

**CAEP ACCREDITATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
SUBMISSION OF ANALYSIS MAY - JUNE 2016**

Standard 1

i.

***Maximum character count: 15,000**

Candidates in the WSU College of Education are proficient in content and pedagogical knowledge as evidenced in our data results. EPP-created assessments and rubrics were revised in Summer 2015 to align to InTASC standards and the Danielson Framework for Teaching; these are the Lesson Plan, Case Study, Digital Video Self-Study, e-Portfolio, and Clinical Observation. The following report reflects two administrations—Fall 2015 and Winter 2016 (Fall 2016 will be available at the site visit); data for 2014-15 are available in the evidence folder and the findings support proficiency of content and pedagogical knowledge for our candidates as well. Other data sources of evidence include the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) assessments and MDE surveys of each completer and also of their clinical supervisors—scores from Winter 2016 were not released at the time of this report and will be available at the site visit). The following score ratings are used for EPP-created assessments: 1- Satisfactory or not Observed; 2-Basic; 3-Proficiency; 4- Distinguished. The score means for all completers for all assessments across all 4 categories of the standards are at or above the proficiency target of 3.0 out of 4.0, as reported in fall of 2015 and winter 2016 (Data Results/Average Mean Score Across Standards by Assessment Fall 2015 - Winter 2016). Scores means for all completers for the four categories are the following:

Category 1: The Learner & Learning – Fall 2015: 3.29, Winter 2016: 3.28

Category 2: Content Knowledge – Fall 2015: 3.38, Winter 2016: 3.37

Category 3: Instructional practice – Fall 2015: 3.38, Winter 2016: 3.31

Category 4: Professional Responsibility – Fall 2015, 3.42, Winter 2016: 3.36

Score means for all assessments that addressed all 10 InTASC standards were also all above the target score of 3.0 out of 4.0.

The first InTASC category is reflected in the first section of the Lesson plan assignment entitled, *Learner and Learning* (EPP-wide assessments/COE - Lesson Plan Assignment, Framework, and Rubric). We look for evidence of our completers engaging and supporting diverse learners by applying principles of the Universal Design for Learning. We ask them to think about the learners for whom the lesson is being developed including but not limited to the following: each learner's background; development level; strengths; and needs. The averages of all completers in this section of the lesson plan assignment were Fall 2015: 3.44 and and Winter 2016: 3.39. Proficiency is also reflected in the candidates' Case Study scores. In the Behavioral/Academic Intervention Plan-Setting Instructional Outcomes section, completers describe what they will do to address the student's behavior and/or academic needs after careful and multiple observations (EPP-Created Assessments/Case Study Assignment and Rubric). The averages of all completers in this section of the case study assignment were 3.06 in Fall 2015 and 3.13 in Winter 2016. Finally, the clinical observation instrument requires our completers to demonstrate knowledge of students as they plan and prepare their

teaching (EPP-Created Assessments/Clinical Observation, Domain 1b; Data Results/COE - 2015-2016 Clinical Observation by Area). The averages of all completers in this section of the observation assignment were 2.95 in Fall 2015 and 3.31 in Winter 2016. Fall 2015 was the first year of implementation of all new rubrics and revised assignments; subsequently all observation assessment scores were consistently low given supervisor's time to become acclimated to the scoring and extensive components of the Danielson Framework. After professional development in Fall 2015, clinical supervisors established better norming on scoring components of the rubric and scores in Winter 2016 better reflect the level of proficiency of the candidates. Fall 2015 still reflects that we were very close to our targeted score of 3.0 and the winter average exceeds our targeted score. The evidence to support the Content category include the MTTC scores, lesson plan and the clinical observation. One strong indicator of our completers' content knowledge is the Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC). All of our completers (100%) pass the MTTC content portion. The observation instrument also requires our completers to demonstrate knowledge of content and pedagogy in Domain 1a: Demonstrating Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy (EPP-Created Assessments/Clinical Observation, Domain 1a; Data Results/COE - 2015-2016 Clinical Observation by Area). The averages of all completers in this section were 3.06 in Fall 2015 and 3.32 in Winter 2016. Furthermore, content knowledge proficiency is synthesized in the lesson plan as candidates prepare and write outcomes aligned with State standards and national content benchmarks (EPP-Created Assessments/Lesson Plan, Section 2). We want our completers to represent rigorous outcomes in the discipline that are clear, measurable and the student learning can be assessed for achievement. The averages in this section were 3.38 in Fall 2015 and 3.27 in Winter 2016 (Data Results/COE - 2015-2016 Lesson Plan by Area). These scores indicate that our completers are proficient in content knowledge.

Evidence to support the Instructional Practice category include the lesson plan and the clinical observation. The fourth section of the Lesson Plan assignment addresses the Instructional Practice category (EPP-Created Assessments/Lesson Plan, Section 4). We look for evidence of our completers actively engaging students in constructing a deep understanding of the content. They need to provide options and strategies for how information is presented to learners; how learners will demonstrate their understanding and will reach higher levels of comprehension and learning. The averages in this section of the lesson plan assignment were 3.46 in Fall 2015 and 3.45 in Winter 2016. This result is further supported in multiple sections of the observation instrument (EPP-Created Assessments/Clinical Observation, Domain 1b; Data Results/COE - 2015-2016 Clinical Observation by Area). Section 3c specifically requires our completers to demonstrate how they engage students in learning. The averages of all completers in this section of the observation assignment were 2.97 in Fall 2015 and 3.28 in Winter 2016. As previously mentioned, professional development in Fall 2015 prepared clinical supervisors to become acclimated to the Danielson Framework. Examples of other sections of the observation instrument related to instructional practice are: Designing Coherent

Instruction (Fall 2015 - M=2.95, Winter 2016 - M=3.31; Establishing Culture for Learning (M=3.03 & 3.26), Managing Classroom Procedures (M= 2.92 & 3.23), Communicating with Student (M=3.03 & 3.31), Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (M=2.78 & 3.23), Demonstrating Flexibility & Responsiveness (M=2.97 & 3.26). Fall 2015 scores are either at the targeted level or very close to our targeted score; whereas all winter scores exceed the targeted score.

Evidence to support the Professional Responsibility category include the lesson plan, case study, and the clinical observation. The last section (5) of the Lesson Plan assignment asks candidates to reflect and articulate professional responsibility of their students' learning. We ask them to use data from the assessment portion of their lesson to inform future lessons. The averages of all completers in this section of the lesson plan assignment were 3.46 in Fall and 3.47 in the Winter. Further, in the case study Professionalism section, completers acknowledge and demonstrate understanding of the high standards of honesty, integrity, and confidentiality in interactions with colleagues, students, and the student's family in regards to information/data for the case study. The averages in this section of the case study assignment were 3.32 in both the Fall and Winter. Finally, two sections of the observation instrument require our completers to demonstrate their growth as a professional. We ask completers to provide evidence that they are seeking out opportunities for professional development to enhance their content knowledge and pedagogical skills. We also expect candidates to be engaging with colleagues and supervisors in professional conversation about practice. The averages of all completers in these sections of the observation assignment were 2.98 and 3.05 in Fall 2015, and 3.34 and 3.45 in Winter 2016. All scores are very close to or exceed our targeted score.

Completers demonstrate proficiency in the use of research and evidence to inform their teaching practice, teacher education and student learning in several assignments and surveys. The first is the rationale section of the Case Study where candidates are asked to systematically acquire knowledge from multiples sources about varied approaches to learning and development. The averages of all completers in this section were Fall: 3.27, Winter: 3.25. This result is also supported with scores on the Case Study's Behavioral/Academic Intervention Plan section. In this section, completers describe specifically what they will do to address the behavior and/or academic needs (such as assessments, strategies, materials, resources, etc.) after they observe the chosen student's strengths, needs and any other pertinent information that informs their case. The averages of all completers in this section of the case study assignment were Fall: 3.06 and Winter: 3.13 which exceeds the target. The clinical observation supports these findings as well. The Observation 1b section looks at how our completers demonstrate knowledge of students as they plan and prepare to do their teaching. The averages of all completers were Fall: 2.95 and Winter: 3.31. Fall 2015 scores reflect that we were very close to our targeted score of 3.0 and the winter average exceeds our targeted score. The results and discussion section of the case study requires completers to reflect on and analyze their own professional practice, as well as an observed K-12 student's progress. The averages of all completers in this section was 3.32 for both

the Fall and Winter semesters. Finally, the Digital Video self-study also addresses understanding of professional responsibility by providing an opportunity to measure p-12 student progress as well as the completer's professional practice in the Growing and Developing Professionally section. The averages of all completers for this section were Fall:3.24 and Winter:3.40. The evidence provided demonstrates that our completers understand the InTASC standards and are proficient in content and pedagogical knowledge.

Our candidates recognize and utilize state and curricular standards to inform their teaching practice which is evidenced by two sources from the Michigan Department of Education (MDE), and scores from state-aligned assessments and rubrics. First is the Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) Performance Score that MDE calculates and shares each year. The Overall Score is calculated by using The Michigan Tests for Teacher Certification 3-year passing percentages (abbreviated MTTC), the 2013-2014 Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey efficacy rates (abbreviated SURV), and the points attributed to the Educator Effectiveness Labels earned by the EPI (abbreviated EFF). 2015 EPI score for Wayne State University reported the overall score of 84.6 calculated as a result of scoring 81 for MTTC, 91.9 for SURV, 80.4 for EFF. 2016 EPI score for Wayne State University reported the overall score of 85.4 calculated as a result of scoring 80.5 for MTTC, 94.5 for SURV, 80.5 for EFF. Both of these overall scores are categorized as Satisfactory by MDE. The second source of data from MDE is MTTC scores by licensure areas. According to the 2015 and 2016 Michigan Department of Education EPI Score Report, an Educator Preparation Institution (EPI) with teacher preparation programs categorized as satisfactory will possess a "high percentage of teacher candidates who are able to pass their Michigan Test for Teacher Certification (MTTC) content-based assessments" (State Specific evidence/ EPI Score Report 2015 and 2016). The 2015 and 2016 EPI reports reveal that Wayne State University's cut score of 81% and 80.5% meets the satisfactory level in the State of Michigan. We recognize that the number of students who took specific licensure area tests is very low, and that percentages for some specific areas are below 80%. Moreover, sub-disciplines have 1 to 5 candidates taking the test. In that case, when 1 or 2 students fail, it affects the licensure area percentage much more than if the number of candidates had been larger. Another effect of not having enough candidates in each disciplinary cohort is that statistically valid conclusions are difficult to reach. To address those candidates who do underperform on the MTTC, all programs can better support candidates in preparing and passing the MTTC—the test required for state certification. With a .5% decrease in cut score over the last year, the Accreditation Advisory Committee recognizes the need to connect with content faculty possibly outside of the College of Education in order to build awareness and familiarity with the test objectives to increase the pass rates of our teacher candidates. The first meeting to explore ways to connect with content faculty will be at the September 2016 Accreditation Committee meeting.

Within the Teacher Education Program, all course work in content-area courses are aligned with state standards and courses are state approved for certification as evidenced through the MDE approval letters (State Specific evidence/MDE

Licensure Program Approval Letters). As part of the state approval process, all areas must submit syllabi and program overviews documenting alignment of standards, outcomes, and outcome measures. At the University level, each licensure group area submits an annual analysis of key program outcomes and a summary of evidence showing progress toward each outcome as measured by selected assignments in the licensure area. Results are reviewed annually by faculty within licensure areas and plans to increase proficiency within each outcome are included (see specialty licensure area data responses for further details regarding individual licensure areas use of data for change).

Our completers demonstrate the use of national standards to inform their practice in preparing students who are college and career ready as evidenced in the Lesson plan and formal observation. The Lesson Plan's Outcome and Assessment section provides data on completers' skills at aligning content to state and content standards (EPP-wide Assessments/Lesson Plan Assignment, Framework, and Rubric - Outcomes and Assessment Section). Candidates also address evidence of student learning and the K-12 students' access to standards. The averages of all completers in this section of the lesson plan assignment were 3.38 in Fall 2015 and 3.27 in Winter 2016 which are above the targeted score. The results are supported by data from the clinical observation (1f: Designing Student Assessments; and 3d: Using Assessment in Instruction). The averages of all completers for 1f were Fall: 2.76 and Winter: 3.18. The averages of all completers for observation of using assessment in instruction were Fall: 2.87 and Winter: 3.23. As mentioned, the lower scores in Fall 2015 were attributed to being the first semester a new rubric for formal observation was implemented. Scores in both areas were very close to the target of 3.0 and met or exceeded the target in Winter 2016.

Our candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice. During Student Teaching, we ask candidates to discuss how they use innovation or creativity in their lesson plans to engage students. We also ask how they incorporate multiple forms of assessment to check for student understanding and specifically how they incorporate technology to facilitate student engagement, deeper understanding, and critical thinking. These are evidenced in the E-Portfolio Assignment's Innovative Practitioner section. The averages of all completers in this section of the E-Portfolio assignment were 3.82 in Fall 2015 and 3.29 in Winter 2016 which are above the targeted score. Another evidence to support this claim is the Teacher Candidate and Candidate Supervisor Survey (by MDE) efficacy rates on using technology. Candidate supervisors rated our completers 97%, completers themselves as 89%, cooperating teachers as 85%, and year-out teachers as 89%. Final evidence comes from an assignment that we have piloted in the Fall of 2015 titled "Lesson Plan Innovation." The purpose of this assignment is to take an existing lesson plan and innovatively redesign it to address the best practices such as making richer use of content or implementing culturally relevant/responsive teaching. The averages of all completers in the Innovative Practitioner section of the Lesson Plan Innovation assignment were 3.33 in Fall 2015. We are planning to use this assignment in the future.

Evidence from multiple data sources provided evidence that completers meet the requirements of CAEP standard 1: Content and Pedagogical Knowledge and its sub-standards. Each of the 5 sub-standards were addressed using evidence from assessments including the Lesson Plan, Case Study, Digital Video Self-Study, e-Portfolio, Observation, and MDE surveys of each completer and also of their clinical supervisors. The score means for all completers for all assessments were at or above the target score of 3.0 out of 4.0 as reported in fall 2015 and winter 2016.

Guiding Questions for Analysis of Evidence

- How do candidates demonstrate an understanding of the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility?
- How does the provider ensure that candidates use research and evidence to develop an understanding of the teaching profession?
- How do candidates use research and evidence to measure their P-12 students' progress and their own professional practice?
- How do candidates apply content and pedagogical knowledge as reflected in outcome assessments in response to standards of Specialized Professional Associations (SPA), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), states, or other accrediting bodies (e.g., National Association of Schools of Music - NASM)?
- How do candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P-12 students access to rigorous college- and career-ready standards (e.g., Next Generation Science Standards, National Career Readiness Certificate, Common Core State Standards)?
- How do candidates model and apply technology standards as they design, implement and assess learning experiences to engage students and improve learning; and enrich professional practice?