

1. What general outcome are you seeking?	How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it? (What will the student know or be able to do?)	3. How will you help students learn it? (in class or out of class)	4. How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?	5. What are the assessment findings?	6. What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?
Benchmark I – Block I					
<p>Knowledge and Habits of Mind</p>	<p>Understand central concepts in Block I</p> <p>Have foundational knowledge of the areas he/she will teach</p> <p>Be a critical thinker</p> <p>Be attentive and actively involved in class activities</p> <p>Have respect for peers and instructors</p> <p>Comes to class prepared with all class assignments completed</p> <p>Efficacy guides conscientious self-assessments</p>	<p>1. Modeling</p> <p>2. Field Experiences</p> <p>3. Class Discussions</p> <p>4. Readings</p> <p>5. Clear Expectations</p>	<p>All desired behaviors are assessed by the block team of instructors who have had the students in class during the semester. Instructors meet as a group to evaluate each student in each area. Results are put in a database and individual results are sent to students via e-mail.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2008</u></p> <p>This category continues to have the greatest number of students receiving negative indicators with twenty-four percent (24%) of students having one or more negative indicators for the candidate outcomes. This was compared to 23% during the 2007-2008 semesters. The most common negative indicator was “lacks development as a critical thinker” and “careless about assignments and preparation for class” (both 11%). The negative indicator, “demonstrates gaps in understanding about central concepts of the blocks,” was marked for 9% of the students compared to 15% for 2007-2008. N=172</p> <p><u>Spring 2009</u></p> <p>Twenty-two percent (22%) of students had one or more negative indicators on these general outcome.. The most common negative indicator continues to be “gaps in understanding of central concepts from the blocks” (12%) and “being a critical thinker” (9%) N=129</p> <p><u>Fall 2008</u></p> <p>Thirteen percent (13%) of students had one or more negative indicators for these general outcomes compared to 16% during 2007-2008. Twenty –one (n=21) of the students had a negative indicator in writing and one had a negative indicator in oral communications. N=172</p> <p><u>Spring 2009</u></p> <p>Twelve percent (12%) of students had a negative indicator on this general outcome. All these students had only one negative indicator which was for writing. N=129</p>	<p>A summary of results from the fall Benchmark I assessments was shared with the elementary faculty during the spring semester. Areas of concern were noted and discussions are underway to determine ways to address these concerns.</p> <p><u>Areas of Concern from fall 2006</u></p> <p>Improving the writing skills of our students prior to entering the program continues to be a goal..</p> <p>Providing opportunities for students to improve depth of reflection and abilities as critical thinkers.</p> <p><u>Longitudinal data was also reviewed</u></p> <p>Spring 2006 Summary- Of the four (4) candidates receiving 5 or more negative</p>
<p>Written and Oral Communication</p>	<p>Writing ability – Insightful solid content; appropriate language; good organization; fluent; few mechanical errors</p> <p>Speaking ability – speaks clearly and models good English</p>	<p>1. Modeling</p> <p>2. Written assignments</p> <p>3. Feedback on work</p> <p>4. Readings</p> <p>5. Class presentations</p> <p>6. Field experience lessons</p>			

**Interaction
with
Teachers
and Students**

Able to build rapport with teachers and students in the field

Comes to field experience prepared

Takes initiative to ask questions and help where needed in the classroom

Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching

1. Modeling
2. Field Experiences
3. Class discussions
4. Readings

Fall 2008

Three percent (3%) of students a negative indicator for these general outcomes compared to 1% during 2007-2008. "Coming to field experiences unprepared" was the major area of concern with all but one student of the 3% receiving a negative indicator for this outcome

N= 172

Spring 2009

Two percent (2%) of students received one negative indicator on this general outcome with "tentative about teaching" being marked most often.. N=129

receiving 5 or more negative indicators, two did not complete the program, one had to repeat student teaching and another successfully completed the program.

Fall 2006 Summary - Of the five (5) candidates receiving 5 or more negative indicators, one did not complete the program and the other four completed the program.

Spring 2007 Summary – OF

**Disposition
and
Professional
Behavior**

Focuses on the positive

Flexible - makes adjustments as needed

Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds

Appreciates multiple perspectives

Willing to give and receive help

Commits to class. Takes responsibility for making up work

Commits to being on time

Meets deadlines –on time to class

Has good organizational skills

Dresses professionally in the field

1. Modeling

2. Field Experiences

3. Class discussions

4. Readings

5. Individual conferences

6. Focus groups

Fall 2008

Eighteen percent (18%) of students received at least one negative indicator compared to twenty percent (20%) during fall 2007 with 8% receiving two or more negative indicators. The largest percentage of students received a negative indicator for “occasionally displays negative attitude, bias and/or prejudice” and “turns in assignments late” with 6% each. “Missing class” and “not consistently being on time to class” were both 5%. N=172

Spring 2009

Eighteen percent (18%) of students received one or more negative indicators for this general outcome with 7% receiving more than one negative indicator. The largest percentage of these students received a negative indicator for “not attuned to the needs of others or open to constructive feedback,” and “prioritizes personal perspective.” These were followed closely by “turns in late assignments,” “not consistent about begin on time to class,” and “lacks effective organizational skills.”

N=129

the six (6) candidates receiving five or more negative indicators, five did not complete the program and one is still active in the program.

Fall 2007 Summary – Of the two (2) candidates receiving five or more negative indicators both have dropped out of the program.

Spring data will be shared with the faculty in the fall.

The School of Education decided to implement the completion of Benchmark I a second time after the end of the second semester. At that time students are given feedback on their progress for the areas of concern noted by the Block I team and any new areas of concern are noted.

Benchmark II – Elementary Only

<p align="center">Conceptual Understanding</p>	<p>Sensible choice of concept supported by clear knowledge of children’s mathematical development.</p> <p>Choice of task, questions, and responses to the child reflect thorough understanding of math concept.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modeling 2. Math Courses 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences 	<p>Each student in Block II complete Benchmark II at the end of the semester and submits is electronically. Benchmarks are “blindly” scored by faculty who have completed scorers’ training. Individual feedback is recorder by the scorer and is sent to the student. Students receiving a “failing” score must complete a follow-up to the assessment during Block III.</p>	<p>During Fall 2008, sixty students completed the Benchmark II assessment. For this cohort, 72% received passing scores. Twenty-eight percent (28%) received failing scores were required to do the Benchmark II follow-up during the spring semester. N=60</p> <p>During the spring 2009, sixty-seven percent (67%) of the benchmarks were scored as passing. N=108</p>	<p>The School of Education continues to work on inter-rater reliability. Scorers will re-calibrate before scoring in the spring.</p> <p>The School continues to work to refine the Benchmark II to provide better data to answer the three guiding questions below.</p>
<p align="center">Quality of Written Report</p>	<p>Easy to read. Relatively error free.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Writing courses 2. Class assignments 3. Feedback from instructors and assessments 	<p>The following general trends were seen in the feedback to the students:</p> <p><u>Strengths</u></p> <p>Looking Beyond Procedural Knowledge</p> <p>Attending to the Responses of Children</p> <p><u>Areas for Growth</u></p> <p>Ability to construct a working definition on which to build an interview</p> <p>Interpreting Responses of Children</p> <p>Writing Skills</p>	<p>1. Does the intern’s mathematical knowledge have the potential to support student thinking about mathematics with understanding?</p> <p>2. Is the intern beginning to understand how to assess student thinking using interviews. (attends to student responses, bases comments on evidence from data, uses questions to probe student thinking)?</p> <p>3. Has the intern intellectually engaged in making sense of material from Block I & II (respect for students, child centered, bases follow-up on evidence)?</p>	<p>1. Does the intern’s mathematical knowledge have the potential to support student thinking about mathematics with understanding?</p> <p>2. Is the intern beginning to understand how to assess student thinking using interviews. (attends to student responses, bases comments on evidence from data, uses questions to probe student thinking)?</p> <p>3. Has the intern intellectually engaged in making sense of material from Block I & II (respect for students, child centered, bases follow-up on evidence)?</p>
<p align="center">Assessment of Learner’s Development and Knowledge</p>	<p>Purposefully invites and probes the learner’s thinking.</p> <p>Demonstrates a highly developed sense of how to analyze the learner’s thinking.</p> <p>Accurate, insightful analysis of the learner. Suggests good instructional follow-up.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences 	<p>Only pass and fails were reported to students.</p>		

<p>Self-Evaluation of the Task Selection and Interview</p>	<p>Reflects meaningfully on personal performance from informed perspectives.</p> <p>Accurate about what is working, what needs to be improved, and how to improve it.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Individual conferences 			
<p>Overall Effectiveness of the Reflective Cycle of Teaching</p>	<p>The performance provides a convincing demonstration that the student understands and can implement reflective practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences 			

1. What general outcome are you seeking?	How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it? (What will the student know or be able to do?)	3. How will you help students learn it? (in class or out of class)	4. How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?	5. What are the assessment findings?	6. What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?
<p>Learning from Assessment Processes:</p> <p>Impact on Student Learning:</p> <p>Pedagogical Content Knowledge:</p>	<p>The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he sets/presents standards for quality student performance, provides students with feedback on their performance, AND demonstrates the quality of student learning by analyzing a) an assessment process, b) varied measures of learning from (traditional and authentic) assessment tasks; OR c) multiple measures (formative and summative) of student learning.</p> <p>Using evidence, the teacher candidate demonstrates impact on student learning by describing, AND reflecting, (using both feelings and thoughts), AND deconstructing the impact on student learning using concepts of learning, teaching, assessment, and student diversity.</p> <p>Using differentiated purposes based on student characteristics, the teacher demonstrates an ability design instruction that flexibly creates a feedback or assistance loop for students AND results in students demonstrating comprehension of academic content.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Modeling</i> 2. <i>Field Experiences</i> 3. <i>Class Discussions</i> 4. <i>Class Assignments</i> 5. <i>Clear Expectations</i> 	<p>For the purposes of Benchmark IV, teacher candidates analyze the variety of assessment data gathered during a unit of instruction and from videotapes of their teaching to reflect upon and evaluate their own abilities to attend to data or use data to a) provide feedback to students on their learning, b) to inform instruction; and c) to improve class and school level decision making tied to the education of all children.</p>	<p><u>Spring 2009</u></p> <p>Learning from the Assessment Process</p> <p>On a five-point scale, with five being the optimal and three being the target, the mean score was 3.28 with a standard deviation of 1.09 for learning from the assessment process. Seventy-four percent scored at level 3 or higher with only one student receiving a score of 1 which was “not observed.”</p> <p>Impact on Student Learning</p> <p>The mean score on this indicator on the rubric was 3.04 with a standard deviation of 0.98. Sixty-five percent of the students received a score of 3 or higher but no one receiving a score of 1.</p> <p>Pedagogical Content Knowledge</p> <p>The mean score for this indicator was 3.13 with a standard deviation of 1.22. Fifty-seven percent of the students scored a 3 or higher with one student receiving a 1.</p>	<p>This benchmark is being piloted by the School of Education to determine its effectiveness in providing reliable data about the candidates’ abilities to assess and impact K-12 student learning. A summary of results from the spring Benchmark IV assessments was shared with the secondary faculty during the spring semester. Areas of concern and modifications to the instrument and process were discussed.</p> <p>The School of Education continues to work on inter-rater reliability. Scorers will re-calibrate before scoring in the spring.</p> <p>The School continues to work to refine the Benchmark II to provide better data to answer the three guiding questions below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the intern’s mathematical knowledge have the potential to support student thinking about mathematics with understanding? 2. Is the intern beginning to understand how to assess student thinking using interviews. (attends to student responses, bases comments on evidence from data, uses questions to probe student thinking)? 3. Has the intern intellectually engaged in making sense of material from Block I & II (respect for students, child centered, bases follow-up on evidence)?