Standard 1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Predicted Answers | Evidence | Evidence Needed |
| 1. Why aren’t professional dispositions more explicitly addressed in this standard?1. Why is it that 4 out of 5 sub-areas pertain to completers only and not candidates? Shouldn’t we be finding ways to assess all candidates at relevant transition points?
2. Can one piece of data be used to provide evidence for a variety of factors?
3. How are institutions defining and measuring dispositions?
4. What are the Michigan INTASC standards and how do they differ?
5. What content standards will be used for program review with feedback?
6. Which technology standards is Michigan using?
7. “Demonstrate an understanding of the INTASC” What does that mean? Can we give candidates a quiz on INTASC?
 | See INTASC Standard-Key assessments-dispositions-MTTC-GPA | * Key assessments data (both program and unit level)
* Survey data (Employer, principals of our student teachers, exit surveys- both by candidates and supervisors) Alumni\*
* Quality varies by source\*
* Major GPA
* MTTC\*
* Major department endorsement
* Student teacher final evaluation\*
* Surveys\*
* Unit plan reflection
* Dispositions/code of ethics
* Level 2 field placement and course
* PRE
* C- Base
* Core assessments
* Student teaching
* Elem. Content addenday
* Initial pro completer survey
* MDEE exit survey
* Lesson and unit plans
* Reflections
* Lesson observation (field)
* Prof. behavior( dispositions)
* Course syllabi
* Course with field (classroom management)
* Course quizzes and projects
 | * More complete survey data across all programs
* Video clips\*
* Principal surveys
* K-12 surveys
* Training for all stake holders
* Consistent evaluation tools
* IDPs
* Work sample
* Case studies
* Systematic assessments of field?
* A plan to collect
* Assessing online teaching experiments TEM
* Observation learner/learning?
 |

Standard 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Predicted Answers | Evidence | Evidence Needed |
| 1. What counts as a clinical internship?

-Research Projects-Co-Teaching in Schools-Pen Pals- Data and Analysis Project (intervention) 2. How formal codified do the partnerships need to be?-MOU?1. Is this information available to us?
2. How do we do this?
3. How do we choose partners?
 | Jan- April planProject coasted in technology(connected to courses @ El and Sec)Operationalize –May* Meetings
* 2 schedule districts
* Community reps

School board in 2 districtsUse Danielson rubric as the site agreement with local schools/classrooms. Base this on program phase* Profs on site with student teachers
* Lessons co-constructed around standards
 | * Field placement evaluation forms
* Student teaching evaluation forms\*
* Letter of understanding for student teachers’ placements; host teacher must be “effective”
* Transition points
* TEMS Mentoring
* Observation reports for TEMS for all field placements
* Unit plan/ST lesson plans

-reflection assess.Student FacultyCooperating teacherLearning fair (public)Tier 3 of tier 4 programPrincipal review and assignment using schools teacher evaluation tool* Support materials for coop/students for using the tool
* Debriefing meetings

(need to add research support for this) | * Laboratory school expenses
* Selection criteria for mentors
* Mentor/supervisor \*training
* Faculty training
* Clinical faculty selection criteria
* Co-teaching models
* Consistency of evaluation tools
* Teaching video clips\*
* Cooperating teachers are “effective”
* Consistent progress
* Letter of understanding for field placements with input from CTs, including CT expectations
* 3 item survey to CTs re: satisfaction with SVSU
* Track TE/TEMs intro letter to CT
* Webinar
* Mentoring
* Observation reports (for TE elementary)
* Student profile
* CT input/evaluate unit plan
 |

Standard 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Predicted Answers | Evidence | Evidence needed |
| 1. Diversity in candidates – Hope credits and comm. Colleges?
2. High achievement in ability- Do we have to follow the CAP GPA min
3. Additional Selectivity Factors – other ideas for selectivity?
4. Selectivity during preparations- Other ideas?
5. Selection at completion
 |  | * Ask John!
* Incentives –scholarships
* Admissions
* Recruitment
* Visits to Detroit, Chicago
* Scholarships in department for financial need
* ST evaluation (content, Pedagogy)
* Unit plan (Pre and Post test)
* Code of ethics
* INTASC
* NETs
* Laws and Policies
 | -We need more!- retention plan- Recruiting at comm. College- Upward Bound- Cap 3.0 min GPA- Interview process-we need multiple evaluations for high achievement in ability- reliability of our FP forms-Lesson plan development-NETS as a standard- presentation to committee and data to support-keep and showcase evals of anything you do-move IDP into ST |

Standard 4

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Predicted Answers | Evidence | Evidence Needed |
| 1. How do we better connect our current 10L assessments and earlier field expenses?
2. How do we do a better job of collecting information related to employer satisfaction?
3. How do we help our candidates “do formative assessment”?
4. Will longitudinal data be sufficient for data added?
 | ?Complete contentValue addedTeacher effectivenessEmployer satisfactionCompleter satisfaction | * Low response rate on employer surveys
* In spite of well-developed assessments, our implementation process needs to be strengthened.
* Formative assessment results from 10L
* Self-evaluate
* Program evaluate
* Code of ethics
* Completed survey (exit)
* MEAP/MME or standardized tests
* PQA class ECE
* Retention data
* Yooyens graduate survey
 | * more detailed and substantive from a larger number of employees
* more formal collection of anecdotal evidence
* “Going and getting data” as opposed to counting on it coming to us.
* Smarter balance (year before current year) of increased/decrease by completer(standardized tests) (PLAN) elem. School
* P 12 student survey (affective Q) example tripod\*
* Observe them
* Completer and video tape
* Principal observation report
* Personal impact plan (IDP)
* IDP
 |

Standard 5

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Questions | Predicted Answers | Evidence | Evidence Needed |
| 1. What is meant by operational effectiveness?
 |  | -CAEP annual report- ESAR- Statistics to verify validity and reliability- Title II report- Effective data from the state- TEC-Appendix C | -Inter-departmental feedback loop- P-12 Student growth- Community program improvement involvement- Case Studies-Exit Interviews |