

EVIDENCE FOR CAEP 1.2 Use of Research and Evidence to Measure P-12 Student Progress and Professional Practice

CAEP Standard: 1.2

InTASC/ NJPST: 6 and 9

Data: EPP triangulated data reveal candidates are able to use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice. Data used to show evidence of this standard include CPAST, edTPA, and the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (early field).

Analysis and Interpretation: Triangulated data in Exhibit 1.2.A make a strong case to support that EPP candidates can use assessment and research to measure P-12 student progress and their own professional practice. Data are presented from two administrations of edTPA; four administrations of the CPAST; and one administration of the early field assessment called High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics. The edTPA assessment was piloted in the 2016-2017 school year, however portfolios were locally evaluated and could not be used as common assessment data for CAEP. The EPP will, however have a series of data available by the CAEP site visit. The High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics are the new early field assessment which contain 8 assessment directly aligned to this standard.. It's inclusion into EPP quality assurance system came in the Fall of 2017, after the EPP realized we needed to strengthen our early field assessment, thus meeting the level of sufficiency and providing the EPP with valid and reliable data that would be an improved tool to measure EPP candidate growth. Data for the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 will be available at the CAEP site visit.

EPP data reveal candidates are able to use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession and use both to measure P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice. Data shared in Exhibit 1.2.A provides evidence of effectiveness on this standard by triangulating data on three assessments: CPAST, edTPA, and the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics (early field). Summaries of the assessments used in Exhibit 1.2.A are as follows:

CPAST: Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching

The mean scores of the CPAST rubrics for the two final (summative) assessments are 2.42 (F 17) and 2.54 (S 18) (rubric scale of 0-3) on the six rubrics that measure standard 1.2. The six rubrics include: C. Assessment of P-12 Learning, G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment; J. Data Guided Instruction; L. Assessment Techniques; M. Connections to Research and Theory; and N. Participates in Professional Development. These data show EPP strength in assessing P-12 learner, checking for

understanding and adjusting instruction through formative assessment, data guided instruction, assessment techniques, connections to research and theory and participates in professional development. High Scores for both applications of data were on rubrics G *Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessments* and N *Participates in Professional Development*. Although all scores were acceptable, the rubrics with the lowest means relative to EPP strengths include J: *Data Guided Instruction* and M: *Connections to Research and Theory*.

Program Strengths on **Using evidence to measure P-12 Student Progress** on the CPAST are as follows. Secondary Candidates scored highest across the board than Elementary. Elementary candidates were strongest in Fall of 17 and Spring 2018 on rubric G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment. Secondary Candidates scored highest. Program Strengths on **Using Evidence to improve Professional Practice** are as follows. Secondary Math and Science Candidates scored highest on Rubric N. Participates in Professional Development in the Fall of 2017. In the Spring of 2018, Art/Music and Health/PE scored the highest on rubric N. Secondary nudged out elementary candidates in both applications of data. All programs enjoyed growth from midterm to final on each rubric.

High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics

The initial use of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics show great strengths in 1.2 through the Standard 6 Assessment and Standard 7 Planning for Instruction rubrics. Candidates on the 1-4 scale scored an EPP 2.68 mean on the two standards. Candidates scored particularly high on the Standard 7: Planning for Instruction Rubric, which addresses using research and assessment evidence to measure students' progress. Secondary candidates scored highest in Fall 17 on rubric G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment and Rubric L. Assessment Techniques in the Spring of 2018 (m=2.88 out of 3). In this series of data, MAT candidates outscored UG students. Secondary English/Spanish candidates outscored all other programs by scoring a mean of 2.83. P-3 candidates scored the lowest mean of 2.32.

edTPA

To further support the EPP strength on CAEP 1.2, the two applications of data on the edTPA revealed EPP means of 2.82 and 2.83 on the 15 rubrics that are tagged by SCALE. These means are very strong considering candidates have no cut-score, and were only required to complete the portfolio. Strengths on both applications of data include Rubrics 1 (*Planning for Content Understanding*), 2 (*Planning to Support Varied Student Needs*), 3 (*Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning*), 4 (*Identifying and Supporting Language Demands*), 5 (*Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning*), 6 (*Learning Environment*), 12 (*Providing Feedback to Learners*). The lowest rubric means for both applications of data came

from Rubric 10 (*Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness*). Although it was the lowest mean, it was still an acceptable score.

Programs with the highest means on all rubrics in the Fall of 2017 include Elementary (2.99), and Spanish (2.92). Lowest scores on the rubrics in the same application of data include Secondary Science (2.27) and Secondary Math (2.33). In the Spring of 2018, Elementary (2.89) and Art (3.03) candidates were strongest. Lowest scores in this application of data were for P-3 (2.20) and Health and Physical Education (2.27).

When looking at item analysis, clear strengths emerged across the two series of data.

Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students To Inform Instruction (Spring 2018 and Fall 2017). 6/11 programs in which EPP data was reported scored a 3.0 or higher.

Rubric 6: Learning Environment. Spring 2018 had 11/12 programs with a rubric mean of 3 or better. In Fall 2017, 10/11 programs demonstrated a rubric mean of 3 or better.

Rubric 6 Learning Environment. 10/12 programs in which EPP data was reported scored a 3.0 or higher.

Rubric12: Providing Feedback to guide learners. Spring 2018 demonstrated 1/12 programs achieving a score at or above m=3.0 or better.

Areas of improvement were also revealed over the two applications of data and include:

Rubric15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction (Spring 2018). 1/12 programs scored a *mean* of 3.0 or better.

Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning (Spring 2018). 3/12 programs scored a *mean* score of 3.0 or better.

Rubric 3: Subject-Specific Pedagogy (Fall 2017). 3/11 programs scored a *mean* score of 3.0 or better.

Rubric 13: Student use of Feedback (Fall 2017). 3/11 programs scored a *mean* score of 3.0 or better.

Use of Data for Continuous Improvement:

Data for each of these assessments is reviewed each semester by the Dean's, the Office of Certification and Clinical Practice, Faculty, Deans Academic Leadership Council, and the University Teacher Education Advisory Council. It is also reviewed annually at the Teacher Education Retreat. Each of these reviews consists of an analysis of the data, implications, and use for improvement. Some examples of how the institution has acted upon data are included in Exhibit 5.3.B Data Informed Improvements. Some examples of these improvements include:

- a. Data sharing at the university-wide committee (UTEAC) each semester had given the content faculty opportunities to improve area of relative strength and need.
- b. To address the clear need for improvement in the area of differentiated instruction, the EPP has included two courses in special education (and intro course and a behavior management course) to address these needs. These courses have been approved to begin in the Fall of 2018.
- c. edTPA writing day implementation – four edTPA writing days have been mandated at critical times throughout the semester to provide support for the edTPA process.
- d. Department chairs have worked with programs to infuse edTPA activities in to all courses. An edTPA matrix was created to share where edTPA rubrics are taught.
- e. A series of monthly professional development for faculty was offered throughout the edTPA pilot year.
- f. Addition of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics to strengthen the need for valid and reliable early field assessment.

Data Charts on Next page

edTPA Fall 2017 and Spring 2018
Fall 2017 Data

INTASC/ NJPST Standards	CAEP Standards		Rubrics		EPP N=32	Elementary N=17	Spanish N=1	History- Secondary N=2	Visual Arts N=1	Science - Secondary N=1	Early Childhood Ed N=4	Mathematics - Secondary N=1	Performing Arts N=3	Health Education N=1	Physical Education N=1	MAT N=7	UG N=25	
2, 3, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	1	Planning for Content Understandings	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.8 0.6	3 0.6	3 0	2.5 0.5	3 0	2 0	3 0	2 0	2.7 0.5	2 0	3 0	3.29 0.70	2.72 0.449	
1, 2, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.3, 3.6	2	Planning to Support Varied Student Needs	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.9 0.7	3 0.7	4 0	3 0	3 0	2 0	2.5 0.5	3 0	2.7 0.5	2 0	2.5 0	3.29 0.70	2.82 0.61	
1, 2, 4, 7	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	3	Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.9 0.5	3 0.5	3 0	3 0	3 0	2 0	2.8 0.4	2 0	3 0	2 0	3 0	3.14 0.64	2.84 0.46	
1, 2, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5	4	Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	Mean: Std. Dev:	3 0.6	3 0.6		2 0	3 0	3 0	2.8 0.4	3 0	2.7 0.5	3 0	3 0	3.43 0.49	2.83 0.55	
1, 6, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5	5	Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.8 0.6	2.9 0.7	3 0	2.5 0.5	3 0	3 0	2.5 0.5	2 0	3 0.8	2 0	3 0	3.14 0.83	2.68 0.55	
2, 3, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	6	Learning Environment	Mean: Std. Dev:	3 0.3	3.1 0.2	3 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	3.3 0.4	3 0	2.7 0.5	3 0	3 0	3.14 0.35	3.00 0.28	
2, 3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	7	Engaging Students in Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.8 0.7	3.1 0.7	2 0	2 0	3 0	2 0	3 0	3 0	2.3 0.5	2 0	2.5 0	3.43 0.73	2.66 0.54	
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	8	Deepening Student Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.8 0.5	2.9 0.3	3 0	2 0	3 0	2 0	3 0.7	4 0	2.3 0.5	2 0	3 0	2.86 0.35	2.76 0.59	
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	9	Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.7 0.8	3.1 0.7	1 0	2 0	3 0	2 0	2.3 0.4	2 0	2.7 0.5	2 0	3 0	3.14 0.64	2.60 0.75	
9	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	10	Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.6 0.5	2.8 0.3	3 0	2.5 0.5	3 0	2 0	2.8 0.4	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2.86 0.35	2.60 0.49	
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	11	Analysis of Student Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.7 0.7	3 0.8	3 0	0 0	3 0	3 0	3 0	2 0	2 0.8	2 0	2.5 0	3.29 0.70	2.62 0.68	
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	12	Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	3.2 0.8	3.4 0.8	4 0	0 0	4 0	2 0	3.5 0.5	2 0	2.5 0.4	2 0	3 0	3.57 0.73	3.14 0.84	
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	13	Student Use of Feedback	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.7 0.8	2.9 1	3 0	0.5 0.5	3 0	2 0	2.5 0.5	2 0	2.3 0.5	3 0	2 0	3.29 0.88	2.56 0.75	
1, 2, 4, 5	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	14	Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.7 0.6	2.8 0.5		2 1	3 0	3 0	3 0	2 0	2.8 0.6	2 0	2 0	3.14 0.35	2.65 0.59	
6, 7, 8, 9	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	15	Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Mean: Std. Dev:	2.7 0.8	2.9 0.6	3 0	2.5 0.5	3 0	1 0	3 0.7	1 0	2.2 0.8	3 0	2 0	2.86 0.83	2.66 0.78	
					Mean	2.82	2.99	2.92	1.97	3.07	2.27	2.87	2.33	2.53	2.27	2.63	3.19	2.74
					Std. Dev.	0.63	0.60	0.00	0.23	0.00	0.00	0.36	0.00	0.49	0.00	0.00	0.62	0.59
					Overall Mean													2.66
					Overall Std. Dev.													0.27

Spring 2018 Data

INTASC/ NJPST Standards	CAEP Standards	Rubrics			EPP N=92	Elementary N=46	Spanish N=2	History- Secondary N=3	Visual Arts N=7	Science - Secondary N=5	Early Childhood Ed N=2	Mathematics - Secondary N=3	Performing Arts N=3	Health Education N=1	Physical Education N=4	English - Secondary N=16	MAT N= 27	UG N= 65
2, 3, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	1	Planning for Content Understandings	Mean:	2.9	2.8	2	3.3	3.1	2.6	2.5	3.2	2	2	2	3.1	3.07	2.76
				Std. Dev:	0.8	0.8	0	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.8	2.8	0	0	0.5	0.66	0.77
1, 2, 4, 7, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 3.3, 3.6	2	Planning to Support Varied Student Needs	Mean:	2.8	2.9	3	2.7	3.1	2.6	2	2.7	3	3	2.3	2.8	3.07	2.74
				Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6	0	0.5	0.3	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0.8	0.4	0.47	0.56
1, 2, 4, 7	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3	3	Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	Mean:	2.9	3	2.5	3	3.3	2.4	2.5	3.3	3.3	3	2	2.9	3.11	2.86
				Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1.2	0	0	0.8	0.68	0.72
1, 2, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5,	4	Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	Mean:	2.8	2.9		3.7	3.3	2	2.5	3	3	2	2	2.8	2.92	2.81
				Std. Dev:	0.6	0.5		0.5	0.5	0.6	0.5	0	0	0	0.7	0.7	0.67	0.63
1, 6, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5	5	Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	Mean:	2.9	2.7	2	3.3	3.4	3	1.5	3.3	3.3	2	2.3	3.1	3.04	2.78
				Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0.4	0.5	0.58	0.75
2, 3, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	6	Learning Environment	Mean:	3	3	3	3	3.1	3	3	3	3	3	2.5	3.1	3.02	3.02
				Std. Dev:	0.2	0.2	0	0	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0.2	0.29
2, 3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5,	7	Engaging Students in Learning	Mean:	2.8	2.9	2.5	3	3	2.6	3	2.3	3	2	2.3	2.9	2.93	2.78
				Std. Dev:	0.5	0.4	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0.4	0.6	0.47	0.51
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	8	Deepening Student Learning	Mean:	2.9	2.9	2.5	3.3	3	2.8	3	2.8	3	2	2.5	2.9	2.81	2.90
				Std. Dev:	0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.7	0	0.2	0	0	0.5	0.7	0.55	0.58
3, 4, 5, 8	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.5	9	Subject-Specific Pedagogy	Mean:	2.8	3.1	2	3.3	3.1	2	1	3	3	1	2.3	2.8	2.93	2.80
				Std. Dev:	0.8	0.7	0	0.5	0.3	0.6	0	0	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.86	0.77
3	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	10	Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	Mean:	2.6	2.8	2	2.3	2.6	2	3	2.7	2.3	2	2.5	2.6	2.70	2.60
				Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6	0	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.7	0.60	0.60
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	11	Analysis of Student Learning	Mean:	3	2.9	2	2.3	3.1	2.2	2	3	2.7	2	1.8	2.8	2.81	2.71
				Std. Dev:	1	0.7	0	0.5	0.6	1.2	0	0	1.2	0	0.8	0.8	0.82	0.84
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	12	Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	Mean:	3.1	3.2	3	3.3	2.9	2.4	1.5	3.3	4	3	2	3.1	3.07	3.08
				Std. Dev:	0.9	0.7	0	0.5	0.8	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0	0.7	0.9	0.86	0.86
6	1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 3.6	13	Student Use of Feedback	Mean:	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	3	2	1	2	3.3	3	1.8	2.4	2.67	2.49
				Std. Dev:	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0	0	0.9	0	0.4	0.7	0.77	0.75
1, 2, 4, 5	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.6	14	Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning	Mean:	2.7	2.7		2.3	3	2.6	2.5	3	3	3	2.3	2.7	2.87	2.66
				Std. Dev:	0.6	0.6		0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0	0	0	0.4	0.8	0.51	0.64
6, 7, 8, 9	1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6	15	Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	Mean:	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.3	2.7	2	2	2.8	3.3	2	2.5	2.6	2.78	2.70
				Std. Dev:	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.9	1	0.2	0.5	0	0.5	0.9	0.74	0.74
				Mean:	2.83	2.89	2.42	2.92	3.05	2.41	2.20	2.89	3.01	2.33	2.21	2.84	2.92	2.78
				Std. Dev:	0.67	0.61	0.19	0.40	0.53	0.51	0.27	0.28	0.56	0.00	0.47	0.67	0.63	0.66
				Overall Mean	2.69													
				Overall Std. Dev.	0.46													

Candidate Preservice Assessment of Student Teaching (CPAST)

Fall 2017 Midterm

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Spanish	MAT	UG
				N=30	N=16	N=4	N=3	N=2	N=4	N=1	N=7	N=23
6	1.1, 1.2	C. Assessment of P-12 Learning	Mean:	1.77	1.88	2	1.33	1	1.75	2	2.14	1.63
			Std. Dev:	0.63	0.62	0	1.15	0	0.5	0	0.35	0.63
6, 8	1.1, 1.2	G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	Mean:	1.97	2.25	1.75	1.67	1.5	1.75	1	2.00	1.92
			Std. Dev:	0.72	0.58	0.96	1.15	0.71	0.5	0	0.53	0.75
6	1.1, 1.2, 2.3	J. Data-Guided Instruction	Mean:	1.63	1.81	1.75	1.33	1	1.25	2	1.71	1.58
			Std. Dev:	0.56	0.4	0.96	0.58	0	0.5	0	0.45	0.57
7	1.1, 1.2	L. Assessment Techniques	Mean:	1.90	2.00	1.75	2.00	1.5	1.75	2	2.14	1.79
			Std. Dev:	0.55	0.52	0.5	1.00	0.71	0.5	0	0.35	0.56
9	1.1, 1.2, 3.3	M. Connections to Research and Theory	Mean:	1.60	1.69	1.25	1.67	1	1.75	2	1.71	1.54
			Std. Dev:	0.67	0.79	0.5	0.58	0	0.5	0	0.45	0.71
9	1.1, 1.2, 3.3	N. Participates in Professional Development (PD)	Mean:	2.47	2.69	2.25	2.33	2.5	2	2	2.86	2.33
			Std. Dev:	0.63	0.48	0.96	0.58	0.71	0.82	0	0.35	0.63
Overall Mean				1.89	2.05	1.79	1.72	1.42	1.71	1.83	2.09	1.80
Overall Std. Dev.				0.63	0.57	0.65	0.84	0.36	0.55	0.00	0.41	0.64

Fall 2017 Final

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/ Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Spanish	MAT	UG
				N=32	N=17	N=4	N=4	N=2	N=4	N=1	N=7	N=25
6	1.1, 1.2	C. Assessment of P-12 Learning	Mean:	2.50	2.65	2.5	2.50	1.5	2.25	3	2.86	2.40
			Std. Dev:	0.67	0.49	0.58	1.00	0.71	0.96	0	0.35	0.69
6, 8	1.1, 1.2	G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	Mean:	2.56	2.71	2.75	2.00	1.5	2.75	3	2.71	2.52
			Std. Dev:	0.62	0.47	0.5	0.82	0.71	0.5	0	0.45	0.64
6	1.1, 1.2, 2	J. Data-Guided Instruction	Mean:	2.28	2.41	2.25	2.25	1	2.5	2	2.57	2.20
			Std. Dev:	0.58	0.51	0.5	0.50	0	0.58	0	0.49	0.57
7	1.1, 1.2	L. Assessment Techniques	Mean:	2.44	2.71	2.5	2.25	1	2.2	2	3.00	2.28
			Std. Dev:	0.62	0.47	0.58	0.50	0	0.5	0	0.00	0.60
9	1.1, 1.2, 3	M. Connections to Research and Theory	Mean:	2.13	2.18	2	2.00	0.5	2.75	3	2.57	2.00
			Std. Dev:	0.71	0.53	0	0.82	0.71	0.5	0	0.49	0.69
9	1.1, 1.2, 3	N. Participates in Professional Development (PD)	Mean:	2.63	2.71	2.75	2.50	2.5	2.25	3	2.86	2.56
			Std. Dev:	0.49	0.47	0.5	0.58	0.71	0.5	0	0.35	0.50
Overall Mean				2.42	2.56	2.46	2.25	1.33	2.45	2.67	2.76	2.33
Overall Std. Dev.				0.62	0.49	0.44	0.70	0.47	0.59	0.00	0.36	0.62

Spring 2018 Midterm

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	English	Spanish	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	Art/Music	MAT	UG
				N=84	N=44	N=22	N=12	N=2	N=3	N=2	N=9	N=27	N=64
6	1.1, 1.2	C. Assessment of P-12 Learning	Mean:	2.12	2.02	2.32	2.00	1.67	1.50	3.00	2.42	1.54	1.80
			Std. Dev:	0.63	0.59	0.57	0.71	0.58	0.71	0	0.67	0.71	0.62
6, 8	1.1, 1.2	G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	Mean:	2.17	2.30	2.23	1.56	1.67	1.50	2.50	2.42	1.56	2.09
			Std. Dev:	0.64	0.55	0.61	0.73	0.58	0.71	0	0.79	0.81	0.55
6	1.1, 1.2, 2.	J. Data-Guided Instruction	Mean:	1.83	1.84	2.18	1.33	1.33	0.50	2.00	2.33	1.64	2.16
			Std. Dev:	0.76	0.61	0.66	1.22	0.58	0.71	0	0.65	0.67	0.77
7	1.1, 1.2	L. Assessment Techniques	Mean:	2.06	2.05	2.32	1.89	1.33	1.00	2.50	2.42	1.81	2.01
			Std. Dev:	0.50	0.43	0.48	0.33	0.58	0	0	0.51	0.52	0.48
9	1, 1.2, 3.	M. Connections to Research and Theory	Mean:	1.94	1.95	2.23	1.78	0.33	0.50	3.00	2.08	1.02	1.45
			Std. Dev:	0.96	0.86	0.87	1.09	0.58	0.71	0	1	0.88	1.01
9	1, 1.2, 3.	N. Participates in Professional Development (PD)	Mean:	2.36	2.36	2.64	1.56	2.67	2.00	2.50	2.67	1.89	2.18
			Std. Dev:	0.83	0.87	0.49	1.13	0.58	0	0	0.49	0.95	0.79
Overall Mean				2.08	2.09	2.32	1.69	1.50	1.17	2.58	2.39	1.58	1.95
Overall Std. Dev.				0.72	0.65	0.61	0.87	0.58	0.47	0.00	0.69	0.76	0.70

Spring 2018 Final

INTASC	CAEP	Competency Area		EPP	Elementary	Secondary	Art/Music	Health & Physical	P-3 & TSD	English	MAT	UG
				N=78	N=36	N=25	N=10	N=5	N=2	N=14	N=28	N=64
6	1.1, 1.2	C. Assessment of P-12 Learning	Mean:	2.60	2.58	2.80	2.60	1.80	2.50	2.83	2.61	2.61
			Std. Dev:	0.54	0.5	0.41	0.70	0.45	0.71	0.29	0.62	0.49
6, 8	1.1, 1.2	G. Checking for Understanding and Adjusting Instruction through Formative Assessment	Mean:	2.67	2.72	2.80	2.50	2.00	2.50	2.83	2.79	2.69
			Std. Dev:	0.53	0.45	0.41	0.71	0.71	0.71	0.29	0.58	0.46
6	1.1, 1.2, 2.	J. Data-Guided Instruction	Mean:	2.38	2.44	2.64	2.20	1.40	1.50	2.74	2.36	2.42
			Std. Dev:	0.61	0.5	0.49	0.63	0.55	0.71	0.49	0.61	0.58
7	1.1, 1.2	L. Assessment Techniques	Mean:	2.58	2.58	2.88	2.30	1.80	2.00	2.79	2.54	2.61
			Std. Dev:	0.57	0.5	0.33	0.67	0.84	0	0.44	0.64	0.52
9	1, 1.2, 3.	M. Connections to Research and Theory	Mean:	2.35	2.36	2.48	2.60	1.40	1.50	2.61	2.43	2.38
			Std. Dev:	0.64	0.64	0.51	0.52	0.55	0.71	0.55	0.56	0.65
9	1, 1.2, 3.	N. Participates in Professional Development (PD)	Mean:	2.68	2.67	2.68	2.80	2.80	2.00	2.70	2.71	2.70
			Std. Dev:	0.5	0.53	0.48	0.42	0.45	0	0.525	0.44	0.49
Overall Mean				2.54	2.56	2.71	2.50	1.87	2.00	2.75	2.57	2.57
Overall Std. Dev.				0.57	0.52	0.44	0.61	0.59	0.47	0.43	0.58	0.53

Spring 2018

High Leverage Teaching Proficiency Rubrics (1.2)

INTASC / NJPST	CAEP	Criteria	EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD	
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
			N=18		N=13		N=6		N=12		N=2		N=1		N=2		N=12	
6	1.1.1, 2.1.3	STANDARD 6: Assessment	2.42	0.67	2.34	0.77	2.50	0.75	2.50	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.50	0.71	2.42	0.67
7	1.1.1, 2.1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction	2.95	0.60	2.84	0.64	3.00	0.55	2.92	0.67	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60
6	1.1.1, 2.1.3	STANDARD 6: Assessment	2.42	0.67	2.34	0.77	2.50	0.75	2.50	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.50	0.71	2.42	0.67
7	1.1.1, 2.1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction	2.95	0.60	2.84	0.64	3.00	0.55	2.92	0.67	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60
6	1.1.1, 2.1.3	STANDARD 6: Assessment	2.42	0.67	2.34	0.77	2.50	0.75	2.50	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.50	0.71	2.42	0.67
7	1.1.1, 2.1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction	2.95	0.60	2.84	0.64	3.00	0.55	2.92	0.67	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60
6	1.1.1, 2.1.3	STANDARD 6: Assessment	2.42	0.67	2.34	0.77	2.50	0.75	2.50	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	1.50	0.71	2.42	0.67
7	1.1.1, 2.1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction	2.95	0.60	2.84	0.64	3.00	0.55	2.92	0.67	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60
Overall			2.68	0.04	2.59	0.07	2.75	0.11	2.71	0	2.5	0	3	0	2.25	0.38	2.71	0.04