards ACEI Association for Childhood Education International	Program Assessments
Are knowledgeable about a variety of philosophical, theoretical, historical, and practical approaches to teaching	3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction —Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators
Draw on knowledge bases which underlie the program to make informed decisions that support the intellectual, social, and personal development of their students.	1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation --Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and Students Teacher Work Sample
Adapt to diverse educational contexts while maintaining professional integrity.	3.4 Active engagement in learning —Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and the Environment Teacher Work Sample
Make linkage between theory, research, and practice, the university and the school classroom	3.3 Development of critical thinking and problem solving —Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students' development of critical thinking and problem solving	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teacher Work Sample
Are knowledgeable, critical consumers of research; understand implications from	3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction —Candidates plan and implement instruction based on	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators

research for their own classroom practices.	knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	
Work collaboratively with other professionals in the school, with parents, with children, and with the community.	5.2 Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies —Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators Teaching and the Profession
Model and demonstrate a commitment to the importance of life-long learning.	5.1 Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation —Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and the Profession
Acknowledge, respect, and critically support multiple perspectives within the educational and social contexts.	3.4 Active engagement in learning —Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators
Meet the challenges of students with diverse learning abilities.	3.2 Adaptation to diverse students —Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and Students Teacher Work Sample
Internalize and demonstrate a beginning repertoire of practices characteristic of effective, novice teachers.	3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction —Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators
Create a learning environment which allows experiential, integrated, and investigative learning developed around accepted curriculum standards.	3.4 Active engagement in learning —Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and the Environment Teacher Work Sample
Implement on-going assessments of curriculum and instructional practices.	4.0 Assessment for instruction —Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and Instruction MAT Lesson Plan and Analysis

	instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student	Teacher Work Sample
Base planning and organization of classroom experiences upon process as well as outcome assessments	3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction —Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and Instruction Teacher Work Sample MAT Lesson Plan and Analysis
Create student assessments which include teacher evaluation, peer evaluation, and self-evaluation.	4.0 Assessment for instruction — Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and Instruction Teacher Work Sample MAT Lesson Plan and Analysis
Create teacher assessments which include student evaluation, peer evaluation, and self evaluation	4.0 Assessment for instruction — Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student	ELE 597 Competency Appraisal Indicators- Teaching and Instruction MAT Lesson Plan and Analysis Teacher Work Sample

The Elementary and Middle Level Teacher Education (EMLTE) department advocates for all learners in K- 8 schools. As a result, the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program in Elementary Education prepares teacher candidates to meet the diverse needs of K-8 students in today's classrooms in order to positively impact learning outcomes. The work of the EMLTE department supports the larger mission of the National College of Education (NCE) in preparing teachers to make a difference, classroom by classroom, through bringing effective teaching and enhanced learning opportunities to everyone's children. Championing social justice issues and closing achievement gaps occur when teachers are well prepared to implement teaching practices that honor and support the students sitting in all classrooms. The NCE Conceptual Framework sets forth a set of outcomes embraced by the MAT program's curriculum. These outcomes follow:

NCE Conceptual Framework Outcomes - 2007

NCE Faculty and candidates use scholarly habits of mind and methods of inquiry in order to affect P-12 student learning by:

- Envisioning, articulating, and modeling democratic and progressive education.
- Designing powerful learning environments that:
 - integrate appropriate technologies.
 - utilize multiple meaningful assessments.
 - enable self-directed learning.
- Working collaboratively in diverse communities and with diverse learners to achieve learning goals.

- Advocating for democratic values, equity, access and resources to assure educational success for all.

NCE Faculty and candidates continuously demonstrate a high standard of professional ethics by:

- Cultivating curiosity and excitement for learning in themselves and others.
- Respecting and learning from other peoples, cultures, and points of view.
- Demonstrating a caring attitude in recognizing the needs of others and acting to promote their growth.
- Acting with confidence and self-knowledge to assume professional leadership roles and responsibilities.
- Using information from self and others to continuously improve.

NCE Outcomes Faculty & students use scholarly habits of mind and methods of inquiry to:	NCE Dispositions Faculty & students demonstrate a high standard of professional ethics by:	NCATE Standards	ISBE IL - Professional Teaching Standards	ACEI Association for Childhood Education International	ITS Illinois Tech Standards
1. envision, articulate, model democratic & progressive education	1. cultivating curiosity & excitement for learning	(CK) Content knowledge (CK)	1. Content Knowledge	1. Development, Learning, Motivation	1. Basic Computer Operations and Standards
2. design powerful learning environments	2. respecting & learning from other peoples, cultures, & points of view	(KSD) Pedagogical or professional knowledge, skills or dispositions (KSD)	2. Human Development Learning Environment	2. Curriculum	2. Personal and Professional Use
2.a. that integrate appropriate technologies	3. demonstrating a caring attitude in recognizing the needs of others & acting to promote their growth	(SL) Effects on student learning (SL)	3. Diversity 4. Planning for Instruction	3. Instruction	3. Application for Instruction
2.b. that utilize	4. acting with		6. Instructional	4, Assessment	4. Social, Ethical and

multiple meaningful assessments	confidence & self-knowledge to assume professional leadership		Delivery		Human Issues
2.c. that enable self-directed learning	5. use information from self & others to continuously improve		7. Communication 8. Assessment	5. Professionalism	5. Productivity Tools

In our electronic portfolio and competency appraisals we ask teacher candidates to respond to their understanding of and identification with the (NCE) National College of Education program and conceptual framework and professional outcomes Our program outcomes are aligned with the (ISBE) Illinois State Board of Education Professional Teaching Standards, (ACEI) Association for Childhood Education International Standards and (ITS) Illinois Technology Standards.

Teacher candidates show evidence of their understandings of these standards by including common program assignments and assessments that were designed to connect to these standards in their electronic portfolio. Our practicum course (ELE 587) and student teaching (ELE 597) have a field component as part of the curriculum requirement, and the Competency Appraisals are further aligned with these program outcomes and standards.

These competency appraisals indicate that teacher candidates are meeting the standards. The competency appraisals are completed by university supervisors, mentor teachers and teacher candidates (residents) twice during the program. The use of these on-going assessments is designed to assess our teacher candidates in the following areas: Teaching and Students, Teaching and Instruction, Teaching and the Environment, Teaching and Curriculum and Teaching and the Profession. These are the same categories in our electronic portfolio. See the list below for a comprehensive display of how each of these five areas addresses the key program standards.

The Knowledge and Performance Standards on Which the Competency Appraisal Indicators are based

- (B) ISBE CAST – Illinois State Board of Education Content Area Standard for All Teachers
- (D) INTASC – Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standard
- (E) ACEI – Association for Childhood Education International Standard

1. Teaching and Students

Candidates provide opportunities that support all students’ intellectual, social, and personal development (D – #2, E – #1) and address the diversity of students and their learning needs (B Technology – #4, D – #3, E - #3.2).

2. Teaching and the Environment

Candidates demonstrate an awareness of and the ability to maintain a classroom environment conducive to learning (D – #5, E – #3.4).

3. Teaching and Instruction

Candidates possess the skills of planning and teaching lessons appropriate for the students, subject, and curriculum (B Technology – #3, 5, 6, 7 & 8, D – #4 & 7, D – #3.1 & 3.3). Candidates utilize effective modes of communication (verbal, nonverbal, written, and/or technology) (A – #13, B Technology – #6, D – #6, E – #3.5). Interns demonstrate the ability to incorporate assessment in their teaching (B – Technology #5 & 8, D – #8, E – #4).

4. Teaching and Curriculum

Candidates understand and demonstrate the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of content and create meaningful integrated learning experiences that develop all students' competence in subject matter and skills for various developmental levels (B Technology – #1, D – #1, E – #2.8).

5. Teaching and the Profession

Candidates collaborate with school colleagues (including support services personnel), parents/families and community agencies to support students and their learning (D – #10, E – #5.3 & 5.4). Candidates are reflective/analytic practitioners in ways that support their own professional development (B Technology – #2, D – #9, E – #5.1 & 5.2).

Please refer to the chart below that clearly shows our benchmarks and assessment that provide evidence of meeting program standards.

Knowledge Type	Transition Point 1 Admission	Transition Point 2 Practicum I ELE 500	Transition Point 3 Practicum II ELE510	Transition Point 4 Student Teaching ELE 590
Content	Basic Skills Test Content Test 110	Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis	Lesson Planning, Teaching & Analysis Competency Appraisal	Lesson Planning, Teaching, & Analysis Teacher Work Sample Video Sample and Analysis Competency Appraisal
Pedagogical Content		Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis Competency Appraisal	Content Test Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis Competency Appraisal	Lesson Planning, Teaching & Analysis Teacher Work Sample Video Sample and Analysis Competency

				Appraisal
Professional and Pedagogical		Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis Competency Appraisal	Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis Competency Appraisal	APT Test Lesson Planning, Teaching and Analysis-Teacher Work Sample Video Sample and Analysis Competency Appraisal

Aspect of Standard	Transition Point 1 ELE 500	Transition Point 2 ELE590
Student Learning	Lesson Planning, Competency Appraisal	Lesson Planning, Competency Appraisal
Dispositions	Competency Appraisal Remediation Plan	(6) Competency Appraisal (7) Remediation Plan
Technology	Competency Appraisal Technology Use in Portfolio	(6) Competency Appraisal (8) Technology Use in Portfolio

Section III: Key Program Assessments

Using the chart below, indicate the name, type, and administration point for each of the assessments that the program uses to assess candidate learning and evaluate program effectiveness. Refer to the specific requirements of the program’s SPA (if any) to ensure that the program is meeting these standards. **For non-SPA programs**, only one content knowledge assessment domain is necessary.

Assessment Domain	Type or Form of Assessment (Note if assessments are different for Undergraduate, Graduate, Alternative Programs or Online)	When the Assessment Is Administered
Assessment of Content Knowledge I (i.e., Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment) *Note: Non-SPA programs do not have state content tests)	Illinois State Licensure Test Basic Skills Test 96 Elementary Grades Content Test 110 Assessment of Professional Teaching 102	Prior to Admission Prior to Student Teaching ELE 597 Prior to certification

Assessment of Content Knowledge II	Competency Appraisal- Teaching and the Curriculum	Completion of Final Term ELE 597 Student Teaching
Assessment of Professional Knowledge (Pedagogical content knowledge)	Project/Lesson Plan-Analysis	Midpoint Practicum II-ELE 587
Assessment of Field Experiences	Competency Appraisal	Completion of Final Term ELE 597 Student Teaching
Assessment of Candidate Impact on Student Learning	Project/Teacher Work Sample	Midpoint and Completion of Final Term: ELE 587 Practicum II and ELE 597 Student Teaching
Assessment of Candidate Dispositions	Checklist Competency Appraisal	Completion of ELE 587 and ELE 597 Completion of Final Term-ELE 597 Student Teaching
Assessment of Candidate Diversity Proficiencies	Competency Appraisal	Completion of Final Term- ELE 597 Student Teaching
Assessment of Candidate Technology Proficiencies	Competency Appraisal	Completion of Final Term-ELE 597 Student Teaching

Section IV: Assessment Tools and Data Analysis

In this section, to provide a complete picture of each assessment and its findings, include information for the components listed below for **each** individual assessment. Note: If the program does not use an assessment for any of the required assessment domains in Section III (Content Knowledge, Professional/Pedagogical Knowledge, Field Experience, Impact on Student Learning, Dispositions, Diversity and Technology), in section V below you will be asked to provide a description of how the program is working toward developing an assessment for that category or a rationalization for why it is not applicable to the program.

Required components to include for each assessment tool:

Program Assessments

1. A narrative description of the assessment including:
 - why it was developed and what it assesses,
 - how and when it is implemented (i.e. where is it administered in the program, the course in which it is a part of, etc.)
 - how and when it is evaluated, and
 - who evaluates the assessment.
2. A blank sample of the assessment.
3. A blank sample of the scoring guide/rubric that is used to assess the tool.

Assessment Data

1. Annual data collected from the tool.
2. A narrative interpretation of what the data means to your program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

1. Describe the steps that program faculty have taken to use information from the key assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and of the program. Provide information for **each** tool related to the domains from section III: (1) content knowledge, (2) professional/pedagogical knowledge, (3) field experiences, (4) candidate impact on student learning, (5) candidate dispositions, (6) candidate diversity proficiencies, and (7) candidate technology proficiencies. If the program does not have an assessment in place for any of the required domains, please provide a rationalization for why the component is not applicable to the program or how the program is working toward developing an assessment for that category.
2. Reflect on the previous year's assessment and recommendations from the NCE Assessment Council review (2010-2011). How did/can the program use the feedback? Were changes to the program's assessments/assessment system implemented? What progress has been made? Feedback from the NCE Assessment Council for your program can be located on the I drive. Follow this pathway: *Councils and Committees* folder, *Assessment Council* folder, *2011-2012* folder, *Program Assessment Reports 2010-11* folder, *2010-11 Assmt. Report Reviews* folder.
3. Describe how the assessment data inform the program of candidate achievement related to the NCE Conceptual Framework/Outcomes.
4. Based on the program's 2011-12 candidate and program data, describe recommendations or changes the program could/will make related to the program's assessment system and curriculum.

Assessment of Content Knowledge I

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Basic Skills Test 96, Elementary/Middle Grades Content Test 110,

How and Why it was Developed:

This state licensure test is used to assess teacher candidates' knowledge of content in elementary education. The test is administered several times a year and teacher candidates can take the test up to five times to pass.

The Elementary Middle Grades Content Test #110 is based on current and relevant expectations for elementary teacher candidates as defined by the Illinois Content Area Standards for Educators. This test covers content in five subareas: Language Arts and Literacy, Mathematics, Science, Social Science, and the Arts, Health and Physical Education. The test objectives are broad, conceptual, meaningful statements, written in language that reflects the skills, knowledge, and understanding that an entry-level teacher needs to teach effectively in an elementary classroom. The test has established reliability and validity.

Basic Skills Test 96:

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
The State of Illinois requires a passing score on the Basic Skills Test #96 for admission to teacher certification programs.	Must have a passing score before beginning a teacher certification program	ISBE

Content Test 110:

AUSL Teacher Candidates must take and pass the Elementary Middle Grades Content Test #110 before beginning their NLU coursework.	<p>The content area test consists of 125 multiple-choice questions. Scores are represented on a scale of 100-300. A total test scaled score of 240 or above is required to pass the test. Each multiple-choice question counts the same toward the total score. Please refer to the scoring guide for more detailed information.</p> <p>Resident teacher candidates are required to pass the Elementary Middle Grades Content Test #110 prior to admission to the program.</p>	ISBE
--	--	------

2. *A blank sample of the assessment.* NA

3. *The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:* See Appendix #2 for scoring guide

4. *Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.*

Historically, Master of Arts in Teaching completers have had consistently high passing scores on the Elementary Middle Grades Content Test #110. Data for resident teacher candidates is displayed in the following two displays. The first table details the pass rate for all ELE/AUSL/MAT candidates from the year 2010-2011 as raw scores. The second display gives us a clear picture of the strengths of our resident teacher candidates' content knowledge and the areas for further investigation and program enhancement. Additionally, we have attached the Elementary Middle Grades Content Test Score Explanation Guide provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

As shown, the overall number of ELE/AUSL/MAT program completers who are successful has surpassed the state pass rate of 80% with our own ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates displaying a pass rate of 95% in 2010-2011.

year	total	Total passed	Total failed	% passed	% failed
11-12	30	29	1	95	5

year		Total Test	Sub #1	Sub #2	Sub #3	Sub #4	Sub #5
11-12	Mean	277	273	291	257	273	291

Key

Subtest 1: Language Arts and Literacy

Subtest 2: Mathematics

Subtest 3: Science

Subtest 4: Social Science

Subtest 5: Arts, Health and Physical Education

ELE/AUSL/MAT resident completers’ scores on the Elementary Middle Grades Content Test # 110 document that ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates have sufficient knowledge, as defined by the test, to be considered highly qualified to teach elementary students in the State of Illinois. Furthermore, the data suggests that ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates possess the required content knowledge to meet the standards established by the State of Illinois Board of Education for certification as elementary educators. In addition, the results support that resident teacher candidates meet the following ACEI standards: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7. We continue to work with our ELE/AUSL/MAT partners in the recruiting process for residents. From this data, it appears that stronger candidates were recruited for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Name of Assessment: Assessment of Professional Teaching 102 (APT102)

How and Why it was Developed: The ELE/MAT/AUSL resident teacher candidates who seek Type 03 elementary education certification must pass the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT K-9) Test #10 prior to state certification. This state certification test is used to assess teacher candidates’ pedagogical and professional knowledge, skills and dispositions as specified by ISBE and aligned with ACEI standards

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment.
This test is administered several	Each APT test consists of 120 multiple-choice questions and two constructed-response	ISBE

<p>times throughout the year and resident teacher candidates can take the test up to five times to pass. Resident teacher candidates are required to pass the APT test prior to becoming certified in the State of Illinois.</p>	<p>assignments. Constructed-response assignments are scored on a four-point scale. Within the range of scores (i.e., from 1-4), a response that receives a score point of 1 is an undeveloped response, while a score point of 4 is assigned to a response that is very well developed. Each category of the four-point scale reflects a range of ability across that score point. Each response is graded by two readers and the sum of the two readers' scores will be the examinee's total score for each constructed-response assignment. The test has established reliability and validity. Scores for the APT tests are reported on a scale of 100-300. A total test scaled score of 240 or above is required to pass these tests. The multiple-choice section represents 80% of the total test and the constructed-response assignments combined represent 20% of the total score.</p>	
--	---	--

2. A blank sample of the assessment. N/A

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool: See Appendix #3 for scoring guide

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

Historically, Master of Arts in teaching completers has had consistently high passing scores on the Assessment of Professional Teaching #102. Data for MAT teacher candidates is displayed in the following two displays. The first table details the pass rate for all ELE/AUSL/MAT candidates from the year 2011-2012 as raw scores. The second display gives us a clear picture of the strengths of our teacher candidates' knowledge in the areas of: Foundations, Characteristics and Assessment, Planning and Delivering Instruction, Managing the Learning Environment, Collaboration, Communication and Professionalism, Language Arts, Educational Technology and Constructed Response. The second display also shows the areas for further investigation and program enhancement. Additionally, we have attached the Assessment of Professional Teaching Test Guide provided by the Illinois State Board of Education.

APT Test Overview

Year	Total	Total passed	Total failed	% passed	% failed
11-12	32	32	0	100%	0%

APT Test Mean Scores N=32

Year		Total Test	Sub #1	Sub #2	Sub #3	Sub #4	Sub #5	Sub #6	Sub #7
11-12	Mean	281	282	290	279	278	276	278	283

Key:

Sub Test 1- Foundations, Characteristics and Assessment

Sub Test 2- Planning and Delivering Instruction

Sub Test 3- Managing the Learning Environment

Sub Test 4- Collaboration, Communication and Professionalism

Sub Test 5- Language Arts

Sub Test 6- Educational Technology

Sub Test 7- Constructed Response

The APT K-9 #102 data from 2011-2012 are reported in the following displays. The results show that 100 % of our teacher candidates passed the APT in 2011-2012. This is a consistent rate of passage with the last previous two years of data and 2009-2010-96% and 2010-2011-96% respectively. These scores well exceed the state pass rate of 80%.

In analyzing the APT data from the three years posted, it is apparent that the three strongest areas for the MAT candidates were: Planning and Delivering Instruction, Collaboration, Communication and Professionalism and Educational Technology. While still displaying strong scores, the areas of Foundations, Characteristics and Assessment, Language Arts and Constructed Response were lower in comparison. It is impressive to note the continued gain in the area of Educational Technology. We have continued to add technology based assignments to our teacher preparation curriculum.

1. ASSESSMENT OF CONTENT KNOWLEDGE II

Assessment of Content Knowledge II

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment

Student Teaching Competency Appraisal - Teaching and the Curriculum Section

How and why it was developed:

The competency appraisal for this data set is from ELE 597 Resident Student Teaching final evaluation. The competency appraisal is divided into four sections: Planning and Preparation, The Classroom Environment, Curriculum and Instruction and Professional Responsibilities. The data set for this assessment comes from the **Curriculum and Instruction** section of the appraisal. The content knowledge indicators found on the appraisal are aligned to the following 2007 ACEI standards: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7.

Content knowledge directly impacts resident teacher candidates’ ability to plan and organize for instruction. The competency appraisal measures the resident teacher candidates’ use of content knowledge to both plan and implement lessons in K-8 classrooms.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
The ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates use a competency appraisal at two benchmark points in ELE 597 Resident Student Teaching, mid-term and final.	Resident teacher candidates are observed four times during their student teaching experience and their weekly lessons are evaluated by mentor teachers and university supervisors. This process allows the opportunity for the university supervisors, mentor teachers and resident to determine the extent to which the resident teacher candidates are meeting this requirement.	University supervisors, mentors, and residents

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

See Appendix #4

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:

Contained in sample Competency Appraisal in Appendix #4

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

ACEI Standard	Competency Appraisal Indicator	Mean Score (out of possible 4 points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards
3.3	The candidate uses teaching techniques that demonstrate higher-level thinking (i.e., analysis, synthesis, evaluation) about real-world situations within and across	3.70	98%	1%	1%

	content areas.				
2.1	3.d- Reading and Language Arts concepts	3.42	92%	8%	0%
2.3	The candidate makes proficient use of science content (physical, life, and earth) and scientific concepts, thinking and reasoning when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.62	82%	18%	0%
2.2	The candidate makes proficient use of mathematical concepts, processes and reasoning to foster student understanding when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.13	82%	18%	0%
2.4	The candidate makes proficient use of social science content, concepts, and the interrelationships of the disciplines when planning and teaching curriculum	3.13	82%	18%	0%
2.6/2.7	The candidate makes proficient use of physical development and health content when planning and teaching curriculum	2.9	81%	19%	0%
2.5	The candidate makes proficient use of fine arts content across academic disciplines when planning and teaching curriculum	2.9	81%	19%	0%
3.3	The candidate values multiple ways of knowing and conveys to students that knowledge is developed from the vantage point of the knower.	3.59	96%	2%	2%
3.4	The candidate shows enthusiasm for the curriculum being taught and helps students make curriculum connections to everyday life.	3.86	98%	1%	1%

The spring 2011 data demonstrate that the ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates meet the 2007 ACEI standards. Residents have achieved above the 80% level in all content areas related to all content area standards for: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7. As an ELE/AUSL/MAT program we are looking at new ways to help our resident teacher candidates grow as content area experts related to both the ACEI standards and elementary and middle grades curricula. Ongoing conversations in 2011 with our Academy of Urban School Leaders Advisory Board will help us better understand the changing nature of K-8 curriculum, the needs of the AUSL schools, and the requisite content knowledge teacher candidates must possess in order to be considered highly effective educators. Additional conversations with college and university faculty, outside the ELE/AUSL/MAT program, will help infuse additional ways of thinking about the needs of teacher preparation for high needs, turnaround schools and subsequently look at ways to further build the

content knowledge of resident teacher candidates learning to become agents of change for our nation’s urban schools.

Assessment of Professional Knowledge (Pedagogical content knowledge)

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Lesson Plan Assignment

How and why it was developed:

Our ELE/AUSL/MAT program added the lesson plan assignment as an assessment for the 2010-2011 academic year. Lesson planning is a major focus of the ELE MAT program and the department utilizes a standardized lesson plan template that can be adapted to individual content areas and a variety of lesson plan formats found in the school systems where teacher candidates fulfill hours for field experiences. In order to assure consistency across the program, all lesson plans must include the essential elements of planning found in the ELE MAT Lesson Plan: Connecting to Standards, Learning Outcomes, Assessments, Materials, References, Technology, Procedures and Differentiation.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
<p>The introduction of the ELE/AUSL/MAT program’s lesson plan format occurs early in the program (ELE 587) as an introduction to teaching and learning. Later in the more advanced ELE597 Student Teaching course, residents continue to learn about effective planning for instruction as a means to impact student learning.</p>	<p>A benchmark of readiness to transition from Practicum to Student Teaching is the ability to plan instruction that delivers appropriate content while both engaging students in critical thinking and motivating them to learn. In order to determine a readiness to move into the capstone Student Teaching experience, lesson plans are evaluated using lesson plan rubrics designed by the MAT faculty. The final assessment of candidates’ ability to plan and organize instruction before beginning the student teaching experience occurs during ELE 587 Resident Practicum course. A candidate’s ability to plan instruction is assessed using a three-point rubric ranging from Met (3) to Not Met (1).</p>	<p>Feedback is given on the lesson plan by the resident and university supervisor. The lesson plan is evaluated by the ELE587 Seminar Leader.</p>

2. *A blank sample of the assessment:* See Appendix #5

3. *The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:* See Appendix #5

4. *Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.*

Lesson Plan Assessment: Instructional Design
ELE597 winter 2012 (Sample Size=29 Students)

ACEI Standard	Lesson Plan Component	Mean Score (out of 3 possible points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards
3.1	Standards	2.91	94%	3%	3%
3.1	Learning Outcomes/Objectives	2.91	91%	9%	0%
4.0	Assessment	2.88	88%	12%	0%
N/A	Materials and References	2.88	91%	6%	3%
1.0	Opening	2.84	85%	15%	0%
3.3	Instruction -Critical Thinking	2.94	98%	2%	0%
3.4	Instruction -Active Engagement	2.94	98%	2%	0%
3.5	Instruction - Communication and Collaboration	2.82	94%	6%	0%
3.1	Closing	2.78	82%	15%	3%
3.2	Differentiation	2.75	82%	12%	6%

The data from the Winter 2011 ELE/AUSL/MAT Lesson Plan assessment show that our ELE/AUSL/MAT resident candidates overall have the ability to plan for instruction well. Findings show that candidates are strongest in the pedagogical areas related to identifying learning outcomes/objectives and planning procedures/instruction that encourage critical thinking and active engagement in the classroom. Areas in need of additional emphasis include: assessment, identifying standards, opening and closing the lesson, communication and collaboration and differentiation.

Furthermore, the winter 2011 application of the Lesson Plan assessment for our ELE597 candidates provides evidence that our candidates understand and apply content in the ACEI areas 2.1-2.4. In these four content areas related to reading, writing and oral language, science, mathematics and social studies our candidates are showing competency in developing lessons that display knowledge of the content field while choosing appropriate strategies to teach the elementary curriculum well to K-8 students.

Continued emphasis on lesson planning, content knowledge, and pedagogical applications for teaching and learning will be explored by faculty in order to help MAT candidates impact student learning outcomes in their field experiences and beyond.

Assessment of Field Experiences

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Student Teaching Competency Appraisal

How and why it was developed:

All resident teacher candidates complete a minimum ten-week student teaching experience. They are given opportunities during student teaching to integrate theory and practice in one elementary classroom setting with diverse learners. Resident teacher candidates are assessed on five aspects of their professional practice in their full-day student teaching experience using the competency appraisal. The five aspects are: Teaching and Students, Teaching and the Environment, Teaching and Instruction, Teaching and Curriculum and Teaching and the Profession. There are 42 indicators on the competency appraisal and each indicator is rated on a 4-point Likert scale (4-Excellent, 3-Good, 2-Fair, 1-Poor and 0-Unable to Assess).

Resident teacher candidates are observed by a university supervisor four times during their student teaching experience and all of their weekly lesson plans are monitored by university supervisors and their mentor teachers. This process allows the opportunity for the university supervisors, resident teacher candidates and the mentor teachers to determine the extent to which the resident teacher candidates are demonstrating the ability to plan and implement lessons in K-8 classrooms with success.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
A competency appraisal is used at the end of ELE587 Resident Practicum and ELE597 Resident Student Teaching. Mentors, residents, and university supervisors each complete the same version of the appraisals. In addition to the rating scale, there are comment sections on the competency appraisal for both the mid-term and final evaluations.	After the mid-term evaluation (End of ELE587) resident teacher candidates receive feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors in preparation for assuming a leading role in the classroom. The competency appraisal is then evaluated at the end of the field experiences: ELE597 Resident Student Teaching.	Mentor, Resident, University Supervisor, and NLU Faculty Instructor for ELE587/597

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

See Appendix #4

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:

Contained in sample Competency Appraisal in Appendix #4.

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

This data set is taken from our ELE597 Resident Student Teaching competency appraisal. Competency appraisal data from the university supervisor and mentor teacher ratings is analyzed

for the purposes of this fieldwork assessment. The data presented here comes from the spring 2011 application of the competency appraisal.

Note: Only the quantitative data are presented in this report due to limited space. The ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates had fairly high ratings across all four areas of the spring 2011 application of the competency appraisal by the raters (i.e., cooperating/mentor teachers, and university supervisors). Almost all scores for all individual items/indicators were above 85% level. Those areas between 80-84% will be reviewed by faculty in the coming year in order to determine new approaches to guiding resident competency and success.

Several interesting findings have emerged from the data. First, our ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates scored the highest in the area of Teaching and the Profession/Professional Responsibility. Our resident teacher candidates are clearly showing their commitment to the profession as lifelong learners with an emphasis on self-reflection, self-assessment and lifelong learning.

Second, it appears from the data that our resident teacher candidates are weaker in areas requiring the use of IEPs and making modifications for special needs students in their classrooms. Direct experiences applying IEPs will need to be added to the program’s curriculum for the coming year.

Third, resident teacher candidates did not do as well in the area of planning and teaching lessons in the content areas related to the fine arts (2.5) and health and physical education (2.6 and 2.7) as in the other content areas. This finding bears further investigation by faculty.

Overall, our resident teacher candidates performed well during resident student teaching (ELE 597) on all ACEI standards based on the competency appraisal data. The findings from the spring 2011 assessment will guide our actions in program improvements and changes. More details will be discussed in the section V of this report.

ELE 597

Competency Appraisal Indicator	Mean Score (out of possible 4 points)	Percentage Excellent	Percentage Good	Percentage Fair	Percentage Poor	Percentage Not Applicable
The candidate...						
1 A - The candidate demonstrates sensitivity to cultural and gender differences of learners.	3.95	97%	0%	3%	0%	0%
1 B - The resident models effective communication strategies in conveying ideas and information and in asking questions.	3.66	66%	34%	0%	0%	0%
1 C -The candidate makes proficient use of oral and written English in his or her	3.95	95%	5%	0%	0%	0%

teaching.						
1 D -The candidate adapts instruction to meet individual students' needs.	3.46	45%	53%	0%	0%	2%
1 E -The candidate understands how individual experiences, talents, knowledge, and prior learning influence student learning	3.82	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%
1 F -The candidate facilitates a learning community in which individual differences and cultural diversity are respected.	3.89	92%	5%	3%	0%	0%
1 G -The candidate believes that all children can learn at high levels and persists in helping all children achieve success.	3.84	87%	11%	2%	0%	0%
1 H -The candidate appreciates cultural and linguistic diversity and shows respect for students' varied talents, perspectives, and learning styles.	3.95	92%	5%	0%	0%	3%
1 I -The candidate is sensitive to community and cultural norms.	3.92	92%	3%	3%	0%	3%
2 A -The candidate organizes and manages time, materials, and physical space to provide active and equitable engagement of students in productive tasks.	3.66	68%	29%	3%	0%	0%
2 B -The candidate uses different motivational strategies that are likely to encourage development for each student.	3.53	51%	46%	0%	0%	3%
2 C -The candidate promotes a positive climate in the classroom and participates in maintaining such a climate in the school as a whole.	3.79	79%	21%	0%	0%	0%
2 D -The candidate creates a smoothly functioning learning community that supports purposeful learning activities.	3.58	66%	26%	8%	0%	0%
2 E -The candidate uses a range of strategies and can collaborate with specialists to promote positive relationships, cooperation, and conflict resolution in the classroom.	3.63	58%	34%	0%	0%	8%
2 F -The candidate values the role of students in promoting each other's learning and recognizes the importance of peer relationships in establishing a climate of learning.	3.72	68%	26%	0%	0%	6%
2 G -The candidate recognizes the value of intrinsic motivation to students' life-long growth and learning.	3.7	68%	29%	0%	0%	3%
3 A -The candidate plans and teaches lessons appropriate for the students, subject, curriculum and community.	3.86	86%	14%	0%	0%	0%
3 B -The candidate understands how individualized education programs [IEPs] impact instruction.	3.45	34%	42%	0%	0%	24%
3 C -The candidate applies understanding of the cognitive processes associated with	3.4	39%	61%	0%	0%	0%

various kinds of learning [e.g., critical and creating thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, memorization, and recall] and how these processes can be stimulated.						
3 D -The candidate knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide range of materials such as computers, audio-visual technologies, videotapes and disks, local experts, primary documents and artifacts, texts, reference books, literature, and other print resources.	3.49	47%	50%	0%	0%	3%
3 E -The candidate demonstrates flexibility in the teaching process as necessary for instruction to student responses, ideas, and needs.	3.79	82%	16%	2%	0%	0%
3 F -The candidate evaluates plans in relation to short- and long-term goals and systematically adjusts plans to meet student needs and enhance learning.	3.61	58%	37%	0%	0%	5%
3 G -The candidate uses a variety of assessments to evaluate progress and performance of students.	3.58	58%	42%	0%	0%	0%
3 H -The candidate uses assessment results to diagnose student learning, align and modify instruction, and design teaching strategies.	3.5	49%	49%	0%	0%	2%
3 I -The candidate collaborates with resource personnel on accommodating and assessing the needs of students with exceptionalities.	3.48	35%	38%	0%	0%	27%
3 J -The candidate uses a variety of formative and summative assessment to determine student understanding in each subject area.	3.61	61%	39%	0%	0%	0%
3 K -The candidate involves students in self-assessment, reflection, and goal setting.	3.4	32%	49%	0%	0%	19%
3 L -The candidate helps maintain useful and accurate records of student work and performance.	3.78	69%	19%	0%	0%	12%
3 M -The candidate values the development of students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performance capabilities.	3.68	70%	27%	3%	0%	0%
3 N -The candidate values flexibility and reciprocity in the teaching process as necessary for adapting instruction to student responses, ideas, and needs.	3.76	72%	22%	0%	0%	6%
3 O -The candidate believes that plans must always be open to adjustment and revision based on student needs and changing circumstances.	3.87	87%	13%	0%	0%	0%
3 P -The candidate values planning as a collegial activity.	3.84	84%	16%	0%	0%	0%

4 A -The candidate uses teaching techniques that demonstrate higher level thinking [i.e., analysis, synthesis, evaluation] about real-world situations and across content areas.	3.27	26%	71%	0%	0%	3%
4 B -The candidate makes proficient use of reading and language arts concepts [reading, writing, listening, and speaking] when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.84	82%	16%	0%	0%	2%
4 C -The candidate makes proficient use of mathematical concepts, processes, and reasoning to foster student understanding when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.76	66%	21%	0%	0%	13%
4 D -The candidate makes proficient use of science content [physical, life, and earth] and scientific concepts, thinking, and reasoning when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.62	42%	26%	0%	0%	32%
4 E - The candidate makes proficient use of social science content, concepts, and the interrelationships of the disciplines when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.68	50%	24%	0%	0%	26%
4 F - The candidate makes proficient use of physical development content when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.18	5%	24%	0%	0%	71%
4 G - The candidate makes proficient use of health education content when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.33	16%	21%	3%	0%	60%
4 H - The candidate makes proficient use of fine arts content across academic disciplines when planning and teaching curriculum.	3.76	58%	18%	0%	0%	24%
4 I - The candidate values multiple ways of knowing and conveys to students that knowledge is developed from the vantage point of the knower.	3.82	82%	18%	0%	0%	0%
4 J - The candidate shows enthusiasm for the curriculum being taught and helps students make curriculum connections to everyday life.	NA					
5 A - The candidate collaborates with other professionals as resources for problem solving, generating new ideas, sharing experiences, and seeking and giving feedback.	3.84	82%	16%	0%	0%	2%
5 B - The candidate demonstrates commitment to reflection, assessment, and learning as an ongoing process.	3.86	89%	8%	3%	0%	0%
5 C - The candidate is willing to seek and integrate constructive feedback.	3.89	89%	11%	0%	0%	0%
5 D - The candidate follows codes of professional conduct.	3.87	87%	13%	0%	0%	0%
5 E - The candidate follows school policy and procedures, respecting boundaries of	3.92	92%	8%	0%	0%	0%

professional responsibilities, when working with students, colleagues, and/or families.						
---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Assessment of Candidate Impact on Student Learning

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Teacher Work Sample

How and why it was developed:

Exemplary teacher candidates support student learning by designing a Teacher Work Sample (TWS) employing a wide range of strategies that build on each student’s strengths, needs, and prior experiences. The Elementary Education department Master of Arts in Teaching and Bachelor of Arts (ELE MAT/BA) investigated the TWS design during the 2008-2009 academic year prior to requiring this assessment for all teacher candidates in the department in winter 2010. We piloted the assessment during spring 2008 and fall 2009. We collected and analyzed teacher candidate feedback data to revise our initial project. The ELE MAT/BA department decided to require the TWS assessment for all teacher candidates beginning in winter 2010, including MAT AUSL residents.

Through the TWS performance assessment, resident teacher candidates provide evidence of their ability to design units of study for all of the diverse learners in their classrooms. Resident teacher candidates are required to design a TWS (unit of study) that connects the complexities of teaching with an assessment-based on the expected student learning outcomes. By using the TWS design (see the attached Teacher Work Sample framework) resident teacher candidates plan coherent curriculum grounded in the application of effective instruction and assessment practices in teaching and learning.

The TWS protocol includes six teaching components: Context of the Classroom and Community, Planning for Instruction, Assessment Plan, Instructional Design, Analysis of Teaching and Learning and Reflection and Evaluation. These teaching components are identified by research and best practice as fundamental to improving student learning. Our goal is for our resident teacher candidates to develop “a teacher’s way of thinking” as they develop as future teachers through the design of this TWS assessment.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment

The TWS is a scaffold assignment that begins at the start of ELE587 with an analysis of the school community and builds through the entire residency year. The instructional plan is drafted in the winter term, and the teaching plans, teaching of the lessons and analysis occur during the second lead teach in the spring term.	The TWS is evaluated at the end of the ELE597 experience using the rubric below.	The mentor and the university supervisor give feedback to the resident on all components of the TWS. The ELE597 seminar leader evaluates the final TWS.
--	--	---

2. A blank sample of the assessment: See Appendix #6.

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool: See Appendix #6.

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

2011-2012 Data- Teacher Work Sample (Sample Size= 19 Students) AUSL

ACEI Standard	TWS Component	Mean Score (out of possible 3 points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards
1.0	Context of Classroom and Community	2.74	79%	16%	5%
3.1	Planning for Instruction	2.74	79%	16%	5%
4.0	Assessment Plan	2.79	79%	21%	0%
3.2	Instructional Design	2.89	89%	11%	0%
3.3	Instructional Design	2.89	89%	11%	0%
3.4	Instructional Design	2.89	89%	11%	0%
4.0	Analysis of Teaching/Learning	2.89	95%	0%	5%
5.1	Reflection/Self-Evaluation	2.89	95%	5%	0%

Note: There is a discrepancy in the sample size (19 students).

Data analysis of the ELE/AUSL/MAT Teacher Work Sample is found in the display above. Resident teacher candidates were assessed across the six components of the TWS framework using a three-point rubric. Three is the highest rating of competency. The data tell us that our resident teacher candidates are strong in the area of understanding the context of the classroom and community. They also are working hard in the area of planning for instruction. Further, the data tell us that as ELE/AUSL/MAT faculty we need to focus our practice on the assessment plans and

instructional design areas of the TWS. ELE MAT/BA faculty meetings have begun, and others have been planned, in order to discuss ways to enhance our own teaching and guiding of the TWS. Methodology.

Assessment of Candidate Dispositions

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Student Teaching Competency Appraisal

How and why it was developed:

See above under “Assessment of Field Experiences”.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
A competency appraisal is used at the end of ELE587 Resident Practicum and ELE597 Resident Student Teaching. Mentors, residents, and university supervisors each complete the same version of the appraisals. In addition to the rating scale, there are comment sections on the competency appraisal for both the mid-term and final evaluations.	After the mid-term evaluation (End of ELE587) resident teacher candidates receive feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors in preparation for assuming a leading role in the classroom. The competency appraisal is then evaluated at the end of the field experiences: ELE597 Resident Student Teaching.	Mentor, Resident, University Supervisor, and NLU Faculty Instructor for ELE587/597

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

See Appendix #4 for the full Competency Appraisal. Specific indicators used to assess candidate dispositions are indicated in the Aggregated Data Table below.

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:

Contained in sample Competency Appraisal in Appendix #4.

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

ACEI Standard	Competency Appraisal Indicators That Address Candidate Dispositions	Mean Score (out of possible 4 points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards

3.2	The candidate believes that all children can achieve at high levels and consistently helps all children succeed.	3.84	98%	2%	0%
3.4	The candidate assists in building and supporting a positive climate and learning community in the classroom and throughout the school.	3.5	94%	6%	0%
5.2	The candidate collaborates with resource personnel on accommodating and assessing the needs of students with special needs.	3.84	98%	0%	2%
3.4	The candidate shows enthusiasm for the curriculum being taught and helps students make curriculum connections to everyday life.	NA			
5.1	The candidate demonstrates commitment to self-reflection, self-assessment, and life-long learning.	3.86	97%	%	3%
5.1	The candidate seeks and integrates constructive feedback in his/her teaching.	3.89	100%	%	0%
5.1	The candidate follows school and university codes of professional conduct.	3.87	100%	0%	0%
5.1	The candidate follows school policies and procedures and respects legal and professional responsibilities when working with students, colleagues, and families.	3.92	100%	0%	0%

This data set is taken from our ELE597 Resident Student Teaching competency appraisal. Competency appraisal data from the university supervisor and mentor teacher ratings is analyzed for the purposes of this disposition assessment. The data presented here comes from the spring 2011 application of the competency appraisal.

The ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates had fairly high ratings across all indicators above that relate to dispositions of teacher candidates. The spring 2012 application of the

competency appraisal by the raters (i.e., cooperating/mentor teachers, and university supervisors). all scores for the disposition indicators were above 90% level with the exception of collaborating with resource personnel for special needs students. However, even in this area the sum of “Excellent” and “Good” rankings was 93%. This area was addressed in the discussion of the Field Placement above.

Assessment of Candidate Diversity Proficiencies

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Student Teaching Competency Appraisal

How and why it was developed:

See above under “Assessment of Field Experiences”.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
A competency appraisal is used at the end of ELE587 Resident Practicum and ELE597 Resident Student Teaching. Mentors, residents, and university supervisors each complete the same version of the appraisals. In addition to the rating scale, there are comment sections on the competency appraisal for both the mid-term and final evaluations.	After the mid-term evaluation (End of ELE587) resident teacher candidates receive feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors in preparation for assuming a leading role in the classroom. The competency appraisal is then evaluated at the end of the field experiences: ELE597 Resident Student Teaching.	Mentor, Resident, University Supervisor, and NLU Faculty Instructor for ELE587/597

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

See Appendix #4 for the full Competency Appraisal. Specific indicators used to assess candidate dispositions are indicated in the Aggregated Data Table below.

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:

Contained in sample Competency Appraisal in Appendix #4.

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

ACEI Standard	Competency Appraisal Indicators That Address Candidate Diversity Proficiencies	Mean Score (out of possible 4 points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards

3.2	The candidate appreciates cultural and linguistic diversity and shows respect for students' varied abilities, intellect, and learning styles.	3.95	97%	0%	3%
3.1	The candidate involves students in self-assessment, reflection and goal setting.	3.4	81%	0%	19%
3.2	The candidate is sensitive to community and cultural norms and facilitates a learning community in which individual differences and cultural diversity are respected.	3.92	98%	0%	2%
3.3	The candidate interacts equitably and with sensitivity with diverse learners.	3.54	96%	4%	0%

The lowest score was in relation to candidates using self-assessment and goal setting with students, This is an area faculty will further explore for the 2012-2013 school year. This is further discussed in Section V in relation to our continued work with the Teacher Work Sample.

Assessment of Candidate Technology Proficiencies

1. A Narrative description of the assessment including:

Name of Assessment: Student Teaching Competency Appraisal

How and why it was developed:

See above under “Assessment of Field Experiences”.

How and when it is implemented	How and when it is evaluated	Who evaluates the assessment
A competency appraisal is used at the end of ELE587 Resident Practicum and ELE597 Resident Student Teaching. Mentors, residents, and university supervisors each complete the same version of the appraisals. In addition to the rating scale, there are comment sections on the competency appraisal for both the mid-term and final evaluations.	After the mid-term evaluation (End of ELE587) resident teacher candidates receive feedback from mentor teachers and university supervisors in preparation for assuming a leading role in the classroom. The competency appraisal is then evaluated at the end of the field experiences: ELE597 Resident Student Teaching.	Mentor, Resident, University Supervisor, and NLU Faculty Instructor for ELE587/597

2. A blank sample of the assessment.

See Appendix #4 for the full Competency Appraisal. Specific indicators used to assess candidate technology proficiencies are indicated in the Aggregated Data Table below.

3. The scoring guide/rubric used to assess the tool:

Contained in sample Competency Appraisal in Appendix #4.

4. Aggregated data tables and a narrative interpretation of what the data means to the program in terms of candidate learning and performance.

ACEI Standard	Competency Appraisal Indicators That Address Candidate Technology Proficiencies	Mean Score (out of possible 4 points)	Percentage Meeting Standards	Percentage Partially Meeting Standards	Percentage Not Meeting Standards
3.5	The candidate knows how to enhance learning through the use of a wide range of materials such as computers, audio-visual technologies, videotapes, and disks, local experts, primary documents and artifacts, texts, reference books, literature, and other print sources.	3.49	97%	0%	3%

This data set is taken from our ELE597 Resident Student Teaching competency appraisal. Competency appraisal data from the university supervisor and mentor teacher ratings is analyzed for the purposes of this technology assessment. The data presented here comes from the spring 2012 application of the competency appraisal.

The ELE/AUSL/MAT resident teacher candidates had average ratings across all indicators above that relate to technology proficiencies. The spring 2012 application of the competency appraisal by the raters (i.e., cooperating/mentor teachers, and university supervisors) for all scores for the technology indicators were above 80% level. With a recently received Gates Grant for AUSL, as well as iPods in every resident’s hand for the 2011-2012 we did see a gain in this area of technology proficiencies from 2.99 mean score 2010-2011 to 3.49 for this 2011-2012 residents.

Section V: Use of Assessment Results to Improve Candidate and Program Performance

5. Describe the steps program faculty has taken to use information from the key assessments for improvement of both candidate performance and of the program. This information should be organized around the following appropriate assessment foci: (1) content knowledge, (2) professional knowledge, (3) field experiences, (4) candidate impact on student learning, (5) candidate dispositions, (6) candidate diversity proficiencies, and (7) candidate technology proficiencies.
6. Reflect on the previous year’s assessment and recommendations. What changes were implemented? What progress was made?

7. *Include recommendations for assessment revisions/actions based on this year's data for the program/department.*

The Elementary Education program at National Louis University is reviewed annually as part of the larger college assessment schedule. Faculty write annual reports based on program data for the assessments used in this report as well as other assessments used within the program. We use this data to determine strengths and uncover weaknesses in the program. Below, we discuss how the Academy of Urban School Leadership (ELE/AUSL/MAT) program has analyzed assessment data from the spring of 2011 in response to conditions set by ACEI. This current set of data has been, and will be, used to inform continuous improvement, make changes and set an agenda for further work to improve candidate performance and strengthen the program. The evidence presented in our response to conditions includes data sets in the areas where new, improved assessments were administered and analyzed during the spring term 2011. These updated assessments relate to Lesson Planning and our Teacher Work Sample. A further look at our candidates' content knowledge was analyzed with a new lens; this lens now includes using a rubric based upon the current 2007 ACEI standards.

The NCATE process, initially and again in response to the conditions set forth by ACEI, provided us with the opportunity to examine our ELE/AUSL/ MAT program as we work to improve its curriculum, instruction and assessments that support the more complex knowledge and skills needed in twenty-first century schools. After receiving ACEI's feedback in February 2011, we developed new and improved assessments that now measure the ways in which the 2007 ACEI Standards are reflected in our candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions related to their teaching abilities that impact learning for all students. Most importantly, the revised assessments developed for a spring 2011 application were written using the 2007 ACEI standards in order to focus our standards of measurement on candidate competencies using the language, and vision, of ACEI as our guide. We feel that our assessments are now much stronger as a result of these revisions.

1. Content Knowledge

Principal Findings from Evidence:

Our data provides solid evidence that our candidates are able to demonstrate their knowledge and preparedness in the content areas. The content areas assessed include reading, science, mathematics, social studies, the arts, health and physical education (ACEI Standards 2.1-2.7). Competency appraisals for every teacher candidate in the program are completed by university supervisors and cooperating teachers; data from competency appraisals completed in spring 2011 document that our candidates possess the required content knowledge related to these aforementioned curriculum areas taught in the elementary and middle level classrooms. Candidates scored above the 80% level in all areas assessed (2.1-2.7) as assessed by the Teaching and Curriculum (content area) section of the competency appraisal.

Faculty Interpretation of these Findings:

Our AUSL candidates show a high level of success in meeting the 2007 ACEI Standards associated with content knowledge for elementary school teachers. Although the scores are above the 80% level for our candidates, we would like to continue to strengthen these numbers. Our next step, beginning in the fall of 2011, is to have candidates build content area lesson plans and ask our arts and science faculty representing the content disciplines to assess the plans using content based rubrics as assessment guides. Our ELE/AUSL/MAT program faculty would like to involve a wide range of content experts from across the university landscape to help support our work in elementary teacher preparation. These new content specific assessments will need to be developed in tandem with our arts and sciences colleagues. Moreover, a future goal will be to have all scores on next spring 2012 competency appraisals reflect an 85% benchmark for content knowledge expertise. In order to achieve this goal, continued work on lesson planning related to content knowledge will need to be emphasized by faculty in program's seminars.

We began a new initiative with our AUSL partners in 2011 by administering every AUSL MAT ELE teacher candidate/resident a math placement test designed by the NCE Math Education faculty. We examined the results of this test and identified the areas of content weakness with the resident class. Our AUSL partners are in the process of developing five professional development sessions tied to these areas in order to deepen the candidates/residents' understanding of math content.

2. Professional and pedagogical knowledge, skill, and dispositions

Principal Findings from Evidence:

Our AUSL experience requires candidates to engage in preclinical fieldwork from the first day that they enter the year long residency program. The early fieldwork requires the candidates to work on problem-solving and decision-making skills while taking the initiative to actively participate in the classroom/fieldwork experience. We recognize and value the critical role that this year long field experience with student teaching has on the development of our future teachers. ELE/AUSL/MAT program faculty strongly believe that deep and direct experiences with children in a year-long educational setting is an essential component in helping candidates learn the exemplary habits of mind of educational professionals. The strong evidence from the competency appraisal data provides evidence that the full year of fieldwork with an intense student teaching experience is valuable for our candidates.

The use of competency appraisal data to measure teacher candidates' professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills and dispositions has been documented successfully in our program for many years. The data report candidate effectiveness by categories that match the Danielson Framework used in AUSL: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, Instruction, and Professional Responsibilities, related to delivering instruction, planning curriculum and student assessment.

Our program faculty strongly believe that becoming a "reflective practitioner" is a critical goal for all candidates. Teaching is a complex process and the task of teaching requires constant observation, assessment and action. It is not enough to be able to recognize only what happens in the classroom. In order to become an effective educator, it is important to understand the "why's"

and “how’s” of the classroom. This understanding is developed through the constant practice of analyzing one’s own teaching. The data from two assessments, the Lesson Plan Assessment and the Teacher Work Sample are emerging data that we are closely monitoring and continuously adjusting. We see improving trends with this data and growth across student populations. The spring 2011 assessment based upon the 2007 ACEI standards have improved faculty understanding of candidates’ abilities to plan, implement and analyze instruction that reflect the quality of teaching necessary for today’s diverse schools and inclusive classrooms.

Faculty Interpretation of these Findings:

Our ELE/AUSL/MAT candidates begin the process of analyzing lesson plans in early in their teacher preparation program and matched field experience. Early on, our program faculty take time to emphasize the importance of analyzing one’s own practice. We have added newer assessments based upon the language of the 2007 ACEI standards for examining teacher candidates’ planning for instruction and analysis of student work through the use of both the Teacher Work Sample assignment as well as the Lesson Plan assignment. The implementation of these refined assessments has already had a direct impact on our coursework. Specifically, the language of the 2007 ACEI standards has helped AUSL faculty focus their teaching around the intended outcome of the assessments. For example, with an emphasis on planning for instruction using the language of ACEI, comes a greater focus on all aspects of the 2007 ACEI standards including those related to development, learning and motivation, curriculum, instruction and assessment. We will continue to apply the lesson plan content area rubrics in the coming year in the areas of reading, science, mathematics and social studies. Additionally, we will be rolling out the content area lesson plan rubrics for the arts, health and physical education in the fall 2011. These additional areas will help us as program faculty ensure that all candidates are ready and able to teach all areas of the elementary curriculum with the competence required to motivate and impact student learning.

3. Student Learning

Principal Findings from Evidence:

Measuring the impact that our candidates have on student learning is perhaps the most challenging requirement of the NCATE process. Teacher Work Sample (TWS) data show a continuous improvement of teacher candidate competency with each application of the teacher work sample and specifically its impact on student learning. In the first pilot of the TWS with our ELE/AUSL/MAT candidates there was a clearly evident weakness in the area of student learning. In the latest application of the TWS from spring 2011, major gains in student learning and our teacher candidates’ understanding of that were seen. The TWS assessment was revised using the 2007 ACEI standards. An application of the spring 2011 data is provided.

We also added questions for our teacher candidates to complete on our competency appraisals for ELE 597 Student Teaching. Our faculty strongly believe that experiences with children in diverse educational settings is an essential component in helping candidates learn the exemplary habits of mind of educational professionals. Analyzing the data regarding the questions displayed in the table below will help us critically assess the field placements of our teacher candidates. We will discuss these findings with our program faculty as we continue to strive to provide our teacher candidates with exemplary field placements for student teaching. It is interesting to note that the

class size of students' placement has decreased. We will further discuss this finding during the 2012-2013 academic year.

NEED TO INCLUDE

N=38 2011-2012 ELE 597 Teacher Candidates competency appraisals

	Diversity Question on Teacher candidate competency appraisal- final	Average class size	Percentage of Total Students
70	What is the total number of students in your field experience classroom?	25.7	
71	Approximately how many students are identified as racially or culturally minority students?	23.4	91%
72	Approximately how many students are identified as English language learners?.	2.7	11%
73	Approximately how many students are identified as having special education needs or learning disabilities?	4.4	17%
74	Approximately how many students are identified as gifted or talented?	0	0%

Faculty Interpretation of these Findings:

Teacher Work Sample - The current version of the Elementary Program Teacher Work Sample (TWS) was a new requirement for candidates in fall 2009. In winter 2010 during a quarterly university supervisors' workshop, all faculty (on campus and AUSL) along with university supervisors participated in training devoted to guiding and assessing the TWS process. It was clear to the faculty that we needed a shared training after reviewing the original data sets. In the summer of 2011 the Elementary Education university supervisors received updated training regarding the Teacher Work Sample document and its updated assessment. As faculty, we continue to focus our supervisor training on ways to help our teacher candidates improve their practices related to teaching for, and measuring, student learning outcomes.

During the most current application of the TWS in spring 2012, faculty shared strategies used to support elementary and middle level student learning, as well as other insights intended to support teacher candidate success with this work. Areas for improvement, based on data collected, include the need to help our candidates align assessment and instructional decision making and implementation related to the revised TWS rubric in order to strengthen each candidate's ability to impact K-8 student learning and achievement gains.

At the end of spring 2011 term, the entire Elementary and Middle Level Teacher Education department including the BA/MAT/AUSL faculty met to discuss the progress the data sets aligned to the revised TWS rubrics. As a result of this meeting, a faculty committee was constituted to oversee continued improvements in the way all faculty in the department guide the development of the TWS assignment in both the university-based seminars and in the field.

In addition, at an upcoming fall 2012 meeting of the Elementary Education Advisory Board, the revised TWS assessment will be presented in order to communicate with the broader educational community the goals of the assignment and improvements in its assessment related to both teacher candidate and K-8 student learning.

In closing, we would like to say we are integrating our updated assessments from spring 2012 into the fabric of our work at the Academy of Urban School Leadership program and within the larger EMLTE department. We are committed to the assessment process as a means to strengthen our program and its impact on our teacher candidates' practice. Most importantly, we are committed to the enhancement of learning outcomes of the K-8 students our candidates teach. Thus, as a teacher preparation program committed to continuous learning and improvement, we value the process of implementing a well designed assessment system and understand that its findings lead to improved learning for all. We are pleased to report that that our latest ACEI assessment report for our AUSL program in response to the conditions set forth in February 2011 has greatly improved our own work as a teacher residency program. Using the language of the current ACEI standards our assessments are more focused and help us look at assessment in new, meaningful ways. This work, we are happy to report, has positively impacted the quality of the ELE/AUSL/MAT program and will continue to shape its direction for years to come.

Appendix for MAT ELE AUSL Assessment Report

1. Relationship of Assessments to Standards
2. Content Test Scoring Guide
3. Assessment of Professional Teaching Scoring Guide
4. ELE597 Competency Appraisal (pdf attachment)
5. Lesson Plan Assignment and Rubric
6. Teacher Work Sample

Appendix #1: Chart from SPA Report

**Section II- Relationship of Assessment to Standards
Elementary Education- MAT ACEI
September, 2011
National-Louis University**

For each ACEI standard on the chart below, identify the assessment(s) in Section II that address each standard. One assessment may apply to multiple ACEI standards.

ACEI STANDARD	APPLI CABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
<p>DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND MOTIVATION 1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation--Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/>#1 <input type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>
<p>CURRICULUM STANDARDS 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language—Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas;</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>
<p>2.2 Science—Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science;</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>
<p>2.3 Mathematics—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and procedures that define number and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. In doing so they consistently engage problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation;</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>
<p>2.4 Social studies—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies—the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas—to promote elementary students' abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world;</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>
<p>2.5 The arts—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—the content, functions, and achievements of the performing arts (dance, music, theater) and the visual arts as primary media for communication,</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#2 <input type="checkbox"/>#3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>#4 <input type="checkbox"/>#5 <input type="checkbox"/>#6</p>

ACEI STANDARD	APPLI CABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
inquiry, and engagement among elementary students;	
2.6 Health education—Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health;	X <input type="checkbox"/> #1 X <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
2.7 Physical education—Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.	X <input type="checkbox"/> #1 X <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
INSTRUCTION STANDARDS 3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction—Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community;	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 X <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
3.2 Adaptation to diverse students—Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students;	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 X <input type="checkbox"/> #2 X <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 X <input type="checkbox"/> #6
3.3 Development of critical thinking and problem solving—Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students' development of critical thinking and problem solving;	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 X <input type="checkbox"/> #2 X <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
3.4 Active engagement in learning—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments;	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 X <input type="checkbox"/> #2 X <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
3.5 Communication to foster collaboration—Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
ASSESSMENT STANDARDS 4.0 Assessment for instruction—Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 X <input type="checkbox"/> #3 X <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input type="checkbox"/> #5 X <input type="checkbox"/> #6

ACEI STANDARD	APPLI CABLE ASSESSMENTS FROM SECTION II
PROFESSIONALISM STANDARDS 5.1 Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation—Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 x <input type="checkbox"/> #4 X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6
5.2 Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies—Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.	<input type="checkbox"/> #1 <input type="checkbox"/> #2 <input type="checkbox"/> #3 x <input type="checkbox"/> #4 <input type="checkbox"/> #5 <input type="checkbox"/> #6

Appendix # 2: ELE MAT Content Test #110 Scoring Guides and Rubric

**Illinois Certification Testing System
SCORE REPORT EXPLANATION
Content-Area Tests**

(For all content-area fields except foreign language fields)

Overview

Your score report provides information regarding the content-area test you took at the recent administration of the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS). The report includes information regarding your Pass/Did Not Pass status for that test, your performance on the test as a whole, and your performance on the major subareas of the test. Your scores are reported to you, to the Illinois State Board of Education, and to the institution(s) you indicated during the registration process. The content-area tests each contain 125 multiple-choice test questions.

Total Test Score

Scores for the content-area tests are reported on a scale from 100 to 300. A total test scaled score of 240 or above is required to pass these tests. Candidates with a total test score below 240 do not pass the test. Each multiple-choice test question counts the same toward the total score. You do not "lose" any points for wrong answers. Your total test score is based on the **total** number of test questions you answered correctly.

Subarea Scores

The scores listed in the "Subarea" section are also reported on a scale from 100 to 300 and are intended to provide you with feedback on your performance in the major subareas of the test. This information is descriptive only and will help you assess your areas of strength and weakness. Generally, a score at or above 240 on a given subarea indicates satisfactory performance within

that subarea. You do not have to "pass" each subarea or section of the test—there is no "passing" score associated with individual subareas. Subareas with more objectives receive more coverage on the test. Because subareas have different numbers of test questions, it is not possible to average your performance across subareas to arrive at the total test score. Your total test score is **not** an average of your subarea scores.

See the Illinois Certification Testing System content-area test study guides for further information on how your tests are scored. Study guides are available on the ICTS Web site at www.icts.nesinc.com.

Passing Scores

The passing scores for the ICTS were established by the Illinois State Board of Education with input from Illinois educators.

Appendix #3: Assessment of Professional Teaching Scoring Guide

Illinois Certification Testing System SCORE REPORT EXPLANATION Assessment of Professional Teaching Tests Fields: 101, 102, 103, and 104

Overview

Your score report provides information regarding the Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) test you took at the recent administration of the Illinois Certification Testing System (ICTS). The report includes information regarding your Pass/Did Not Pass status for that test, your performance on the test as a whole, and your performance on the major subareas of the test. Your scores are reported to you, to the Illinois State Board of Education, and to the institution(s) you indicated during the registration process. The APT tests each contain 120 multiple-choice test questions as well as 2 constructed-response assignments.

Total Test Score

Scores for the APT tests are reported on a scale from 100 to 300. A total test scaled score of 240 or above is required to pass these tests. Candidates with a total test score below 240 do not pass the test. Your scaled total test score for the APT test that you took is based on your performance on the entire test, including the number of multiple-choice test questions you answered correctly and the scores you received on the two constructed response assignments. The multiple-choice section represents 80 percent of your total test score and the constructed-response assignments combined represent 20 percent of your total test score.

Subarea Scores

The scores listed in the "Subarea" section are also reported on a scale from 100 to 300 and are intended to provide you with feedback on your performance in the major subareas of the test. Performance Indicators for the two constructed-response assignments are also provided. This information is descriptive only and may help you assess your areas of strength and weakness. Generally a score at or above 240 on a given subarea or the constructed-response assignments indicates satisfactory performance within that subarea/assignment. You do not have to "pass" each subarea or section of the test—there is no "passing" score associated with individual subareas. Subareas with more objectives receive more coverage on the test and thus contribute more to your total test score. It is therefore not possible to average your performance across subareas to arrive at the total test score. Your total test score is **not** an average of your subarea scores.

Multiple-Choice Scores

Your performance on the multiple-choice test section is based on the number of test questions answered correctly; you do not "lose" any points for wrong answers. Each multiple-choice test question counts the same toward the total score.

Constructed-Response Scores

Each of the responses to the two constructed-response assignments for the APT tests is scored by at least two qualified educators. Scorers are unaware of the identities of the individuals whose responses they score and are unaware of the score(s) assigned by others to the same response. Scorers receive extensive orientation in standardized scoring procedures and take a qualifying assessment to ensure that they are ready to score. Scorers judge the overall effectiveness of each response while focusing on a set of characteristics that have been defined by Illinois educators as important. Scorers are oriented to provide an overall judgment, not to indicate specific errors. Scorers base their judgments on the quality of pedagogical knowledge demonstrated in the constructed response assignments rather than on penmanship, length, or neatness.

In general, a response that receives a passing score demonstrates the following performance characteristics:

- **Purpose:** the fulfillment of the assigned tasks by responding in an appropriate manner to the elements of the specific performance assignment
- **Application of Professional Knowledge:** the application of accurate, effective, and Current professional knowledge and practices relevant to the specific performance assignment and to the appropriate subarea of the APT test framework
- **Support/Elaboration:** the appropriateness and quality of support/elaboration through the use of supporting details, examples, and rationales relevant to the specific performance assignment and to the appropriate subarea of the APT test framework

Each response is scored on a scale from 1 to 4, with 1 representing a totally undeveloped response and 4 representing a response that is very well developed. Each response is read and scored by two readers; the sum of the two readers' scores is the total score assigned to the response. Any pair of scores that differs by more than one point is regarded as discrepant and is scored by a third reader. For example, a total score of 5 can result only from readers' scores of 2 plus 3, not from scores of 1 plus 4, since the scores in the latter pair differ by more than one point.

The raw scores from each of the two constructed-response assignments are then **combined** into a single score. The combined raw score for the two constructed responses is converted to a scale from 100 to 300, with 240 or above representing acceptable performance on the assignment. If your response is off topic, illegible, written in a language other than English, of insufficient quantity to score, or merely a repetition of the assignment, you will receive a score of "U" for unscorable. A designation of "B" is assigned if the constructed-response form is blank.

See the Illinois Certification Testing System Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) test study guides for an explanation of the performance characteristics and for further information on how the responses are scored. Study guides are available on the ICTS Web site at www.icts.nesinc.com.

Passing Scores

The passing scores for the ICTS were established by the Illinois State Board of Education based on recommendations from panels of Illinois educators.

Constructed Response Assignment: Score Point Description

The "4" response reflects a thorough understanding of current professional knowledge and practices, as described in the subarea of the APT test framework relevant to the constructed-response assignment.

- The response completely fulfills the purpose of the assignment by responding fully and appropriately to the given task.
- The response demonstrates an accurate, highly effective application of current professional knowledge and practices that is entirely relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.
- The response is well elaborated through the use of high-quality examples, strong supporting evidence, and effective rationales relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.

The "3" response reflects a general understanding of current professional knowledge and practices, as described in the subarea of the APT test framework relevant to the constructed-response assignment.

- The response generally fulfills the purpose of the assignment in a generally appropriate manner.
- The response demonstrates a generally accurate, effective application of current professional knowledge and practices that is relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.
- The response is elaborated through the use of some effective examples, supporting evidence, and rationales relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.

The "2" response reflects a limited understanding of current professional knowledge and practices, as described in the subarea of the APT test framework relevant to the constructed-response assignment.

- The response partially fulfills the purpose of the assignment by attempting to respond to the given task in a partially appropriate manner.
- The response demonstrates a partially accurate, partially effective application of current professional knowledge and practices that has limited relevance to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.
- The response is not well elaborated, containing few effective examples or rationales and minimal supporting evidence relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.

The "1" response reflects little or no understanding of current professional knowledge and practices, as described in the subarea of the APT test framework relevant to the constructed-response assignment.

- The response does not fulfill the purpose of the assignment in an appropriate manner.
- The response demonstrates a largely inaccurate, ineffective application of current professional knowledge and practices that may be irrelevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.
- The response contains little or no effective elaboration, with few, if any, effective examples or rationales and little, if any, supporting evidence relevant to the subarea of the APT test framework being assessed.

“U”: The response is unscorable because it is not written to the assigned topic, illegible, written in a language other than English, of insufficient length to score, or merely a repetition of the assignment.

“B”: The constructed-response section is blank.

Appendix #4: : ELE597 Competency Appraisal and Rubric Scoring Guide

National College of Education
Elementary Education Program

This Competency Appraisal is a tool used to assess the active involvement of the candidate (the National-Louis student) with the mentor teacher and resident during his/her ELE 597 Resident Teaching experience. These Competency Appraisals help determine the course grade for the experience and become a part of the candidate's permanent record at the university. Mentor Teacher, Supervisor, and Candidate Each Complete a Competency Appraisal

ELE 597 Competency Assessment Rubric

The rubric serves as a guide for understanding the terms of the scale (Excellent to Unable to Assess) used to assess each indicator. **The candidate is to be assessed at this point in their development as a preservice teacher.** Please include comments in the space provided.

	Quality	Frequency
Excellent	Complete understanding and outstanding performance of high quality is evident in this area.	Consistently present throughout the entire experience.
Good	Thorough understanding and acceptable performance of high quality is evident in this area.	Present throughout most of the experience.
Fair	Partial understanding and uneven performance of some quality is evident in this area.	Present throughout some of the experience.
Poor	Minimal understanding and performance of questionable quality is evident in this area.	Present throughout very little of the experience.
Unable to Assess	Understanding or performance of this area was not observed.	Understanding or performance of this area was not observed.

The Knowledge and Performance Standards on Which the Competency Appraisal Indicators are Based

ISBE - Illinois State Board of Education Illinois Professional Teaching Standards
INTASC – Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards
ACEI – Association for Childhood Education International Standards

1. Planning and Preparation

Candidates possess the skills of planning and teaching lessons appropriate for the students, subject, and curriculum. Candidates provide opportunities that support all students' intellectual, social, and personal development and address the diversity of students and their learning needs.

2. The Classroom Environment

Candidates demonstrate an awareness of and the ability to maintain a classroom environment conducive to learning.

3. Instruction

Candidates understand and demonstrate the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of content and create meaningful integrated learning experiences that develop all students' competence in subject matter and skills for various developmental levels. Candidates utilize effective modes of communication (verbal, nonverbal, written, and/or technology). Candidates demonstrate the ability to incorporate assessment in their teaching.

4. Professional Responsibilities

Candidates collaborate with school colleagues (including support services personnel), parents/families and community agencies to support students and their learning. Candidates are reflective/analytic practitioners in ways that support their own professional development. Candidates demonstrate a commitment to teaching as a profession.

See pdf attachment for competency appraisal

<http://www3.nl.edu/nce/surveys/elemauslca.cfm> (link for appraisal)

Appendix 5: ELEMAT Lesson Plan and Rubric

Name of Student teacher _____ School _____

Subject being taught _____ Grade Level _____

Date of Lesson _____ Time frame of lesson _____

Connecting to Standards State/District Goal(s), Standard(s), Benchmark(s)	
Learning Outcomes (Objectives)	
Assessment(s) Formative/Summative	
Materials/References/ Technology	
Procedures: Opening Instruction Closing	
Differentiation	

Lesson Plan	ACEI Standard	Not Met (1)	Partially Met (2)	Met (3)
Standards	3.1 Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	Lesson plan does not include appropriate standards representing learning goals and benchmarks related to the content of the curriculum, student learning needs and community context.	Lesson plan partially includes appropriate standards representing learning goals and benchmarks related to the content of the curriculum, student learning needs and community context.	Lesson plan clearly includes appropriate standards representing learning goals and benchmarks related to the content of the curriculum, student learning needs and community context.
Learning Outcomes/ (Objectives)	3.1 Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community	Learning outcomes are not connected to knowledge of the students, learning theory, curricular goals and community context.	Learning outcomes show a partial connection to knowledge of the students, learning theory, curricular goals and community context.	Learning outcomes show a clear connection to knowledge of the students, learning theory, curricular goals and community context.
Assessment[s]	4.0 Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual,	Formal and Informal assessments are not aligned to the learning outcomes, and do not provide any structure for planning and evaluating instruction.	Formal and Informal assessments show partial alignment to the learning outcomes, and do not provide a clear structure for planning and evaluating instruction.	Formal and Informal assessments show a clear alignment to the learning outcomes, providing a clear structure for planning and evaluating instruction.

Lesson Plan	ACEI Standard	Not Met (1)	Partially Met (2)	Met (3)
	social, emotional and physical development of each elementary student.			
Materials, References & Technology	N/A	Materials and technological resources that support meaningful engagement of learning are not included.	Materials and technological resources that engage students in meaningful learning are only partially included	Materials and technological resources that engage students in meaningful learning. Are included
Procedures: Opening	1.0 Candidates know, understand, and use major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development acquisition of knowledge and motivation.	Lesson opening is not connected to an understanding of the concepts, principles and research related to students' prior knowledge, interests and motivation to learn.	Lesson opening is partially connected to an understanding of the concepts, principles and research related to students' prior knowledge, interests and motivation to learn.	Lesson opening is clearly connected to an understanding of the concepts, principles and research related to activating students' prior knowledge, interests and motivation to learn.
Procedures: Instruction	3.3 Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students'	Instructional delivery is not connected to an understanding and use of various teaching practices that encourage the development of	Instructional delivery is partially connected to an understanding and use of various teaching practices that encourage the development of critical thinking and	Instructional delivery is clearly connected to an understanding and use of various teaching practices that encourage the development of critical thinking and

Lesson Plan	ACEI Standard	Not Met (1)	Partially Met (2)	Met (3)
	development of critical thinking and problem solving	critical thinking and problem solving for all students in the classroom	problem solving for all students in the classroom	problem solving for all students in the classroom
Procedures: Instruction	3.4 Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self-motivation and positive social interaction to create supportive learning environments.	Instruction does not demonstrate an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior. Instruction does not fosters active engagement in learning and social interaction resulting in supportive learning environments	Instruction partially demonstrates an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior. Instruction partially fosters active engagement in learning and social interaction resulting in supportive learning environments,	Instruction clearly demonstrates an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior. Instruction clearly fosters active engagement in learning and social interaction resulting in supportive learning environments.
Procedures: Instruction	3.5 Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom	Instruction does not demonstrate a knowledge and understanding of using communication techniques to foster active inquiry and collaboration in the classroom.	Instruction partially demonstrates a knowledge and understanding of using communication techniques to foster active inquiry and collaboration in the classroom	Instruction clearly demonstrates a knowledge and understanding of using communication techniques to foster active inquiry and collaboration in the classroom.
Procedures: Closing	3.1 Candidates	Closing of the lesson	Closing of the lesson	Closing of the lesson

Lesson Plan	ACEI Standard	Not Met (1)	Partially Met (2)	Met (3)
	<p>plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community</p>	<p>does not demonstrate an understanding of lesson design, learning theory, and creating curricular connections in order to support student learning.</p>	<p>partially demonstrates an understanding of lesson design, learning theory, and creating curricular connections in order to support student learning.</p>	<p>clearly demonstrates an understanding of lesson design, learning theory, and creating curricular connections in order to support student learning.</p>
<p>Differentiation</p>	<p>3.2 Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.</p>	<p>Lesson plan does not demonstrate an approach to instruction that is appropriately differentiated and adapted to the developmental learning needs of diverse students.</p>	<p>Lesson plan partially demonstrates an approach to instruction that is appropriately differentiated and adapted to the developmental learning needs of diverse students.</p>	<p>Lesson plan clearly demonstrates an approach to instruction that is appropriately differentiated and adapted to the developmental learning needs of diverse students</p>

Appendix #6: Teacher Work Sample and Scoring Rubric

Teacher Work Sample (TWS): Elementary and Middle Level Teacher Education Vision and Conceptual Framework

The purpose of the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is to link K-8 student learning with the preparation of elementary and middle level teacher candidates. Teacher candidates in the Elementary Education program are required to design a TWS (unit of study) that connects the complexities of teaching with an assessment-eye toward student learning. Using a TWS design (described below) elementary and middle level teacher candidates plan coherent curriculum grounded in the application of effective instructional and assessment practices in teaching and learning. The goals of the TWS include:

- identifying desired learning outcomes based upon the content of curriculum to be taught
- developing a knowledge /understanding of the context of the candidate's own classroom
- developing a knowledge /understanding of student learning needs
- linking instruction with an understanding of national, state and local curriculum standards
- understanding professional teaching standards and pedagogies of practice
- designing assessment practices linked to the measurement of student achievement
- designing instruction to impact student learning
- analyzing student gains related to instruction
- reflecting upon the outcomes of student learning
- reflecting upon one's own areas for professional growth
- designing next steps in curriculum and instruction for all K-8 students

Teacher candidates in the Elementary and Middle Level Teacher Education Program are required to design and document a Teacher Work Sample that contains a minimum of ten lessons. The planning of a TWS grounded in coherent curriculum and instruction for K-8 students provides candidates the opportunity to fully assess learning and adjust instruction accordingly. Formative and summative assessment of student learning underscores the TWS design. As a result, TWS planning is outcomes oriented and results driven; this type of planning enables teacher candidates to understand the connection between teaching and learning.

Planning for the TWS begins in Practicum II and extends through Student Teaching. The Elementary Education TWS includes the following required components. Each component is assessed by a corresponding rubric that identifies the knowledge, skill(s) and dispositions of each teacher candidate related to the areas of curriculum planning, instructional practice, assessment of learning outcomes and classroom management. Teacher candidate impact on K-8 student learning is the goal of the TWS.

Components and Implementation Schedule: An Overview

Component #1: Context of the Classroom and Community

Draft in Practicum/ Revise in Student Teaching

Suggested length of component #1: 2-4 pages

- Provide an analysis of the context of the school community. Include information about the geographic location, school population, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic conditions, family involvement, and other relevant information specific to this school and community. Some of this information may be found on the Illinois School Report Card or on the school's website.

- Describe the students in your classroom. Include information about the students’ Learning Styles, ELL/ Language abilities, Special Needs, Strengths/Talents, Culture, Parent/Guardian support at home, etc.
- Identify information related to students’ skill levels and varied approaches to learning.
- After identifying implications for instructional planning and assessment based upon the context described, and taking into account students’ skill levels and varied approaches to learning, include a set of recommendations that will impact student learning and an analysis of:
 - Differentiation of instruction based upon student characteristics and learning needs
 - Identification of resources and technology/media applications that you might need to support instruction

Component #2: Planning for Instruction

Draft in Practicum/ Complete in Student Teaching

Suggested Length of component # 2: 2-4 pages

Identify and explain:

- Topic and grade level of unit to be taught.
- Rationale – Why is it important to teach this topic?
- Scope and Sequence – General content included in the unit and where the unit fits within the academic year.
- Essential Questions – What are the 2-4 key questions and/or big ideas that **connect to** the unit’s curriculum and instructional planning?

Identify Learning Goals, Standards and Outcomes:

- Illinois State Goals and Standards– include all subjects that apply. For example ----- English/Language Arts, Science, Fine Arts, etc. ... Be sure to write out the entire text of each goal and standard you include.
- Local school or school district standards, if applicable.
- Specific unit learning outcomes (3-5) and describe how these outcomes are aligned with the identified learning standards. Think about what you would like the students to know and be able to do as a result of this unit.

Component #3: Assessment Plan

Complete in Student Teaching

Suggested length of Component # 3: 2-3 pages

- Identify the pre-assessment(s) you will use prior to teaching the unit. This assessment should provide baseline data about each student’s knowledge and skill related to the unit content. Examples might include quizzes, writing prompts, knowledge or skill checklists, etc.
- Analyze your results and discuss how you will use this information to plan your instruction
- Identify the post-assessments you will implement in order to assess your impact on student learning. What is the culminating activity/assessment that brings together the big ideas included in the unit [e.g., presentations, tests, writing sample projects
- Use the following chart to align pre and post assessments with standards and learning outcomes for the unit.

Standards	Unit Learning Outcomes	Pre -Assessment	Post-Assessment

--	--	--	--

- When you have completed teaching the unit, present pre and post assessment data that explains students achievement related to the identified learning outcome(s) (i.e., met, partially met, not met). Use a graphic organizer such as a checklist, chart or spreadsheet to profile student assessment outcomes.

Component #4: Instructional Design

Complete in Student Teaching

Suggested Length of Component# 4: 10 pages (or more as needed)

- Unit Overview - Make a chart or outline of a minimum of 10 lessons that includes lesson title, learning outcome, activity overview, lesson assessment, and technology (if applicable):

Lesson Title	Learning Outcome	Activity	Assessment	Technology

- Include a formal, detailed lesson plan for every lesson to be presented in the unit. Use the EMLTE department’s common lesson plan framework for each lesson in this unit. A minimum of ten lessons plans is required.
 - Lessons should be integrated across content areas, as appropriate. Language arts, math, science, social studies, technology, health, PE and the arts may contribute to the interdisciplinary design of the unit of study.
 - Reference the use of technology/media on individual lesson plans.
 - Include all handouts for students and all teaching materials needed for each plan.
- Include representative student work samples showing variations in achievement for students. Make sure to remove any identifying student information.
- Compile a resource list including all the materials you used in planning and teaching this unit including textbooks, trade books, reference materials, internet web sites. If you plan a field trip, include that information here.

Component #5: Analysis of Teaching and Learning

Complete in Student Teaching

Suggested Length of Component # 5: 2-4 pages

*Present and analyze pre and post assessment data that explains the extent to which students achieved the **unit** learning outcomes (i.e., met, partially met, not met). Use a graphic organizer such as a checklist, chart or spreadsheet to profile student assessment outcomes. Consider what the display of data tells you about student learning by answering the following question:*

- What does the display of data tell you about the learning gains for all students? Identify areas of strength and areas in need of additional work/improvement for individual students as well as for the entire class.

- For students who did not meet intended learning outcomes, how did you create new opportunities for student learning? Include here (if appropriate) a discussion of students with special needs, including IEP's, English Language Learners, etc.
- For students meeting or exceeding expectations, how did you plan for enrichment and extension of learning?

Component 6: Reflection and Self Evaluation

Complete in Student Teaching

Suggested Length of Component # 6: 2-3 pages

- Based on the unit you designed and taught and the analysis of student learning, what would you retain and what would you change in future planning and teaching? Explain why you would retain and/or revise these elements.
- What actions will you take for your own improved practice and professional development when teaching this unit, or another unit, in the future?

Rubric for Teacher Work Sample

Directions: Refer to the scale below and circle the category that best represents the teacher candidate's level of performance.

- **Unsatisfactory**, performance does not meet expectations described in the component
- **Partially meets**, performance partially (vague details & minimal analysis) meets expectations described in the component
- **Meets**, performance meets expectations described in the component
- **Exceeds**, performance exceeds (thorough & specific details) expectations described in the component

Context of the Classroom & Community	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Provides detailed contextual information pertaining to students and school community that is subsequently used for instructional planning. Provides school overview; descriptive statistics of learners (gender, age range, ELL, special needs); descriptions of student skill level; and, based on this information, provides implications for teaching (types of differentiation, resources, etc.)</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.4: Planning for Instruction (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				

Planning for Instruction	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Sets standards based learning outcomes that are appropriate and challenging. Unit topic is guided by essential questions and connected to relevant standards; clear rationale for study is articulated; scope and sequence is described and connected to standards</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.4: Planning for Instruction & IL-PTS.6: Instructional Delivery (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				

Assessment Plan	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Uses multiple assessment approaches that connect standards and unit learning outcomes in order to assess student learning. Assessment plan is developed that includes pre-assessments & post-assessments that are aligned to unit goals and standards.</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.3: Diversity & IL.PTS.8: Assessment (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				

Instructional Design	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Designs standards based instruction that reflects classroom and community context, and includes differentiation strategies & assessment tools in order to guide instruction to meet individual student's learning needs. Instructional design is standards based; includes a minimum of 10 lessons that includes differentiation strategies and assessment tools; demonstrates (as appropriate) cross-curricular integration & uses of technology; and includes handouts, examples of student work, and resource list.</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.1: Content Knowledge, IL-PTS.4: Planning for Instruction & IL-PTS 6: Instructional Delivery (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				

Analysis of Teaching & Learning	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Uses assessment data to analyze and describe student learning, and formulate ways to differentiate instruction (for all levels of learners). Descriptive statistics are provided to illustrate student learning, and articulates ways in which learning opportunities were differentiated for students who were not meeting or were exceeding learning expectations.</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.1: Content Knowledge, IL-PTS.3: Diversity, IL-PTS.6: Instructional Delivery & IL-PTS 8: Assessment (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				

Reflection	Unsatisfactory	Partially Meets	Meets	Exceeds
<i>Reflects upon instruction and student learning in order to improve upon one's practice. Articulates what practices should be retained, revised, and what actions will be subsequently taken to improve upon one's professional practice and professional development.</i>				
Standards: IL-PTS.10: Reflection and Professional Growth (and corresponding ACEI and INTASC standards)				