

Assessment

CAEP Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.3, 5.1,5.2

NJPST Standards: 1-10

INTasc Standards: 1-10

1. During which part of the candidate's experience is the assessment used? Is the assessment used just once or multiple times during the candidate's preparation?

The High Leverage Teaching Proficiency Rubrics are EPP created rubrics directly aligned to InTASC, CAEP, and the NJPST. Each Rubric covers an InTASC Standard. The assessment is administered towards the end of the 100 hour semester, which is the semester preceding full time clinical practice. Since implementing the yearlong clinical practice, the EPP recognized the need for a valid and reliable instrument to measure candidate early field experience, beyond a simple checklist. The instrument was developed using the InTASC rubrics looking at what is developmentally expected at this point in the candidate's clinical experience. It was piloted in the Spring of 2018. Two series of data will be included during the site visit.

2. Who uses the assessment and how are the individuals trained on the use of the assessment.

The candidate, university based clinical educator (university supervisor), and the school-based clinical educator (cooperating teacher) conduct a three way conference in which they review the rubric targets. The university based clinical educator completes the rubric based on the input from the three-way conference. All university based clinical educators are trained on the usage of the assessment in their training, which occurs each semester. Candidates are trained on the three way conference at the yearlong clinical practice orientation that occurs each semester. School based clinical educators are trained on the instruments during their orientation each semester, or through the mentor teacher academy, which occurs monthly through the semester. An online training module is being created to reach each clinical educator that may not attend the required orientation.

3. What is the intended use of the assessment and what is the assessment purported to measure?

The assessment is used to measure candidate skills, dispositions and knowledge of P-12 learning through the lens of the four InTASC categories in their semester prior to full time clinical

practice. The assessment is newly designed and was administered for the first time in the Spring 2018.

The following chart shows the alignment between the instrument and CAEP, NJPST, and InTASC.

Instac Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria
1	1	1.1, 1.4	STANDARD 1: Learner Development
1	2	1.1, 1.3, 1.4	STANDARD 2: Learning Differences
1	3	1.1	STANDARD 3: Learning Environments
2	4,5	1.1,1.4	STANDARDS 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content
3	6	1.1,1.2,1.3	STANDARD 6: Assessment
3	7	1.1,1.2,1.4	STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction
3	8	1.1,1.3,1.4	STANDARD 8: Instructional Strategies
4	9	1.1	STANDARD 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (NJPST 9 and 11)
4	10	1.1	STANDARD 10: Leadership and Collaboration

4. Please describe how validity/trustworthiness was established for the assessment.

Validity

Given that the High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric was developed during the 17-18 academic year, the initial focus of the School of Education (in conjunction with the Office of Planning and Decision Support), was in establishing the content validity of the assessment tool. The validity of the rubric was established by gathering evidence based-feedback on each individual rubric trait (whether the trait is essential, useful or not necessary) from an evaluation

panel of 10 experts in the field. The data collected during the rubric evaluation process was then used in calculating the content validity ratio for each rubric trait.

High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric Trait Content Validity Ratios (CVR)	
Standard/Trait	CVR
Standard 1: Learner Development	.80
Standard 2: Learning Differences	1.0
Standard 3: Learning Environments	.80
Standard 4 & 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content	.80
Standard 6: Assessment	1.0
Standard 7: Planning for Instruction	1.0
Standard 8: Instructional Strategies	.80
Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice	1.0
Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration	.60

Referencing the CVR critical values table developed by Ayre and Scally (2014), it was determined (given the number of evaluation panel respondents) that the minimum number of respondents needed, who identified a trait as essential, for the trait to be valid is nine (9)(which would result in a CVR of .80). A review of the content validity ratios identified Traits/Standard 1-9 as valid measures while Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration requires further review or elimination.

To determine the overall validity of the rubric the content validity index (CVI) was calculated using the CVR outcomes provided in the table above (CVI = overall mean score of item CVRs). When interpreting the CVI a value of .800 or greater was identified as an acceptable minimum for the determination of validity.

Overall Rubric Content Validity: Content Validity Index (CVI)
.867

Going forward, as the rubric is applied to future student cohorts and as existing student cohorts evaluated by tool persist in the TPP, the School of Education will continue to analyze the validity of the rubric and will seek to establish both construct and predictive validity when applicable. The processes of establishing the construct and predictive validity of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric will include the comparison of rubric outcomes (by student) to other assessment outcomes within/outside of the program (including, but not limited to, CCAST outcomes, student teaching evaluations, employer evaluations, etc..)

5. Please describe how reliability/consistency was established for the assessment.

Overall Reliability

Given that each student was assessed by a different evaluator the use of Cohen’s Kappa (the measure utilized to evaluate inter-rater reliability) is less applicable than the use of Cronbach’s Alpha which is the most common measure of internal reliability.

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
0.886	9

The Cronbach’s Alpha value ($\alpha = .886$) indicates a high level of internal consistency (good internal reliability)

Cronbach’s Alpha Interpretation	
$\geq .900$	Excellent
.899 - .800	Good
.799 - .700	Acceptable
.699-.600	Questionable

The internal reliability of an assessment instrument is often impacted by the number of items/scales contained within the tool. Often the greater the number of reliable items included in the instrument results in a higher alpha value. In the case of the High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric the main variable keeping the instrument from attaining an alpha value of greater than .900 is the number of items on the rubrics. (Even with a relatively low number of items (for the purposes of the analysis), the rubric still attains a high alpha value)

Individual Item Reliability

Rubric Scale Items	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
Learner Development	18	2.89	0.58	0.777	0.862
Learning Differences	18	2.72	0.46	0.543	0.881
Learning Environment	18	2.83	0.62	0.608	0.876
Content Knowledge & Application	18	2.56	0.62	0.687	0.869
Assessment	18	2.39	0.70	0.736	0.864

Instruction	18	2.94	0.64	0.751	0.863
Instructional Strategies	18	2.83	0.51	0.659	0.873
Learning & Ethical Practice	18	2.61	0.85	0.705	0.871
Leadership & Collaboration	18	2.72	0.46	0.295	0.896

Two measures to focus on in the analysis include:

- a. Corrected Item-Total Correlation: identifies how well the item differentiates between students who performed well overall on the evaluation and those who did not. The higher the value (closer to 1.0) the better the item differentiates among high performing and low performing students.

Corrected Item-Total Correlation Interpretation	
≥ .40	Very Good
.39 - .30	Good
.29 - .20	Fair
< .20	Poor

- b. Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted: identifies the impact of the deletion of an individual item on the overall reliability of the instrument. If the overall alpha value decreases with the deletion of the item that identifies that the item is a good discriminator adds to the overall reliability of the instrument. If the overall alpha value increases with the deletion of the item that identifies that the item may not be a good discriminator and negatively impacts the overall reliability of the instrument.

An analysis of the individual items on the High Leverage Teaching Practice Rubric identifies that eight of the nine scales are very good discriminators and their inclusion in

The Corrected Item-Total Correlation value of one scale, “Leadership and Collaboration” (.295), identifies that it is a fair discriminator and in its inclusion in the rubric has a negative impact on its overall reliability. An analysis of the item’s mean and standard deviations suggests that there was little variation in the way that students were evaluated within this scale item, meaning that student who performed well overall and those score lower were rated the same relative to “Leadership and Collaboration”. (Although there was a great deal of variance in the other items 16 out of 18 students received a 3 in “Leadership and Collaboration” with the other two students receiving a 2.

6. Data Interpretation and Analysis

The High Leverage Teaching Proficiency Rubrics are based on the following four (4) weighted points:

- 1: Does not meet Expectation (pre-emergent)
- 2: Approaching Expectation (Novice)
- 3: Meets Expectation (Proficient)
- 4: Exceeds Expectation (Advanced)

Data was collected Spring 2018. There was a very low number of candidates completing their first semester of the yearlong clinical practice. There will be two more series of data collected before the April 2019 site visit. Based on this single set of data, the EPP demonstrated a relative strength in Category 1: The Learner and Learning. The category in which the EPP scored lowest was in Category 2: Content Knowledge. The second highest category was 3: Instructional Practice. Because of the small number, not all programs were represented and data is only given on those programs with candidates. Additionally, TSD candidates are endorsements added to other programs, therefore there is some overlap in the scores where a student may be counted in two areas (if a candidate is in the P-3 TSD program their scores are counted in both). Secondary candidates were grouped together. There was only one secondary student who had a dual major in English and Spanish.

Category 1: The Learner and Learning

The EPP candidates are adept at InTASC category 1: The Learner and Learning. This category presented the highest mean scores of any of the four for the EPP (2.82). MAT students (2.94) scored slightly higher than the undergraduates (2.70). Elementary, Secondary and TSD candidates scored above the EPP mean. The P-3 program ($n=2$) had the lowest mean score of 2.50 in instructional practice. STANDARD 1 Learner Development was the rubric with the highest mean scores. In fact, 3 out of the 5 programs (Secondary, HEPE, TSD) scored a 3.0 or better. STANDARD 2: Learning Differences, was the lowest rubric for category 1, with only one out of five programs achieving a 3.0 mean score.

Category 2: Content Knowledge

The EPP candidates scored mean scores in all programs that were approaching the meets expectation category. The means in this category represented the lowest mean scores of the four categories. There was only one rubric for this standard. The EPP *mean* was 2.58. MAT students, once again, scored higher than the undergraduates did. The secondary student scored a mean of 3.0, the highest of any program. With an $n=1$. P-3 candidates ($n=2$) once again demonstrated the lowest mean (2.0), while the Elementary candidates scored in line with the EPP mean. TSD and HEPE candidates scored a 2.50 mean.

Category 3: Instructional Practice

EPP candidates scored well on the three rubrics ($m=2.74$) that made up the Instructional Practice category. MATs outscored undergraduates with a mean of 2.89 to the undergraduate $m=2.64$. Elementary, TSD and Secondary programs outscored the EPP mean. HEPE candidates ($n=2$) had the lowest mean at 2.33. Category 3 was a relative strength for the P-3 program. Candidates scored highest on STANDARD 7: Planning for Instruction, with 4/5 programs achieving a mean of 3.0 or better. STANDARD 6: Assessment was the rubric which had the lowest average mean scores across programs.

Category 4 Professional Responsibility

MU candidates demonstrate professional responsibility in their early field placement. The EPP mean of 2.74 was solid. This is the only category where undergraduates outscored MAT candidates. Secondary and TSD candidates scored above the EPP mean. Elementary candidates

scored slightly below the EPP mean (one one-hundredth of a point). Candidates scored consistently on both rubrics which were combined to obtain scores for this category.

Implications of the data:

1. EPP candidates scored highest in Category 1 and Category 3. They are adept at understanding multi-facets of learners and are relatively strong in respect to assessment, planning for instruction and with selecting instructional strategies.
2. For most categories, MAT candidates outscored undergraduate candidates. There were over twice as many undergraduates which may have impacted that finding.
3. Although the n was low, P-3 candidates scored lowest in three of the four categories. This information was shared with the P-3 program director and will also be triangulated with other data to see trends.
4. This was the first application of data as the assessment is newly developed. Improvements will be made and are discussed below.

Use for Continuous Improvement

All data is shared at Deans meetings, Deans Educational Leadership Council meetings, faculty meetings, and partnership committee meetings. This data is the first application of data and based on the results, may require some revision to the assessment (e.g. adding a rubric to improve strength of category 2). Some other improvements that will be made to programs includes:

1. Improve training for University Based Clinical Educators on the assessment.
2. Professional Development on the developmental curriculum for faculty and University Based Clinical Educators.
3. Continue to improve implementation of the developmental curriculum into methods courses.
4. All EPP candidates are dual majors, therefore they receive full instruction in a content area outside of education. The lowest EPP mean was in Content Knowledge. This category had only one rubric. The team met after reviewing data and is planning to add another rubric to provide depth to the category.

InTASC Standard 1 Learner Development

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 1: Learner Development</p> <p>The candidate understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>has a limited awareness of individual differences in the classroom.</i> • <i>provides a learning environment that serves primarily to control learners' behavior and minimally supports the learning goals</i> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>Learners are observed in activities that are developmentally inappropriate</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>There is little or no evidence that the candidate links learners' development with new learning.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>demonstrates a growing awareness of individual differences in the classroom by addressing a limited range of developmental levels.</i> • <i>demonstrates responsiveness to learners' needs and is able to make some adjustments for learners' needs.</i> • <i>makes vague or superficial links between learners' development and new learning.</i> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>Learners participate in activities that focus solely on one modality for learning.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>regularly discusses the varying levels of student development with the candidate.</i> • <i>is flexible and confident in his or her relationships with students.</i> • <i>makes consistent connections between the plan for instruction and existing knowledge about child development.</i> • <i>creates accommodations for a variety of learners based on the candidate's knowledge of individual learners' development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical).</i> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>Learners are actively participating in learning experiences that occur in multiple modalities.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>designs and modifies instruction to meet each area of development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical).</i> • <i>consistently and explicitly uses multiple strategies (e.g. questions, materials, and facilitated responses) to elicit learners' thinking, actively facilitating the construction of their understanding of the lesson in a meaning based context.</i> • <i>links learners' development and prior academic learning to new learning.</i> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>Learners are consistently engaged in lessons that facilitate the active nature of their learning.</i></p>

InTASC Standard 2 Learning Differences

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 2: Learning Differences</p> <p>The candidate uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards</p>	<p><i>The plan does not consider developmental differences among learners</i></p> <p><i>Materials reflect a one-size-fits-all approach that demonstrates little ability to adapt the lesson to fit individual learners.</i></p> <p><i>There is little evidence of differentiated instruction.</i></p> <p><i>The assessments reflect little differentiation for individual students, primarily target lower level thinking, and do not address higher order thinking.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate allows disruptive behavior to interfere with learners' learning.</i></p>	<p><i>The plan addresses a limited range of developmental levels and does not consider developmental differences among learners.</i></p> <p><i>The materials developed are accurate and reflect a growing awareness of student differences and capabilities.</i></p> <p><i>The assessments show evidence of differentiation and address some higher level thinking skills</i></p> <p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>demonstrates some capacity for adapting individual lessons to meet student needs and is beginning to see more approaches to differentiating instruction.</i> • <i>demonstrates respect for learners.</i> 	<p><i>The plan includes accommodations for learners based on the candidate's knowledge of individual learners' development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical).</i></p> <p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>uses data to plan lessons that are developmentally appropriate, enhance the delivery of instruction, and are relevant to the learning goals.</i> • <i>effectively differentiates instruction for a small group of students</i> • <i>provides students with multiple ways to demonstrate their learning at the higher levels of Blooms taxonomy.</i> • <i>demonstrates rapport with and respect for learners.</i> 	<p><i>The plan includes scaffolds intended to increase the learners' development.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate develops highly engaging materials to meet the learning needs of each individual.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>makes instructional decisions based on each learner's cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical development.</i> • <i>uses assessment to maximize the development of knowledge, critical thinking skills, and problem solving and make inferences that lead to the development of new strategies.</i> • <i>is constantly building and nurturing relationships with students, who appear highly motivated and willing to explore the material beyond the learning goals.</i>

InTASC Standard 3 Learning Environments

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 3: Learning Environments</p> <p>The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fails to plan for, developmental differences in students. • provides a learning environment that serves primarily to control learners' behavior and minimally supports the learning goals. • engages students at a minimal level with questions asked at the low levels of Bloom's taxonomy • demonstrates limited knowledge of proactive classroom management strategies and does not anticipate student behaviors 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • plans for transitions, but has limited effectiveness in leading them. . Sufficient material is planned to keep students fully engaged. Some attention is given to developmental differences. • provides a learning environment that enables students to reach some of the learning goals. • demonstrates some knowledge of proactive classroom management strategies and does not anticipate student behaviors 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • consistently plans and leads effective and efficient transitions. The plan is flexible enough to account for unanticipated student needs and unexpected student behaviors. • developmental differences are consistently addressed by the plan. • creates relationships with students that consistently demonstrate knowledge of proactive classroom management strategies. <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>Students appear motivated, ask numerous questions about the content and consistently engage with the content at higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate excels at</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • planning for regularly assessed individual and group performances in order to design and modify instruction to meet each area of development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical). • anticipating student behaviors and responding effectively to unanticipated and difficult student behaviors. • creating relationships with students that enable the effective use of proactive classroom management strategies. <p><i>The plan includes scaffolds intended to increase the learners' development.</i></p> <p><i>The candidate has created a supportive, low-risk social environment that fosters mutual respect among learners. Learners demonstrate an exceptional level of engagement with learning.</i></p>

InTASC Standards 4 and 5 Content Knowledge and Application of Content

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standards 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content</p> <p>The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.</p> <p>The candidate understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates a limited knowledge of instructional strategies or an ability to use vocabulary and academic language that is specific to the discipline.</i> <i>provides a limited number of content explanations.</i> <i>demonstrates a limited knowledge of content specific resources for developing materials.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Responses include content inaccuracies that will lead to learner misunderstandings.</i> 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates an increasing awareness and ability to model appropriate, content specific vocabulary and academic language that is specific to the discipline.</i> <i>uses some examples and makes minor adjustments in the explanations for the different interests and levels of students</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>Content responses are accurate, and the candidate uses a few instructional strategies that are specific to the discipline.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates significant content knowledge and collaborates with the candidate to expand or deepen his or her content knowledge.</i> <i>engages learners in generating and evaluating new ideas and novel approaches to content specific strategies.</i> <i>models and provides opportunities for learners to understand academic language</i> <i>makes interdisciplinary connections to promote language and literacy development.</i> <i>effectively adjusts explanations to account for different developmental and interest levels</i> <i>consistently creates clear graphics that are developmentally appropriate with a clear focus on content specific learning</i> 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>uses multiple representations and explanations of key ideas in order to connect them to varied learner backgrounds.</i> <i>is skilled at recognizing content specific misconceptions, responding with content specific strategies, and developing new strategies for teaching content.</i> <i>excels at creating opportunities for students to learn, practice, and master academic content knowledge</i> <i>excels at accurately and effectively communicating concepts, processes, and knowledge in the content area</i> <i>can represent content knowledge in multiple ways</i> <i>excels at using supplementary resources and technologies effectively</i>

InTASC Standard 6 Assessment

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 6: Assessment</p> <p>The candidate understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the candidate’s and learner’s decision making.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>uses a single, low level, summative assessment to formally evaluate student learning.</i> • <i>demonstrates little awareness of approaches to assess higher level thinking and demonstrates little expertise for assessing higher level thinking</i> • <i>demonstrates a limited ability to make inferences about learner performance based on assessment data</i> • <i>demonstrates little understanding of the connection between learning goals and assessment</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>The students demonstrate limited achievement of the learning goals</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>uses multiple assessments, including pretests and formative assessments, as a means of providing feedback to students.</i> • <i>demonstrates some proficiency at identifying higher level thinking skills</i> • <i>is able to make some inferences based on more than one assessment</i> • <i>demonstrates some proficiency at using learner performance data to make inferences about student thinking that lead to improved teaching or better strategies.</i> • <i>creates goals that are well aligned with the curriculum, although they are inconsistently achieved and primarily at lower levels of student thinking.</i> 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>engages learners in multiple ways of demonstrating knowledge and skill.</i> • <i>works independently and collaboratively to examine test and other performance data to understand each learner’s progress and to guide planning.</i> • <i>is able to use assessment data to create instructional strategies</i> • <i>consistently makes inferences about learner performance based on data from multiple assessments</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>Students consistently demonstrate achievement of learning goals.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>engages learners in multiple ways using assessments of quality work.</i> • <i>excels at working independently and collaboratively to examine test and other performance data to understand each learner’s progress and to guide planning.</i> • <i>is able to accurately assess higher level thinking</i> • <i>is consistently able to create instructional strategies that lead to observable changes in student thinking skills.</i> • <i>excels in inferring the development of thinking processes based on learner performance data and uses those inferences to implement or design new instructional strategies.</i>

InTASC Standard 7 Planning for Instruction

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 7: Planning for Instruction</p> <p>The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learning and the community context.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates little awareness of student interests or prior learning experiences. • creates a plan that offers learners limited opportunities to construct and share their own understanding. • creates a plan that offers limited opportunities to build relationships with students, create community among students, provide systematic feedback and reinforcement on performance, and foster student autonomy. 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates some awareness of student interests and prior learning experiences. • creates a plan that fosters a limited opportunity for students to learn through constructivist teaching strategies, to analyze and interpret information, to engage in inquiry, and to foster analytical thinking • creates a plan that offers some opportunities to build relationships with students, create community among students, provide systematic feedback and reinforcement on performance, and foster student autonomy. . 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • demonstrates awareness of student interests and prior learning experiences. • creates a plan that consistently fosters opportunities to learn through constructivist teaching strategies, to analyze and interpret information, to engage in inquiry, and to foster analytical thinking. • creates a plan that offers consistent opportunities to build relationships with students, create community among students, provide systematic feedback and reinforcement on performance, and foster student autonomy. 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • excels at creating opportunities to build on existing student knowledge and student decision-making. • creates a plan that fosters exceptional opportunities to learn through constructivist teaching strategies, to analyze and interpret information, to engage in inquiry, and to foster analytical thinking. • creates a plan that offers frequent and exceptional opportunities to build relationships with students, create community among students, provide systematic feedback and reinforcement on performance, and foster student autonomy.

InTASC Standard 8 Instructional Strategies

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 8: Instructional Strategies</p> <p>The candidate understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates a limited ability to build rapport with students, elicit widespread student participation, demonstrate the relevance of the discussion matter, integrate student comments with the learning goals, and foster high levels of student thinking.</i> <i>Obtains limited insight into student thinking based primarily on a single assessment.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>The students did not appear motivated, participation was limited or spotty, responses were typically brief and primarily located at lower levels of thinking, and students asked no questions about the content matter.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates some ability to build rapport with students, elicit widespread student participation, demonstrate the relevance of the discussion matter, integrate student comments with the learning goals, and foster high levels of student thinking.</i> <i>uses more than one assessment to interpret student thinking.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>The students appeared somewhat motivated, participated widely, responses were brief but demonstrated some higher level thinking skills, and students asked some questions about the content matter.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates an ability to build rapport with students, elicit widespread student participation, demonstrate the relevance of the discussion matter, integrate student comments with the learning goals, and foster high levels of student thinking</i> <i>uses multiple assessments to better interpret student thinking by integrating different sources of evidence.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>The students appeared motivated, participated widely, were able to give extended responses, demonstrated higher level thinking skills, and asked appropriate questions about the content matter</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>demonstrates an exceptional ability to build rapport with students, elicit widespread student participation, demonstrate the relevance of the discussion matter, integrate student comments with the learning goals, and foster high levels of student thinking</i> <i>demonstrates an exceptional ability to use multiple assessments to recognize common patterns of student thinking and develop new instructional strategies.</i> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>AND</i></p> <p><i>The students appeared exceptionally motivated, participated widely, were able to give extended responses, demonstrated higher level thinking skills, and asked appropriate questions about the content matter.</i></p>

InTASC Standard 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (NJPST 9 and 11)</p> <p>The candidate engages in ongoing individual and collaborative professional learning designed to impact practice in ways that lead to improved learning for each student, using evidence of student achievement, action research, and best practices to expand a repertoire of skills, strategies, materials, assessments, and ideas to increase student learning.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engages in limited meaningful and appropriate professional learning experiences exercises limited professional judgement when attempting to promote students' well-being does not maintain the confidentiality of information concerning students relationships with students and colleagues does not uphold professional standards <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>There is limited or no evidence that the candidate seeks professional, community, and technological resources</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engages in meaningful and appropriate professional learning experiences independently OR in collaboration with colleagues seeks professional, community, and technological resources from a singular source shows some respect for students' well-being by exercising inconsistent professional judgement sometimes maintains the confidentiality of information concerning students maintains professional relationships with some students and/or colleagues 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engages in meaningful and appropriate professional learning experiences independently AND in collaboration with colleagues actively seeks professional, community, and technological resources promotes aspect of students' well-being by exercising professional judgement maintains the confidentiality of information concerning students maintains professional relationships with students and colleagues 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> engages in meaningful and appropriate professional learning experiences independently and in collaboration with colleague aligned with their own needs and the needs of the learners, school and system. actively seeks professional, community, and technological resources within and outside of the school with analysis, reflection and problem solving. promotes aspect of students' well-being by exercising the highest level of professional judgement maintains the confidentiality of information concerning students without exception maintains professional relationships with students and colleagues at all times and all settings and events.

InTASC Standard 10 Leadership and Collaboration

Criteria	Does Not Meet Expectations (Pre-Emergent) 1 Pt	Approaching Expectations (Novice) 2 Pts.	Meets Expectations (Proficient) 3 Pts.	Exceeds Expectations (Advanced) 4 Pts.
<p>Standard 10: Leadership and Collaboration</p> <p>The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals and community members to ensure learner growth and to advance the profession.</p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>creates plans that do not address the diverse needs of learners</i> • <i>seldom exhibits high expectations for student learning</i> • <i>demonstrates limited initiative to grow and develop with colleagues. Has little interaction with colleagues to enhance practice and supports student learning</i> <p style="text-align: center;">AND</p> <p><i>There is little or no evidence that the candidate participates on the instructional team.</i></p>	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>takes a limited role on the instructional team and does not share responsibility for decision making or accountability for student learning</i> • <i>independently plans to meet the basic needs of learners without collaboration with other school professionals</i> • <i>Inconsistently supports high expectations for student learning</i> • <i>works with colleagues when prompted to grow and develop through interactions that enhance practice and supports student learning.</i> 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>takes a role on the instructional team and shares responsibility for decision making and accountability for student learning</i> • <i>works with other school professionals to meet the diverse needs of learners</i> • <i>supports high expectations for student learning in their individual classroom</i> • <i>takes initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and supports student learning</i> 	<p><i>The candidate</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>takes an active role on the instructional team giving and receiving feedback on practice, examining learner work, analyzing data from multiple sources and sharing responsibility for decision making and accountability for student learning.</i> • <i>works with other school professionals to plan and jointly facilitate learning on how to meet the diverse needs of learners</i> • <i>contributes to a common culture that supports high expectations for student learning</i> • <i>takes initiative to grow and develop with colleagues through interactions that enhance practice and supports student learning by attending professional growth activities both on and off school grounds.</i>

Spring 2018

Early Field High Leverage Teaching Practice Proficiency Rubrics

INTASC Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary: Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD			
				Mean	SD	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			
1	1	1.1, 1.4	STANDARD 1: Learner Development	2.89	0.55	2.76	0.69	3.00	2.25	2.92	0.51	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60		
1	2	1.1, 1.3, 1.4	STANDARD 2: Learning Differences	2.74	0.44	2.62	0.51	3.00	0.00	2.75	0.45	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.67	0.49		
1	3	1.1	STANDARD 3: Learning Environments	2.84	0.59	2.73	0.69	2.83	0.00	2.83	0.58	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.72		
2	4,5	1.1, 1.4	STANDARDS 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content	2.58	0.59	2.50	0.52	2.83	0.41	2.58	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.50	0.52		
3	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		
3	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		
3	8	1.1, 1.3, 1.4	STANDARD 8: Instructional Strategies	2.84	0.49	2.74	0.48	3.17	0.63	2.83	0.58	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.39		
4	9	1.1	STANDARD 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (NJPST 9 and 11)	2.63	0.81	2.53	0.95	2.50	0.41	2.67	0.65	2.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	2.12	2.75	0.87		
4	10	1.1	STANDARD 10: Leadership and Collaboration	2.74	0.44	2.62	0.38	2.50	0.55	2.67	0.49	1.41	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.39		
Full Scale				24.68	3.93	25.33	2.25	23.60	4.55	24.67	3.73	22.50	0.71	27.00	0.00	22.50	9.19	24.83	3.71		
Mean Total:				2.74		2.63		2.81		2.74		2.32		3.00		2.50		2.76			
Std. Dev. Total:				0.42		0.17		0.67		0.08		0.97		0.00		0.51		0.16			

INTASC Category 1 Spring 2018

				EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary: Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
INSTASC Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	N = 18		N= 13		N= 6		N= 12		N= 2		N= 1		N= 2		N= 12	
1	1	1.1, 1.4	STANDARD 1: Learner Development	2.89	0.55	2.76	0.69	3.00	2.25	2.92	0.51	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	3.00	1.41	3.00	0.60
1	2	1.1, 1.3, 1.4	STANDARD 2: Learning Differences	2.74	0.44	2.62	0.51	3.00	0.00	2.75	0.45	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.67	0.49
1	3	1.1	STANDARD 3: Learning Environments	2.84	0.59	2.73	0.69	2.83	0.00	2.83	0.58	2.50	0.71	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.72
Mean				2.82		2.70		2.94		2.83		2.50		3.00		2.67		2.83	
Std. Dev.				0.08		0.11		1.30		0.06		0.00		0.00		0.41		0.11	

INTASC Category 2 Spring 2018

				EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary: Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
INSTASC Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	N = 18		N= 13		N= 6		N= 12		N= 2		N= 1		N= 2		N= 12	
2	4,5	1.1,1.4	STANDARDS 4 and 5: Content Knowledge and Application of Content	2.58	0.59	2.50	0.52	2.83	0.41	2.58	0.67	2.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.50	0.52
Mean				2.58		2.50		2.83		2.58		2.00		3.00		2.50		2.50	
Std. Dev.				0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00		0.00	

INTASC Category 3 Spring 2018

				EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary: Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
INSTASC Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	N = 18		N= 13		N= 6		N= 12		N= 2		N= 1		N= 2		N= 12	
3	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
3	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
3	8	1.1,1.3,1.4	STANDARD 8: Instructional Strategies	2.84	0.49	2.74	0.48	3.17	0.63	2.83	0.58	3.00	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.39
Mean				2.74		2.64		2.89		2.75		2.67		3.00		2.33		2.75	
Std. Dev.				0.09		0.14		0.10		0.05		0.00		0.00		0.41		0.15	

INTASC Category 4: Spring 2018

				EPP		UG		MAT		Elem		P-3		Secondary: Eng./Span		HEPE		TSD	
				Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
INSTASC Cat	INTASC	CAEP	Criteria	N = 18		N= 13		N= 6		N= 12		N= 2		N= 1		N= 2		N= 12	
4	9	1.1	STANDARD 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice (NJPST 9 and 11)	2.63	0.81	2.53	0.95	2.50	0.41	2.67	0.65	2.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	2.12	2.75	0.87
4	10	1.1	STANDARD 10: Leadership and Collaboration	2.74	0.44	2.62	0.38	2.50	0.55	2.67	0.49	1.41	0.00	3.00	0.00	2.50	0.71	2.83	0.39
Mean				2.68		2.57		2.50		2.67		1.71		3.00		2.50		2.79	
Std. Dev.				0.26		0.40		0.10		0.11		2.12		0.00		1.00		0.34	