School of Education – Elementary/Secondary Education 2010
PLANNING FOR LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT

1. What general outcome are you seeking?	2. 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		
Knowledge and Habits of Mind	Understand central concepts in Block I Have foundational knowledge of the areas he/she will teach Be a critical thinker Be attentive and actively involved in class activities Have respect for peers and instructors Comes to class prepared with all class assignments completed Efficacy guides conscientious self-assessments	1.Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class Discussions 4. Readings 5. Clear Expectations	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.	Fall 2009 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 which matched fall 2008. The most common negative indicator was "misjudges personal strengths and weaknesses when self-assessing" (10%) and "lacks development as a critical thinker" (9%). The negative indicator, "careless about assignments and preparation for class" was marked for 6% of the students. N=185 Spring 2010 Forty-five students (33%) had one or more negative indicators for theses general outcome which is an increase from spring 2009 (22%).. The most common negative indicator was "being a critical thinker" (18%) followed closely by "careless about assignments and preparation for class" (13%). "Gaps in understanding central concepts from the block" was third for this group (11%) while being the top indicator for spring 2009. N=137	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 addresses these concerns. Areas of Concern from fall 2006 Improving the writing skills of our students prior to entering the program continues to be a goal.

Written and Oral Communication	Writing ability – Insightful solid content; appropriate language' good organization; fluent; few mechanical errors Speaking ability – speaks clearly and models good English	1.Modeling 2. Written assignments 3. Feedback on work 4. Readings 5. Class presentations 6. Field experience lessons		<u>Fall 2009</u> Sixteen percent (16%) of students had a negative indicator for these general outcomes. Each student had only one negative indictor which was for writing. . N=185 <u>Spring 2010</u> Twelve percent (12%) of students had a negative indicator on this general outcome which matches spring 2009. Like last spring, all these students had only one negative indicator which was for writing. N=137	Providing opportunities for students to improve depth of reflection and abilities as critical thinkers. Need to possibly establish unit guidelines for attendance.
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		<u>Fall 2009</u> Only two percent (2%) of the students received a negative indicator for these general outcomes compared to 3% during 2007-2008. The two negative indicators that were assigned to one student each were "shows little aptitude for building rapport with teachers and students" and "tentative about teaching" N= 185 <u>Spring 2010</u> One percent (1%) of students received one negative indicator on this general outcome with "tentative about teaching" being the negative indicator for both students N=137	Spring data are shared with the faculty in the fall. Many instructors in Block II are now requiring students to complete Growth Plans based on their Benchmark I –Block I feedback The School of Education

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		<u>Fall 2009</u> Overall there has been a downward trend in the percent of student receiving negative indicators for these outcomes. Fourteen percent (14%) of students received at least one negative indicator fall 2009 compared to eighteen percent (18%) for fall 2008 and twenty percent (20%) during fall 2007. Six percent (6%) receiving two or more negative indicators with the largest percentage of students received a negative indicator for "missed 3 or more days worth of classes" (5%) and "not consistent about being on time" with 4%. N=185 <u>Spring 2010</u> Twenty-four percent (24%) of students received one or more negative indicators for this general outcome with 9% receiving more than one negative indicator. The largest percentage of these students received a negative indicator for "not consistent about being on time to class"(13%) This was followed by "misses 3 or more day worth of classes" (6%) and "prioritizes personal perspectives" (5%). N=137	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. This practice has continued..
			Benchmark II – Elementary Only		
Conceptual Understanding	Sensible choice of concept supported by clear knowledge of children's mathematical development. Choice of task, questions, and responses to the child reflect thorough understanding of math concept.	1. Modeling 2. Math Courses 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences	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.	During Fall 2009, eighty-seven students completed the Benchmark II assessment. For this cohort, 69% received passing scores. Twenty-one percent (21%) received failing scores were required to do the Benchmark II follow-up during the spring semester. This was a slight improvement over fall 2008 when 28% failed N=87 During the spring 2010, sixty-one percent (61%) of the benchmarks were scored as passing. This was a downturn compared to spring 2009 when 67% were passing. N=74	The School of Education continues to work on inter-rater reliability. Scorers continue to meet and discuss criteria for scoring the benchmark. The School continues to work to refine the Benchmark II to provide better data to answer the three guiding questions below. 1. Does the intern's mathematical knowledge have the
Quality of Written Report	Easy to read. Relatively error free.	1. Writing courses 2. Class assignments 3. Feedback from instructors and assessments			

Assessment of Learner's Development and Knowledge	Purposefully invites and probes the learner's thinking. Demonstrates a highly developed sense of how to analyze the learner's thinking. Accurate, insightful analysis of the learner. Suggests good instructional follow-up.	1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences		The following general trends continue to be seen in the feedback to the students: **Strengths** Looking Beyond Procedural Knowledge Attending to the Responses of Children **Areas for Growth** Ability to construct a working definition on which to build an interview Interpreting Responses of Children Writing Skills	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)?
Self-Evaluation of the Task Selection and Interview	Reflects meaningfully on personal performance from informed perspectives. Accurate about what is working, what needs to be improved, and how to improve it.	1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Individual conferences	Only pass and fails were reported to students.		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)?
Overall Effectiveness of the Reflective Cycle of Teaching	The performance provides a convincing demonstration that the student understands and can implement reflective practice.	1. Modeling 2. Field Experiences 3. Class discussions 4. Readings 5. Individual conferences			