

Program: Master's in EducationDate: May 23, 2014Completed by: Victoria Marquesen

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): The following faculty in Teacher Education participated in eportfolio assessment: Checho, Massey, Peters, Pettit, and Piquette; complete program data were reviewed at the fall department convocation.

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
All 9 SLOs were assessed in 2013-2014: 1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge	2012-2013 (all SLOs are assessed)	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey	All program completers in 2013-2014	All (100%) program completers should a)	2013-2014 results indicated that a) >100%	Although all mean ratings showed student proficiency was on the average above 5.00	Although the LDE curriculum has been revised, only 50% has been

<p>related to teaching assignment and the application of content knowledge to classroom instruction and assessment.</p> <p>2. Demonstrate professional growth in the application of scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement.</p> <p>3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning.</p> <p>4. Research, locate and interpret educational research in best practices in teaching.</p> <p>5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.</p> <p>6. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-</p>	each year)	<p>completed by graduates are on p. 47/61 of the <i>M.Ed. Handbook</i> (http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/FormsAndDocuments/TEP%20GRAD%20HANDBOOK.pdf) and are attached to this report.</p> <p>Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.</p>		<p>receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) 80% or > should receive passing scores on licensure exams, and c) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (5.0) or > and avg. ratings of >5.00 on self evaluations</p>	<p>received proficient ratings; mean ratings were always above 5.00; however, b) 100% of all takers in LDE (1) and SPED (7/7) had passing scores; No IT graduates completed the exam, and c) mean ratings by graduates on all items were 5.00 or greater.</p> <p>Too few graduates allowed for disaggregation of data by emphasis area.</p>	<p>across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses for particular standards. Strengths included performance on Goal 1 for all areas save LDE (breadth and depth of knowledge in content area), on Goal 2 (knowledge and application of technology), and Goal 9 (leadership in school change). Lowest rated areas included aspects of Goal 4 (understanding/ applying research) and Goal 1 (LDE content knowledge). These results are similar to those in 2011-2012 and 2012-2013. For Goal 4, weaknesses noted included inconsistent/ inaccurate use of APA style and failure to utilize a range of types of research in addressing research propositions. In addition, the relatively few ratings in the excellent/exceptional range for gprogram goals was noted.</p>	<p>implemented. Faculty will continue to review and revise assignments and activities in this program, working with adjunct faculty to ensure effective instruction.</p> <p>Faculty will continue to develop consistency across program in use of APA style.</p>
---	------------	---	--	---	---	---	--

assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change.							
7. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change							
8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.							
9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.							

Comments: The program has 9 goals that form the SLOs for all master's candidates. Goal 1 focuses on content knowledge in the candidate's emphasis area, and more specific "standards" for this area are aligned with the Colorado Academic content Standards for endorsement areas. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available in the *Graduate Handbook* beginning on page 47 at <http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/FormsAndDocuments/Documents/TEP%20GRAD%20HANDBOOK.pdf>) that outline the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each goal area. Ratings based on this evidence are completed using a scale of 1-8, with a rating of 5.00 an indication of "proficient" on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at program completion by faculty based on multiple types and sources of evidence in the candidate's eportfolio and oral defense. The limited number of program completers in most emphasis areas limited further disaggregation of assessment data.

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?

	2013-2014	Although the LDE curriculum has been revised, only one course has been implemented. Faculty will continue to review and revise assignments and activities in this program, working with adjunct faculty to ensure effective instruction.	Yes. Two new courses were initially implemented as hybrid or online courses (BBE 560 and BBE 503): Syllabi were re-written and strengthened in terms of impact of culture, literacy, emphasis on heritage learners and English learners (ELs) with exceptionalities, history and politics of serving ELs, and assessment. Student assignments have been strengthened to emphasize research and writing., and curriculum applications have been aligned with theory.	Because the new program has not been fully implemented, the impact on students cannot be evaluated at this time. However, this program is a collaborative effort with the Southcentral BOCES, which has undergone a complete turnover in personnel, disrupting smooth application of the grant. The LDE expert at BOCES who assisted in instruction has left, slowing progress towards this goal.
	2013-2014	The program will make improvements to the information management system to allow recording of multiple faculty evaluations by panel in order to assess reliability.	Yes. The program contracted with a private technology consulting firm (Clientsolve) that developed the eportfolio/ management system and completed the updates to allow recording of this information in the system.	Faculty ratings can now be recorded.
	2013-2014	Faculty will continue to develop consistency across program in use of APA style	Yes. ED 503 incorporated activities with the RAGE project and with library staff to improve instruction on APA style.	Dr. Pettit (ED 503) reported improved literature reviews in ED 503 in Spring 2014 by graduate students enrolled in that course; outcome data on program completers will not be available until 2014-2015.

Appendix C

Matrices Used in Evaluating the Portfolio



General Rules for Assessing Performance

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate's mentor, as the content expert, to rate the content for Standard 1 (first dimension) and to make that evaluation available to other members of the team in TEIMS. This should be done prior to the final seminar.
2. Other members of the team should review the portfolio and assign temporary ratings for standards 1-10 prior to the seminar, noting qualities leading to the ratings on the draft document. Ratings should be assigned from 1-8, in increments of .25 (e.g., 3.0, 3.25, 3.50, 3.75).
3. In addition, faculty should develop questions they want to address at the seminar. Faculty should plan to meet briefly prior to the beginning of the seminar to review these questions and general concerns/questions related to the portfolio. Preferably, this could be done electronically at an earlier time.
4. At the meeting, faculty should bring their rating sheets. The candidate's performance at the seminar will affect the ratings for a number of these standards.
5. After completion of the seminar, faculty should meet and review their findings. **ALTHOUGH ALL RATINGS PRIOR TO THIS MEETING SHOULD BE COMPLETED INDEPENDENTLY**, this review should come to a consensus about the rating for each standard. Disagreement will be noted by the chair of the candidate's committee.
6. The faculty will inform the candidate of the disposition of each standard and any changes needed for recommendation for graduation.

7. The consensus information will be recorded in TEIMS by the candidate's sponsor.

10. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge related to teaching assignment and the application of content knowledge to classroom instruction and assessment.

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<i>Depth & Breadth of Knowledge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program Propositions/and or artifact(s) are not present and/or do not address the assignment requirements Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: Propositions and/or artifact(s) are present but may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused (At the seminar) candidate explains propositions superficially and/or the relationship between the proposition and research cited Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance demonstrates candidate can meet the content standards for an initial license in the area based on the ratings of faculty member in that area (proficient evidence presented on all CDE standards or proficient evidence presented on content program standards) Proposition(s) are conceptually sound and important generalization(s) related to content area (At the seminar) candidate clearly explains propositions and the relationship between the proposition and research cited <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on the majority of standards rated by the content mentor.</p> <p>Proposition(s) and bibliography demonstrate exceptional skills and application of research.</p>	<div></div>
	GPA is a <2.5 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA <3.0 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA is a minimum of 3.0 to 3.5 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA in courses in emphasis area is >3.5; the highest rating should be assigned for a GPA of 4.0.	<div></div>

	<p>NOTE: This criterion is not applied if there is no required exam for the content area.</p> <p>No evidence of licensure exam Received a score of <220</p>		Licensure exam scaled score is a minimum of 220	Licensure exam scaled score is a minimum of 220 and passed all sections of the PLACE exam (3s and 4's) and received at least 2 4s	
Growth in Knowledge	No evidence presented or evidence does not address the standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence does not demonstrate change in learning/performance • Evidence in reflection/rationale is superficial or includes errors in thinking or analysis of artifact 	Artifact(s) and/or rationale/reflection demonstrate a change in content knowledge from time entered program until program completion.	Artifact(s) and or rationale/reflection demonstrate exceptional growth, either in depth of growth of content knowledge or in the number of areas of change.	

	List qualities that are not passing:	List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:

OVERALL RATING

11. Demonstrate professional growth in the application of scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience Propositions and/or reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program Presents artifact(s) that demonstrate include application of scientifically based practice AND <u>changes</u> in teaching in at least one of the following areas based on educational research in that area: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Literacy Instructional Technology Differentiation of Instruction Artifact(s) must demonstrate changes in teaching as well as research that informed practice Rationale/reflection demonstrates understanding of own knowledge base and research applied Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level. 	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on one or more bulleted item at the left.</p> <p>A rating at the highest level should be based on exceptional performance in more than one of the bulleted areas.</p>	<div></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

M.Ed. Assessment Report, 2013-2014

Page 11 of 27

12. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<p>Performance on proposition(s) and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program</p> <p>Evidence is included that demonstrates all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More than one means of assessing student learning is included Candidate aggregates student performance and accurately draws conclusions Reflection/rationale demonstrates changes in teaching based on evaluation of data <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research.</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on at least one of the bulleted items at the left</p> <p>A rating at the highest level should be assigned if evidence also includes artifacts that were not generated as requirements for a course or for the program.</p>	<div></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

13. Research, locate and interpret educational research in best practices in teaching. OVERALL RATING: _____

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<i>Critically Reading & Applying Research</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • Propositions are not present and/or do not address the assignment requirements (At the seminar) candidate cannot explain propositions • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience • Propositions are present but may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • (At the seminar) candidate explains propositions superficially and/or the relationship between the proposition and research cited • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<p>Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program , including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Citing relevant research from a variety of sources • Accurately analyzing and synthesizing research • Integrating relevant research and theory from multiple sources and across courses • Applying research for self-directed inquiry and for own problem-solving • Making authentic connections to practice • Integrating theoretical, philosophical, and research sources • Analyzing and synthesizing research related to emphasis area • Explaining propositions by expanding on theory, research, and practice • Integrating theories and research into own thinking 	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left</p>	<div></div>

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<i>Action Research</i>	<p>No action research included and/or action research is incomplete</p> <p>Rationale/reflection is not included or may be described as superficial/incoherent or conceptually confused</p>	<p>Action research is present but includes sufficient errors that result in</p> <p>Errors occur in analysis of data and/or rationale/reflection that limit effectiveness of research</p>	<p>Investigates educational problem by completing all components of an action research project, analyzing data and drawing accurate conclusions about practice</p> <p>Rationale/reflection with research demonstrates changed patterns in thought and action with regard to the connections between research and practice</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on action research</p>	<div></div>

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
Comments	List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

14. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program: No evidence is presented or evidence is not directly related to the standard Rationale is not present, incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: Evidence limited to course generated products/research Artifact(s) do not provide sufficient evidence related to the standard Rationale and/or propositions are superficial and/or may not be defensible based on current research 	<p>Performance on artifact(s) and proposition meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning and implementing quality professional growth opportunities for other teachers Participation in collaborative leadership to address educational challenges Participation formally and informally in appropriate professional learning communities and teams to improve educational practice <p>Rationale/reflection and/or artifact demonstrate effectiveness of professional development on educational practice of colleagues</p> <p>Rationale is keyed to impact of professional growth in leadership abilities on professional self-efficacy and self-worth</p> <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left.</p> <p>The range of activities and quality of the activity should be considered in assigning a rating in the advanced range.</p> <p>A rating at the highest level should require evidence of involvement effective professional development beyond expectations in courses.</p>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 40px; height: 40px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
		Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.		
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

15. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change.

NOT PASSING	PASSING	OVERALL
-------------	---------	---------

Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	RATING
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: • Reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<p>1. Candidate's reflection meets expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Describes value of experience on thinking and practice • Utilizes reflection to change own practice of teaching • Illustrates relationship among research/theory, own practice and student achievement • Refers to changes in patterns in thought and action with regard to own practice • Identifies patterns of program impact on practice • Identifies directions for future inquiry and development • Candidate must demonstrate at least 4/6 expectations. <p>1. Artifact(s) or proposition addresses use of technology in self-assessment or collaboration for change.</p> <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted items at the left.</p> <p>A rating of the highest level must demonstrate exceptional performance on both #1 and #1.</p>	<div data-bbox="1776 402 1873 500" style="border: 1px solid black; width: 46px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

16. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program Both the artifact(s), its rationale/reflection, and proposition(s) all demonstrate the ability to accurately analyze and synthesize current research and trends in school change <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance in analyzing and synthesizing research.</p> <p>A rating at the highest level would address research/trends related to candidate's emphasis area or may include artifacts that are not related to course or program requirements.</p>	<div></div>

17. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience Propositions and/or reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program Artifact(s) clearly demonstrates improvement in student achievement to high levels Artifact(s) disaggregates data for individual students and demonstrates improvement in achievement for students with various learning characteristics Reflection demonstrates understanding of relationship between student learning and teaching/learning activities <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on bulleted items at the left. Exceptional performance should present some research base for change.</p>	<div></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that indicate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

M.Ed. Assessment Report, 2013-2014

Page 25 of 27

18. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program No evidence is included and/or evidence included does not provide support for the goal Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Propositions may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research 	<p>Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program demonstrate candidate can assume responsibility and leadership in school change through <u>at least two</u> of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Artifact that demonstrates leadership in change Artifact demonstrates a plan that would lead to school reform Involvement in school, district, or discipline activities that impact school change outside one's own classroom (collaborative work, presentation, grant writing, etc.) Artifact that verifies effect on at least one aspect of school change Rationale explains relationship of research to own efforts <p>Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research</p> <p>Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.</p>	<p>Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left; includes some verification of the effect of own efforts on school change.</p> <p>Some evidence is included that was not generated as a requirement in a course.</p>	<div></div>

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that are proficient:	List qualities that are advanced:	

5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thin problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and ensures attention to these l processes so that students can master content standards. (CO: 5.5)

Basic (1.0 - 1.9)		Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)
<p>A table that includes the thinking/cognitive processes that should be addressed in plans and in instruction are inc These are based on the revised levels of Bloom's taxonomy (see http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/)</p>			
Questioning	No evidence of questioning OR questions are 1) written by others (e.g., from a teacher's manual) or 2) require only recall and/or comprehension	Demonstrates at least one example of a question at each level of Bloom's taxonomy in lesson plans; questions must be written by teacher	Demonstrates that s/he can plan and ask questions that include all levels of Bloom's taxonomy (see http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/taxonomy/#table)
	<p>No evidence for how s/he implements or uses questions OR consistently does not use any of the following effective questioning strategies:</p> <p>a. good questions (not too complex, ambiguous, double questions)</p> <p>b. asks frequent questions</p> <p>c. equitably distributes questions, randomly calling upon students</p> <p>d. appropriate wait time after asking and after initial response</p>	<p>Demonstrates planning or implementation of the following effective questioning strategies but may be inconsistent in one or more OR may have insufficient evidence because of lack of opportunity to apply in instruction:</p> <p>a. good questions (not too complex, ambiguous, double questions)</p> <p>b. asks frequent questions</p> <p>c. equitably distributes questions, randomly calling upon students</p> <p>d. appropriate wait time after asking and after initial response</p>	<p>Demonstrates use of all of the following effective questioning strategies across successive observations:</p> <p>a. good questions (not too complex, ambiguous, double questions)</p> <p>b. asks frequent questions</p> <p>c. equitably distributes questions, randomly calling upon students</p> <p>d. appropriate wait time after asking and after initial response</p>
	No evidence that s/he can modify questioning during lessons to prompt different levels of thinking	Provides evidence that s/he can modify questions during lessons to prompt different levels of thinking but has had limited oportunity to demonstrate consistency/fluency OR is inconsistent in doing so	Demonstrates that s/he can consistently (across different observations) modify questions during lessons to prompt different levels of thinking

Questioning (cont.)	No evidence that s/he can use questions for a variety of purposes OR uses questions only for factual recall	<p>Demonstrates the use of questions for a variety of purposes in planning instruction (3 or more):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. probing for learner understanding (factual recall, comprehension) b. guiding inquiry (probing for deeper understanding, presenting contradictions, pointing discussion in a new direction, passing responsibility to student) c. guiding inquiry (probing for deeper understanding, presenting contradictions, pointing discussion in a new direction, passing responsibility to student) d. helping students articulate their thinking processes and ideas e. encouraging both convergent and divergent thinking f. stimulating curiosity/risk taking/problem solving g. developing social discourse h. enhancing content literacy (pre/post, and during) 	<p>Demonstrates the use of questions for a variety of purposes in planning and implementing instruction (6 or more):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. probing for learner understanding (factual recall, comprehension) b. guiding inquiry (probing for deeper understanding, presenting contradictions, pointing discussion in a new direction, passing responsibility to student) c. guiding inquiry (probing for deeper understanding, presenting contradictions, pointing discussion in a new direction, passing responsibility to student) d. helping students articulate their thinking processes and ideas e. encouraging both convergent and divergent thinking f. stimulating curiosity/risk taking/problem solving g. developing social discourse h. enhancing content literacy (pre/post, and during)
Teaching Thinking	No evidence that s/he is aware of the individual cognitive levels of her/his students	May not always be aware of the individual cognitive levels of her/his students and may not alter interactions accordingly	Usually demonstrates awareness of the individual cognitive levels of her/his students by altering interactions
	Few activities require higher level thinking; focus of activity is usually memorization, recall, and remembering	Includes plans for activities which require the majority of cognitive skills included in the new Bloom's taxonomy but may not have the opportunity to teach them	Plans and implements activities which stimulate all of the cognitive/thinking skills in the new Bloom's taxonomy
Thinking	No evidence that s/he can teach thinking by cognitively modeling the thinking processes (e.g., think alouds)	Demonstrates the development of thinking by cognitively modeling the thinking processes in written lesson plans but may not have the opportunity to teach them OR models a limited number of thinking skills	Demonstrates the development of direct types of thinking by cognitively modeling the thinking processes

Teaching	Students rarely required to talk about what they have learned and how well; no emphasis on requiring different metacognition skills	Includes questions that require students to talk about what they have learned and how well they have learned and prompt other metacognitive skills (e.g., evaluating, monitoring in lesson plans but may not have opportunity to apply questions in instruction	Demonstrates questions that require students to talk about what they have learned and how well they have learned and prompt other metacognitive skills (e.g., evaluating, monitoring in lesson plans and daily instruction
Learning to Learn & Work Skills	No evidence that he/she requires students to establish learning goals, self-evaluate learning, or monitor progress	Demonstrates planning that requires students to do one of the following: establish learning goals, self-evaluate, or monitor progress	Demonstrates in teaching requires students to do all of the following: establish long term and short term learning goals (break tasks into smaller, manageable parts), self-evaluate learning, and monitor progress
	No evidence that he/she requires students to ask questions (e.g., about new information)	Includes activities in lesson plans that require students to ask questions (e.g., about new information) but may not have opportunity to instruct	Demonstrates that he/she requires students to ask questions (e.g., about new information) in lesson planning and in instruction
	No evidence that he/she explicitly designs or implements instruction in any of the following postsecondary & workforce readiness skills related to learning to learn at a level that is developmentally appropriate:	Evidence that s/he designs activities that explicitly instruct at least one of the following postsecondary & workforce readiness skills related to learning to learn at a level that is developmentally appropriate:	Evidence that s/he designs activities that explicitly instruct all of the following postsecondary & workforce readiness skills related to learning to learn at a level that is developmentally appropriate:
	a. work ethic (setting priorities and managing time, taking initiative and following through, taking responsibility for actions and work, acting with civility and politeness	a. work ethic (setting priorities and managing time, taking initiative and following through, taking responsibility for actions and work, acting with civility and politeness	a. work ethic (setting priorities and managing time, taking initiative and following through, taking responsibility for actions and work, acting with civility and politeness
	b. personal responsibility (behaving honestly and ethically, acting assertively, being a self advocate)	b. personal responsibility (behaving honestly and ethically, acting assertively, being a self advocate)	b. personal responsibility (behaving honestly and ethically, acting assertively, being a self advocate)
	c. collaboration (being a team player, cooperating for a common purpose, acknowledging authority and taking direction)	c. collaboration (being a team player, cooperating for a common purpose, acknowledging authority and taking direction)	c. collaboration (being a team player, cooperating for a common purpose, acknowledging authority and taking direction)
Work Skills	No evidence that s/he explicitly designs or implements instruction related to students' finding and using information, including any of the following:	Evidence in written plans that s/he designs instruction related to students' finding and using information in one of the following areas:	Evidence that s/he designs and implements instruction related to students' finding and using information in at least two of the following areas:

Learning to Learn &	a. conducting research using acceptable research methods	a. conducting research using acceptable research methods	a. conducting research using acceptable research methods and information from different sources
	b. assessing the credibility and relevance of information	b. assessing the credibility and relevance of information	b. assessing the credibility and relevance of information
	c. applying different research paradigms, including the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and research	c. applying different research paradigms, including the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and research	c. applying different research paradigms, including the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and research
	d. select, integrate, and apply appropriate technology to expand information and knowledge	d. select, integrate, and apply appropriate technology to expand information and knowledge	d. select, integrate, and apply appropriate technology to expand information and knowledge

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education: *Not evaluated at admission*

Guidelines for Admission to Student Teaching: *Meets criteria for "developing" in all dimensions*

1. Benchmark at admission to student teaching is a rating of "developing" for all dimensions, averaging scores
2. To evaluate, supervisors should review the material in the portfolio that is attached to the standard.

Evidence to be Evaluated: Lesson plans in the portfolio, field experience teachers' feedback, videoclips of teaching

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

1. Required for program completion are ratings of "proficient" on evaluations of the university supervisor.
2. Observe teaching during different types of instruction (direct, inquiry) and different content areas to determine consistency
4. Observe student teacher's ability to utilize a variety of strategies (per criteria in inventory), as well as frequency and consistency.
5. Consistency = requires fluency/repetition, including documentation of competence in different content areas, with different lesson formats.
6. Required for program completion are ratings of "proficient" on all dimensions. The OVERALL rating for the standard should average the ratings across
7. The narrative for the Inventory should specify an example of a skill/observation that led to the rating, e.g.: *Within TWS lessons, she demonstrated qu activities that prompted all cognitive processes in all dimensions (included a table that documented this).*

Examples of Evidence:

Observation of teaching, lesson plan book/lesson plans, TWS, unit plans, videotapes of teaching, interviews with school personnel (e.g., cooperating teacher), reflections of teaching, unit plans, videotapes of teaching, interviews with school personnel (e.g., cooperating teacher), reflections of teaching

Rationale:

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.). (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching and assessing: A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives*. Complete edition. New York : Longman.

Anderson, J. R. (1982). Acquisition of cognitive skills. *Psychological Review*, 89 , 369–406.

Anderson, J. R. (1983). *The architecture of cognition* . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Anderson, J. R. (1995). *Learning and memory: An integrated approach* . New York: Wiley.

Anderson, J. R., Greeno, J. G., Reder, L. M., & Simon, H. A. (2000). Perspectives on learning, thinking, and activity. *Educational Research*

Beyer, B.K. (1987). *Practical strategies for the teaching of thinking*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Beyer, B.K. (1988). *Developing a thinking skills program*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon

Beyer, B. K. (1995). *Critical thinking*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Bloom, Benjamin S. & David R. Krathwohl. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals, by a committee of college* university examiners. Handbook 1: Cognitive domain. New York , Longman.

Center for Critical Thinking (1996a). The role of questions in thinking, teaching, and learning. [On-line]. Available HTTP: <http://www.criticalthinking.org/University/univlibrary/library.nclk>.

Colorado Department of Education and Department of higher Education Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Definition. Available at <http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdedocs/ASMTRev/PWRdescriptionResource.pdf>.

Costa, A.L. (Ed.)(1985). *Developing minds: A resource book for teaching thinking* . Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Cruz, E. (2004). *Encyclopedia of Educational Technology: Bloom's Revised Taxonomy*. Retrieved from <http://coe.sdsu.edu/eet/Articles/bloomrev/>

Davidson J.E., Deuser R. & Sternberg R.J (1996) in Metcalfe J. & Shimamura A.P. (1996) *Metacognition; Knowing about knowing* , Cambridge. Mass: MIT Press

de Bono, E. (1992) *Teach your child How to think* , London: Viking

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences* . New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice* . New York: Basic Books.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century* . New York: Basic Books.

Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A revision of bloom's taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41 (4), 212-218.

Manning, B.H. (1991). *Cognitive self-instruction for classroom processes* . Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Marzano, R.J. & Arredondo, D.E. (1986). Restructuring schools through the teaching of thinking skills. *Educational Leadership* , 43(8), 20-26.

Noble, T. (2004). Integrating the revised bloom's taxonomy with multiple intelligences: A planning tool for curriculum differentiation, *Teachers College Record* (Vol. 106, pp. 193): Blackwell Publishing Limited.

Oregon State University . (2004). *OSU extended campus: Course development: Instructional design -The Taxonomy Table* . Retrieved April 3, 2005 from <http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/coursedev/models/id/taxonomy/>

Osman, M.E. & Hannafin, M.J. (1992). Metacognition` research and theory: Analysis and implications for instructional design. *Educational Technology and Development*, 40(2) , 83-99.

Oz-TeacherNet. (2001). *oz-TeacherNet: Teachers helping teachers: Revised Bloom's Taxonomy*. Retrieved March 19, 2005 from <http://rite.ed.gut.edu.au/oz-teachernet/index.php?module=ContentExpress&func=display&ceid=29>

Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Retrieved from http://www.p21.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=254&Itemid=120.

Paul, R. W. (1985a). Bloom's taxonomy and critical thinking instruction, *Educational Leadership* (Vol. 42, pp. 36): Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development

Pressley, M. (1990). *Cognitive strategy instruction that really improves children's academic performance* . Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

Scheid, K. (1993). *Helping students become strategic learners: Guidelines for teaching* . Cambridge, MA: Brookline.

Smith, R.M. & Associates. (1990). *Learning to Learn across the Life Span* . San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

South Carolina State Department of Education (2005). Myscschools.com: South Carolina State Department of Education: Taxonomy for teaching, learning and assessing: (A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of educational objectives). Retrieved March 12, 2005 from http://www.myscschools.com/offices/cso/enhance/Taxonomy_Table.htm

Sternberg, R. J. (1977). *Intelligence, information processing, and analogical reasoning: The componential analysis of human ability* . New York: Penguin Books.

Sternberg, R.J. (1988). *The triarchic mind: A new theory of human intelligence*. New York: Penguin Books.

Tobin, L. (1987). The role of wait-time in higher cognitive level learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 69-95.

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bloom's Taxonomy

The Knowledge Dimension	The Cognitive Process Dimension	
	<u>Remember</u>	<u>Understand</u>
<u>Factual Knowledge</u>	<u>List</u>	<u>Summarize</u>
<u>Conceptual Knowledge</u>	<u>Describe</u>	<u>Interpret</u>
<u>Procedural Knowledge</u>	<u>Tabulate</u>	<u>Predict</u>
<u>Meta-Cognitive Knowledge</u>	<u>Appropriate Use</u>	<u>Execute</u>

king,
learning

Advanced (4.0)
cluded below. taxonomy/#table)
Shows creativity and flexibility in using a variety of questioning strategies, including all levels of Bloom's taxonomy
Consistently demonstrates all of the following effective questioning strategies across numerous observations: a. good questions (not too complex, ambiguous, double questions) b. asks frequent questions c. equitably distributes questions, randomly calling upon students d. appropriate wait time after asking and after initial response
Spontaneously and frequently modifies questions to stimulate various types of student thinking

<p>Demonstrates fluency in using questions for a variety of purposes in planning and implementing instruction, including all of the purposes listed under "Proficient;" demonstrates flexibility in the variety of questions used for various purposes</p>
<p>Consistently demonstrates awareness of the individual cognitive levels of her/his students by altering interactions</p>
<p>Meets criteria for "Proficient" with a variety of types of activities; plans and implements activities which require complex combination of skills (problem structuring and problem solving, project learning, invention, designing, and decision making)</p>
<p>Demonstrates consistency and flexibility in directly teaching different thinking skills by cognitively modeling the thinking processes</p>

Consistently demonstrates questions that require students to talk about what they have learned and how well they have learned and prompt other metacognitive skills (e.g., evaluating, monitoring in lesson plans and daily instruction
Consistently and with flexibility implements strategies that require students to establish long term and short term learning goals (break tasks into smaller, manageable parts), self-evaluate learning, and monitor progress
Consistently demonstrates activities that require students to ask questions, showing flexibility in approaches and activities
Demonstrates a variety of activities and strategies to teach the learning to learn skills below:
a. work ethic (setting priorities and managing time, taking initiative and following through, taking responsibility for actions and work, acting with civility and politeness
b. personal responsibility (behaving honestly and ethically, acting assertively, being a self advocate)
c. collaboration (being a team player, cooperating for a common purpose, acknowledging authority and taking direction)
Evidence that s/he designs and implements instruction related to students' finding and using information in all of the following:

- a. conducting research using acceptable research methods and information from different sources
- b. assessing the credibility and relevance of information
- c. applying different research paradigms, including the collection and analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data and research
- d. select, integrate, and apply appropriate technology to expand information and knowledge

is dimensions.
 estioning and

eacher),

bjectives :

searcher, 29 (4), 11–13.

ge and

development.

MIT Press

g skills.
ecord

Research

[u/](#)

lum Development.

ing, and

. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Apply	Analyze	Evaluate	Create
Classify	Order	Rank	Combine
Experiment	Explain	Assess	Plan
Calculate	Differentiate	Conclude	Compose
Construct	Achieve	Action	Actualize