

I & II. Objectives, Course/Learning Experiences

Please provide your academic program’s learning goals and objectives. Describe the process by which the objectives receive faculty review. Which, if any, of your objectives were modified, deleted, or added in the last year? Provide the linkage between your program’s goals and objectives and their instructional delivery via your curriculum.

Our middle education program is aligned with the 2012 standards for the Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE).

SPA AMLE	PROGRAM Corresponding Middle Education student learning objective	Course experiences that address the student learning objective
<p>Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Element a. Knowledge of Young Adolescent Development Element b. Knowledge of the Implications of Diversity on Young Adolescent Development Element c. Implications of Young Adolescent Development for Middle Level Curriculum and instruction Element d. Implications of Young Adolescent Development for Middle Level Programs and Practices 	<p>At the conclusion of this experience, candidates will be able to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote students; academic, social, emotional, and moral development through the appropriate use of assessment and instructional practices. Apply knowledge and skills to support learners in achieving the appropriate Virginia Standards of Learning for grades 6-8. Select academically challenging, culturally sensitive, and personally motivating curricular materials to help learners develop knowledge and skills, sustain intellectual curiosity, and solve complex and engaging problems. Use technology as a tool for teaching, learning, research, and communication. Use differentiated instruction and flexible grouping to meet the needs of adolescents at different stages of development, readiness, and achievement Modify learning environment and instructional strategies to meet the individual needs of students, including those with disabilities, gifted students, and ELLS. Utilize effective classroom management skills to cultivate maintain a positive learning environment. 	<p>EDUC 310 MSSE 370 MSSE 470 EXED 460 MSSE 650 MSSE 690 MIED 656 MIED 610</p> <p>Key Assessment(s): (numbers correspond to SPA report key assessments)</p> <p>#3 TWS/STC Part 2 DFI (Stnd 1; Element C); Course MSSE 650</p> <p>#5 TWS/STC Part 3 ASL, IDM, RSE (Stnd 1; Element D); Course MSSE 650</p> <p>#6 Management and Motivation project (Stnd 1; all elements); Course MIED 656</p> <p>#7 School Structure and Organization project (Stnd 1; Elements A, B, D); Course MIED 610</p>

Commented [BY-b1]: This statement also provides evidence that all student learning objectives are student centered which corresponds to Element I.B.

Commented [BY-b2]: This sentence specifies the target population the Middle Education program assesses. Specifically, the target population is candidates (i.e., students training to become teachers). This sentence corresponds to Element I.A.

Commented [BY-b3]: The program provides a nice alignment between the standards from the accreditation body (AMLE) and the program-level student learning objectives. Most of the student learning objectives are stated using precise verbs, providing rich description of the content/skill/or attitudinal domain. This could ensure the student learning objectives are assessable and corresponds to Element I.A.

*For space considerations, only 2 of the 5 student learning objectives are presented throughout this APT. And only part of statements for each student learning objective are presented in this example APT.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop professionally through reflection, collaboration, and continuous learning. • Make learning purposeful by relating lessons to students' interests and allowing students to make choices in their learning and leading them to ask questions and pursue problems that are meaningful to them. • Create interdependent learning opportunities which encourage students to work collaboratively using effective cooperative group skills. • Apply theories of young adolescent development to promote academic, social, emotional, and moral development through the appropriate use of assessment and instructional practices. 	
<p>Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Element a. Subject matter content knowledge • Element b. Middle level student standards • Element c. Interdisciplinary Nature of knowledge. 	<p>At the conclusion of this experience, candidates will be able to...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan and teach collaboratively with a more experienced teacher. • Plan and teach independently. • Promote students; academic, social, emotional, and moral development through the appropriate use of assessment and instructional practices. • Apply knowledge and skills to support learners in achieving the appropriate Virginia Standards of Learning for grades 6-8. • Select academically challenging, culturally sensitive, and personally motivating curricular materials to help learners develop knowledge and skills, sustain intellectual curiosity, and solve complex and engaging problems. • Use technology as a tool for teaching, learning, research, and communication. • Use differentiated instruction and flexible grouping to meet the needs of adolescents at different stages of 	<p>MSSE 370 MSSE 470 MSSE 650 MSSE 690 MIED 656 MIED 610</p> <p>Key Assessment(s): (numbers correspond to SPA report key assessments)</p> <p>#1 Praxis Subj Assmts passed prior to student teaching (Stnd 2; Elements A, B); Course MSSE 690</p> <p>#2 STC Part 1 CF, LGAP (Stnd 2; All Elements); Course MSSE 650</p> <p>#3 STC Part 2 DFI (Stnd 2; Elements B, C); Course MSSE 650</p>

Commented [BY-b4]: This column presents what classes or student learning experience are linked to each student learning objective. All student learning objectives are linked to at least one course/ learning experience. The presentation of the curriculum and SLO mapping satisfies the Element II of the APT rubric.

Commented [BY-b5]: The remaining content in this column focuses on specifying the relationship between measures and objectives. The program details what assessments measure subdomains of each SLO and in what course these assessments were administered. This information is useful for Element III.A.

	<p>development, readiness, and achievement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify learning environment and instructional strategies to meet the individual needs of students, including those with disabilities, gifted students, and ELLS. • Use formal and informal assessments to diagnose students' needs, plan and modify instruction, and document student progress. • Make learning purposeful by relating lessons to students' interests and allowing students to make choices in their learning and leading them to ask questions and pursue problems that are meaningful to them. • Use a range of instructional and communication strategies to make the classroom environment safe, positive, and supportive of student independence and success. • Create interdependent learning opportunities which encourage students to work collaboratively using effective cooperative group skills. 	<p>#4 Assessment of Student Teaching-Profile of Student Teaching Performance (Std 2; Element A); Course MSSE 690</p> <p>#6 Management and Motivation project (Std 2; Elements B, C); Course MIED 656</p>
--	---	--

III. Evaluation/Assessment Methods

Provide a listing of the systematic methods and procedures for gathering information about achievement of your goals and objectives. Additionally, specify the expected student achievement results. Please also describe the process for systematic data collection. Finally, describe the measurement properties of the assessment method, such as reliability and validity.

Assessment Tool and Description	AMLE Standards
<p>Assessment #1: Praxis Subject Area Assessment</p> <p>Middle Education candidates are required to take two Praxis Subject Area Assessment exams (corresponding to their two chosen subject area concentrations drawn from math, science, language arts, and social studies). These tests are administered by Educational Testing Service (ETS; http://www.ets.org). The Virginia Department of Education (DOE) awards</p>	<p>Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum, Element A</p>

Commented [BY-b6]: The table further introduces the mechanism how each assessment is mapped to each SLO, details the match between each assessment and SLO, and provides evidence for using each assessment for measuring SLOs (e.g., psychometric properties of each assessment). The table corresponds to Element III.A.

Commented [BY-b7]: The table makes it explicit that the assessments used by the Middle Education program are all direct measures and all SLOs are assessed by at least one measure. This corresponds to Element III.B.

<p>teaching licenses to students when they pass both of their Praxis Subject Area Assessment exams and complete all program requirements; therefore, all graduates of the Middle Education program meet Virginia licensure requirements in two content areas, not just in one area as required by the Virginia DOE.</p> <p>Expectations for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>The Commonwealth of Virginia has established passing scores on Praxis Subject Assessment exams in order to be granted a teaching license. JMU requires MIED students to pass two Praxis Subject Assessment exams in order to progress through their programs. Students are encouraged to begin taking the Praxis Subject Assessment exams during their junior year and they may take each exam as many times as necessary to pass.</p>	
<p>Assessment #2: Teacher Work Sample (TWS)/Student Teaching Capstone (STC) Part 1 Contextual Factors and Learning Goals and Assessment Plan: Content Knowledge in Middle Level Education</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone serves as a master’s thesis project that students complete during their student teaching semester. Successful completion of this six-part, comprehensive project is required for all students seeking licensure in the Middle Education programs. Assessment #2 includes the first two portions of the project: “Contextual Factors” (CF), and “Learning Goals and Assessment Plan” (LGAP). The Contextual Factors (CF) section is written early during the candidates’ placements and is designed to help candidates understand their students and their learning needs in the classroom and use that understanding to guide their design and implementation of instruction, assessment, and reflection. Candidates are expected to explicitly draw on this contextual information in all succeeding phases of the project. The Learning Goals and Assessment Plan (LGAP) requires candidates to articulate what they want their students to Understand, Know, and Be able to Do (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005) at the project’s conclusion, as well as how they will know that students have met these goals. LGAP guides candidates through the process of establishing and clearly stating their standards-aligned, content-based learning goals in addition to developing assessments (pre-, formative, and summative) that will allow them to determine whether students have met those goals. <i>These sections of the TWS require candidates to gather information about their students’ learning needs and to use this information to guide the design of sound, content-based instruction.</i> As such, it addresses AMLE Standards 1 and 2.</p> <p>Expectations for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone has a passing score (80%) on each section; students who do not pass one or more sections must revise and resubmit the project the following semester. The TWS/STC is course embedded within the student teaching experience and all students must complete required coursework for degree completion.</p> <p>Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards</p>	<p>Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development, <i>Elements C and D</i></p> <p>Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum, <i>Elements B and C</i></p> <p>Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction & Assessment, <i>Elements A, B, C and D</i></p> <p>Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles, <i>Element A</i></p>

Commented [BY-b8]: The program specified the desired results for each assessment. This area could be strengthened by providing a rationale as to why these results were expected. This corresponds to Element III.C.

Commented [BY-b9]: The program clearly explained the data collection sample, timeline and justified that it is required by the Commonwealth of Virginia to pass Praxis Subject Assessment exams to achieve a teaching license. In addition, the program addressed why students are motivated to take each exam. This corresponds to Element III.D.

Commented [BY-b10]: The following narratives provide details about how the AMLE Standards are aligned with the specific student learning objectives. This section could be improved by further aligning assessment instruments with the program-level student learning objectives. In addition, this section could be strengthened by specifying whether the mapping is confirmed by faculty subject experts. This corresponds to Element III.A.

AMLE Standard 1: Implications of Young Adolescent Development for Middle Level Curriculum and Instruction (*Element C*)

The first step Middle Level Education candidates undertake before they begin the TWS/STC is the discovery of their students’ learning needs in the Contextual Factors section. In CF, candidates gather information from school sources (e.g., scheduling decisions, student files) as well as from their own surveys and other strategies to determine information such as “...students’ ages, gender, motivation levels, achievement/developmental skill levels, linguistic diversity, special needs, interests, learning styles/modalities, reading levels, writing levels and/or technology skills” (CF Instrument). They must also discuss how these identified student characteristics/needs will “...influence [their] instructional planning” (CF Instrument). Candidates discuss these influences in terms of how they will impact planning at the whole-class level, as well as how it will impact their planning for individual “case study” students. Hence, candidates are enacting AMLE’s Target descriptor for Standard 1, which states that “*Middle level teacher candidates assess the diverse developmental levels of their students and use this information effectively when selecting instructional Strategies and making curricular decisions...*”

AMLE Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum (*Elements B & C*)

The Target descriptor for AMLE Standard 2B states that “*Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate their knowledge of local, state, national, and common core middle level curriculum standards for student learning. They deconstruct the standards to better understand their intent and their effects on all young adolescents.*” The Learning Goals and Assessment Plan (LGAP) portion of the TWS /STC requires candidates to do just that. While they align instruction to Common Core State Standards at other levels of the program (e.g., MIED 656), while they are student teaching, they must align their curriculum and instruction with the Virginia Standards of Learning, the required standards in their middle schools. Candidates select appropriate Virginia state standards and then deconstruct those standards into the knowledge and skill goals they encompass, phrasing each goal as discrete and assessable. In addition, they examine the standards and derive overarching understanding goals to serve as the conceptual lens for their unit and to help middle level students find connections among themselves, the project’s learning goals, and learning goals from other units and courses. These understanding goals allow candidates to “*demonstrate an understanding of the interdisciplinary and integrative nature of knowledge*” (AMLE 2.C). Using these overarching understanding goals, candidates also design ways to connect required middle-level content with students’ interests and needs as discovered in the CF portion of the TWS/STC. This adheres to AMLE 2.C’s Target for candidates to ensure “*...all their students make authentic and meaningful connections among subject areas and their interests and experiences.*”

Once their learning goals are mapped out, candidates construct a detailed assessment plan that includes the construction of 1) a pre-assessment – to discover where learners are and what they need to succeed before instruction; 2)

<p>formative assessments – to gather information on student learning <u>as they progress</u> through instruction; and 3) summative assessment – to capture data on how well students mastered the learning goals <u>at the close</u> of the project. These requirements align to – and even exceed - AMLE’s 2.B’s Target standard, which stresses candidates should “... align instructional goals and student assessments with [required] standards.”</p>	
<p>Assessment #3: TWS/STC Part 2, Design For Instruction: Candidate ability to plan appropriate teaching and learning experiences</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone serves as a master’s thesis project that students complete during their student teaching semester. Successful completion of this six-part, comprehensive project is required for all students seeking licensure in the Middle Education programs. Assessment #3 includes the “Design for Instruction” portion. Design for Instruction (DFI) requires extensive preparation and is at the heart of candidates’ Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone. Candidates must analyze the data gathered from their pre-assessment, develop a matrix that provides an overview of an instructional unit, create three-five detailed lesson plans (including supplemental materials), and discuss two of the strategies they chose to use in teaching their units. This section of the TWS/STC requires candidates to draw from information gathered in the Contextual Factors section (see Assessment #2) about their students’ interests, learning profiles, and other learning needs and to use this information – along with readiness information gathered from their pre-assessment (see Assessment #2) to guide the construction of sound, content-based instruction that aligns to established standards and aligned learning goals (see also Assessment #2).</p> <p>Expectations for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>The TWS/STC has a passing score (80%) on each section; students who do not pass one or more sections must revise and resubmit the project the following semester. The TWS/STC is course embedded within the student teaching experience and all students must complete required coursework for degree completion.</p> <p>Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards</p> <p><u>AMLE Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development (Element C)</u></p> <p>In Design for Instruction (DFI), candidates draw upon what they learned about their students in the Contextual Factors (CF) section of the TWS/STC to plan and implement middle level curriculum and to select instructional strategies – specifically, a three to five lesson, standards aligned, student-centered unit plan (along with all supporting materials). In doing so, candidates “...<i>assess the diverse developmental levels of their students and use this information effectively when selecting instructional strategies and making curricular decisions...</i>” (AMLE Standard 1 Rubric - Target criteria). Further, candidates are required to construct a “...narrative which describes one instructional strategy [they] are using in [their] unit and why [they] have chosen it” (DFI Instrument). This reflective</p>	

component sets candidates up to be successful in the IDM and ASL sections of the project (see Key Assessment #5 Narrative) and causes them to “...reflect on their decision-making practice to enhance their teaching effectiveness and to increase student learning” (AMLE Standard 1 Rubric - Target criteria).

AMLE Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum (Elements B & C)

The Acceptable descriptor for AMLE Standard 2B states that “Middle level teacher candidates demonstrate their ability use content-specific teaching and assessment strategies and integrate information literacy skills and technologies into the subjects they teach.” The Design for Instruction (DFI) portion of the TWS/STC requires candidates to do just that. Evident in both the unit matrix, the three-five extended lesson plans, and the rubric are the requirements for candidates to include the following:

- Learning Goals
- Implications from Pre-assessment (how addressed in instruction)
- Lesson Components (hook, interactive content delivery, practice, and closure)
- Plans for Differentiation
- Plans for Technology Use
- Formative and Summative Assessments

Not only must candidates design and implement the components above; they must also reflect on their efficacy. Their required reflection must discuss a selected learning/teaching strategy in terms of the following:

- How it builds on prior knowledge, previous lessons, and/or connects to subsequent lessons.
- How it will promote student learning
- How it reflects research-based instructional practice that supports and promotes student learning (generally and/or for your content area) – Note that you should include appropriate citations
- How it is driven by OR has the potential to serve as formative assessment
- How you will modify the activity to enhance learning for all students

This adheres to AMLE Standard 2B’s Target rubric criteria, which states that candidates must design curriculum and instruction that is “...relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory. They select, design, evaluate, and modify curriculum in ways that capitalize on the diverse learning needs of all young adolescents” (AMLE 2.C).

AMLE Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment (Element A)

The DFI unit and lesson plans – along with the reflective narrative – described above illustrate Key Assessment #3’s adherence to AMLE 4.A and B. These standards center on candidates using “a wide variety of [content-based teaching and assessment] strategies in their teaching and modifying their use based on the unique learning needs of their students” (AMLE 4.A Target Rubric criteria). Candidates achieve this in DFI by planning – and being assessed on – their ability to “...facilitate learning through a wide variety of developmentally responsive materials and resources (e.g., technological resources...) They employ a process of self-analysis and collaboration...to determine the impact of their instruction on

<p><i>student motivation and learning and they adjust their teaching accordingly”</i> (AMLE 4.B Target Rubric criteria). This latter practice is discussed in more detail in the Key Assessment #5 narrative, but the groundwork for that reflection is here in the DFI portion of the TWS/STC project.</p>	
<p>Assessment #4: Assessment of Student Teaching-Profile of Student Teaching Performance</p> <p>This form is utilized during the candidate’s field experience placement (student teaching). Both the University Supervisor and the Cooperating Teacher evaluate the student teacher twice during the placement – in the middle of the semester, and at the end. The form has seven sections: Professional Knowledge, Assessment of and for Student Learning, Instructional Planning, Learning Environment, Instructional Delivery, Reflection for Student Academic Progress, and Professionalism.</p> <p>Expectations for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>Students are required to achieve at least a “Meeting Expectations (ME)” rating on each rubric criterion. All students complete student teaching as part of their required program. The Assessment of Student Teaching-Profile of Student Teaching Performance is an instrument developed through participation of a consortium of area colleges and universities with teacher education preparation programs.</p>	<p>Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum, <i>Element A</i></p> <p>Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment, <i>Elements A, B, and C</i></p> <p>Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles, <i>Elements C and D</i></p>
<p>Assessment #5: TWS/STC Part 3 ASL, IDM, RSE: Candidate Effect on Student Learning</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone serves as a master’s thesis project that students complete during their student teaching semester. Successful completion of this six-part, comprehensive project is required for all students seeking licensure in the Middle Education programs. Assessment #5 includes the latter three portions of the project: “Instructional Decision Making” (IDM), “Analysis of Student Learning” (ASL), and “Reflection and Self Evaluation” (RSE). IDM asks candidates to use ongoing analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions. ASL requires candidates to use assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement. In RSE, the candidates analyze the relationship between their instruction and student learning in order to improve teaching practice. <i>These sections of the TWS/STC require students to gather data that demonstrates student learning, adjust instruction accordingly, and reflect on the efficacy of their interventions.</i> As such, it addresses multiple standards.</p> <p>Expectations for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>The Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone has a passing score (80%) on each section; students who do not pass one or more sections must revise and resubmit the project the following semester. The TWS/STC is course embedded within the student teaching experience and all students must complete required coursework for degree completion.</p>	

Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards

AMLE Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development (Element D)

In Instructional Decision Making (IDM), candidates discuss specific examples of how they modified their teaching based on data from formative assessments they collected. They discuss both general modifications and specific plans for differentiated instruction. They must also reflect on how their instructional modifications affected student learning and impacted their learning goals. This requirement aligns with the Target descriptor of AMLE Standard 1D, which states that middle level candidates use their understanding of young adolescent learners "...to deconstruct classroom events and other experiences, analyze how this information impacts student learning, and modify their teaching to reflect this understanding." Candidates' modifications and differentiated tasks are designed to address variance in students' grasp of content for a variety of reasons such as language differences, developmental needs, special needs, those designated as high achieving, those at risk of failure, etc. Therefore, candidates adhere to the target description of AMLE Standard 1, which states that candidates must "...assess the diverse developmental levels of their students and use this information effectively when selecting instructional strategies and making curricular decisions..." IDM's reflective requirement satisfies Standard 1's Target criteria for Middle Education candidates to "...reflect on their decisions and revise their practice to enhance their teaching effectiveness and to increase student learning."

AMLE Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment (Element C)

Not only do candidates note the learning needs revealed by their assessment data, as discussed above, they also discuss how they *responded* to that data with differentiated instruction (IDM) and analyze differences in student performance to reflect on the efficacy of their instruction (ASL). The target language for AMLE Standard 4 states that candidates "...analyze [student] data to evaluate their practice and inform their instruction (e.g., adjust pace, differentiated for individuals, create meaningful learning experiences, and implement effective lessons)." In IDM, candidates do just that. They analyze data for learning needs and respond by tailoring learning tasks to meet those needs through both *general curricular modifications* and the development of more *targeted, differentiated, small group tasks*. These differentiated tasks are learner-centered rather than teacher-centered, requiring candidates to "facilitate student learning through a wide variety of developmentally responsive materials and resources" (Target – AMLE Standard 4C). Furthermore, candidates adhere to the Standard 4C Target criteria to "...employ a process of self-analysis and collaboration with students and colleagues to determine the impact of their instruction on student motivation and learning and adjust their teaching accordingly" through both IDM (discussed above) and in Analysis of Student Learning (ASL). This portion of the TWS/STC calls for candidates to analyze full class assessment data from the pre-,

<p>formative, and summative assessments to determine the efficacy of their instructional adjustments and modifications.</p> <p>AMLE Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles (Element A)</p> <p>Reflection and Self Evaluation (RSE) – the final portion of the TWS/STC – requires candidates to 1) reflect on their overall teaching performance to determine their strengths and weaknesses, 2) discuss these areas of strength and weakness as they relate to middle-level best practices, and 3) determine how their strengths and weaknesses indicate areas for future professional growth AND what steps they might take to pursue that growth. Candidates must go beyond the surface level and articulate specific ideas for how they would redesign their instruction to better meet student needs. In addition, their Professional Development Plan must include at least two professional goals (phrased as “SMART goals”), one of which must be focused on their “Craft” (continued development in the field of middle education) and the other of which must be focused on their teaching. Their plan for professional development must include specific activities such as professional development available through AMLE, course work at area universities, collaboration with colleagues in Professional Learning Communities, etc. Such activities will ensure that candidates uphold AMLE’s Standard 5, Element A Target to “...self-assess their professional development needs and take initiatives to seek out and participate in opportunities that address them.”</p>	
<p>Assessment #6: Motivation and Management Project</p> <p>The Classroom Motivation and Management Plan is a cumulative project that serves as a summative assessment for the MIED capstone semester seminar course (MIED 656). This course is required for all candidates in the Middle Education Program. It is offered in the spring semester following student teaching. It is designed to allow candidates to explore the questions pressing at the forefront of their minds at the conclusion of their student teaching experience: <i>1) How do I motivate students to invest in their assignments, and 2) How do I manage my classroom using the highly interactive strategies that will serve to increase motivation?</i> Clearly, the answers to these two questions are multi-faceted, pulling from methodology in establishing a healthy learning environment, crafting worthwhile, integrative instructional experiences, meeting the unique developmental needs of young adolescents AND the more specific needs of students with disabilities, and promoting open lines of communication among teacher, students, and families. As such, this cumulative project addresses multiple standards.</p> <p>Expectation for Students/Systematic Data Collection</p> <p>Students are required to achieve at least an “Acceptable” rating on each rubric criterion. This key assessment is course embedded and required of all students completing the middle education degree program.</p> <p>Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards</p>	<p>Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development, <i>All Elements</i></p> <p>Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum, <i>Elements B and C</i></p> <p>Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment, <i>Elements A, B, and D</i></p> <p>Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles, <i>Element C</i></p>

Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development (ALL Elements)

Every aspect of this assessment is focused on meeting the needs of young adolescents. The unique developmental needs of middle level learners are the focus of the “Learning Environment” portion of the assignment, in which candidates must construct both affective and physical environments that support middle grade students *emotionally* (e.g., making sure they are known by their teachers and classmates), *socially* (e.g., activities designed to build community and foster a safe, interactive, interdependent, and collaborative atmosphere) and *physically* (e.g., classroom set up that facilitates connection, safety, group work, etc.). This aligns to Standard 1, Elements A and D. Recognizing that these needs must be met if instruction is to be effective, candidates design specific strategies for building community that can then serve as launching points for instruction (e.g., discovering interests via surveys and then using those interests to design engaging prompts and tasks as described in the rubric criteria, “Curriculum and Instruction AS Motivation and Management”). This aligns to Standard 1, Elements C and D. Recognizing that one size does not fit all, emphasis in this assessment is given to “*embracing diversity*” (See “Learning Environment Rubric Criteria) in both overt ways (e.g., strategies to demonstrate all learners are different) and more instructionally centered means; both “Universal Design for Learning” and specific accommodations for special needs are required in all portions of the assessment (see the “Accommodations for Student with Special Language and Learning Needs” section of the rubric). This aligns to Standard 1, Element B.

Standard 2: Middle Level Curriculum (Elements B & C)

Candidates are required to combine what they know about young adolescents in general, what they learn about their specific middle-grade students, and their content knowledge – including standards – to create “relevant, challenging, integrative, and exploratory curriculum” (Standard 2, Element C). The “Curriculum and Instruction AS Motivation and Management” rubric criteria reflects this focus specifically, requiring candidates to plan interdisciplinary tasks centered on concepts (e.g., power, perspective, balance, identity) that are central to multiple disciplines as well as to middle-grade students’ lives. These experiences must be aligned with standards from both content areas, as illustrated in linked assignments. This aligns to Standard 2, Element B. In addition, candidates are required to create several tasks that provide students with options or choices in how they demonstrate their grasp of learning goals and content standards, demonstrating critical, higher-order thinking in the process (see linked assignments for interest and learning profile based tasks).

Standard 4: Middle Level Instruction and Assessment (Elements A, B, & D)

This assessment requires candidates to harness what they learned about students in their creation of a healthy learning environment (e.g., students’ interests, cultures, strengths, needs) to create assignment options customized to students’ affective, cognitive, and instructional needs. The “Curriculum and Instruction AS Motivation and Management” rubric criteria reflects this focus as it requires candidates to create “Assignments [that] incorporate relevancy and

MIED APT 2019

<p>choice so that young adolescents are actively engaged in their learning “(Standard 4, Element D). Furthermore, this rubric criterion reflects the requirement for candidates to “...include a wide variety of effective teaching, learning, and assessment strategies that encourage exploration, creativity, and information literacy skills (e.g., critical thinking, problem solving, evaluation of information gained)”. This aligns to Standard 4, Element B. Links to tasks tailored to students’ interests and learning-profiles demonstrate this alignment in more detail, as they demonstrate candidates focus on content-specific principles, skills, knowledge, and standards (Standard 4, Element A). Furthermore, the “Physical Environment” (“Learning Environment” rubric criterion) of the classroom must be designed in such a way that technology, manipulatives, and other learning tools are readily accessible to students, allowing for smooth implementation of the rich tasks that candidates design (Standard 4, Element D).</p> <p><u>Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles (Element C)</u> This assessment has rubric criteria devoted solely to “Collaboration and Communication with Families.” This aspect of the assessment requires candidates to develop “<i>Plans for sharing information and communicating with families demonstrate that the candidate understands and values the ways diverse family structures and cultural backgrounds influence and enrich learning. Candidates plan for multiple and varied methods for communicating and collaborating with all family members and community partners</i>” (rubric language). They are required to find multiple ways to share information with families, recognizing that some will simply not be able to attend back to school nights or parent-teacher conferences. Furthermore, this project must be “Ready for Distribution to Stakeholders” (final rubric criteria), meaning that all plans are made with the candidate’s role as a Communicator in mind. This assessment is designed to ensure candidates are prepared to “...communicate and collaborate with all family members and community partners, and participate in school and community activities. They engage in practices that build positive, collaborative relationships with families from diverse cultures and backgrounds” (Standard 5c).</p>	
<p>Assessment #7: School Structure and Organization Project</p> <p>The key assessment of our MIED 610 course received minor revisions during spring 2019 and the prompt and rubric remained consistent for spring 2019 and 2020. The MIED 610 course is required of all candidates in the Middle Level Education Program and meets in the spring capstone semester following student teaching. This key assessment consists of three parts. Based on pilot implementation data and student feedback, Part 1 was modified to add greater emphasis on the analysis of new school experiences and the integration of the foundational readings and theories guiding middle school organizational structures. Part II was modified to add greater emphasis on integrating TWB and STW by providing evidence to support case aspects. Part III remained unchanged.</p>	<p>Standard 1: Young Adolescent Development, <i>Elements A, B and D</i></p> <p>Standard 3: Middle Level Philosophy and Organization, <i>All Elements</i></p> <p>Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles <i>Elements A, B and D</i></p>

Revised Part I: Knowledge Base for Connecting Theory to Practice: The project is designed to encourage candidates to synthesize and examine questions such as: (1) How does the mission statement of AMLE (This We Believe) compare with the "Schools to Watch" (STW) criteria as promulgated by the National Forum? (2) How does the mission statement of AMLE (This We Believe) manifest itself in the schools? (3) How do the STW criteria manifest in the schools? and (4) How do other works from leaders in the field fit with these two documents in terms of developing and maintaining schools that are developmentally responsive while promoting rigor and equity for all students. Specifically, students will be able to (a) summarize foundational readings, (b) make connections between readings, and (c) analyze school settings illustrating examples and nonexamples of theory in practice.

Part II: Case Study Development and Analysis: Readings and experiences provide the foundation for the creation of an in depth case study where students will (a) create cases reflecting theories of adolescent development and organizational structures aligned or intentionally not aligned with TWB and STW, (b) analyze cases of others through peer review, (c) communicate appropriate feedback to peers, (d) analyze and revise their own cases and finally, (e) orally present their work and lead discussion.

Part III: Professional Development Portfolio: Student develop a portfolio modeled on the requirements of the State of Virginia for teacher evaluation which serves as a culmination of their preparation and development.

www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/performance_evaluation/). Students will (a) identify examples for standards; (b) defend selection incorporating critical perspectives on teaching, behavior and professional competence; and (c) orally present their work.

Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards

AMLE Standard 1: Implications of Young Adolescent Development (Elements A, B, & D)

Every aspect of this assessment is focused on meeting the needs of young adolescents. *This We Believe* (TWB) and "School To Watch" (STW) documents were developed with students as the center. Components of this key assessment focus on helping candidates develop academic interventions and individual management plans to work with students with special needs, English language learners, and at-risk youth. This foundation helps shape the lens through which candidates view the programs and practices in place at middle schools we visit throughout the semester.

Revised Part I: Knowledge Base for Connecting Theory to Practice: The project is designed to encourage candidates to synthesize and examine questions such as: (1) How does the mission statement of AMLE (This We Believe) compare with the "Schools to Watch" (STW) criteria as promulgated by the National Forum? (2) How does the mission statement of AMLE (This We Believe) manifest itself in the

schools? (3) How do the STW criteria manifest in the schools? and (4) How do other works from leaders in the field fit with these two documents in terms of developing and maintaining schools that are developmentally responsive while promoting rigor and equity for all students. Specifically, students will be able to (a) summarize foundational readings, (b) make connections between readings, and (c) analyze school settings illustrating examples and nonexamples of theory in practice.

Part II: Case Study Development and Analysis: Readings and experiences provide the foundation for the creation of an in depth case study where students will (a) create cases reflecting theories of adolescent development and organizational structures aligned or intentionally not aligned with TWB and STW, (b) analyze cases of others through peer review, (c) communicate appropriate feedback to peers, (d) analyze and revise their own cases and finally, (e) orally present their work and lead discussion.

AMLE Standard 3: Middle Level Philosophy and School Organization (Elements A & B)

The cumulative project is completely designed around the philosophical foundations espoused by AMLE and the National Forum. All assigned readings are integrated within this conceptual framework and then applied to candidates work in the schools. Candidates engage in school visits for schools designated as exemplary middle schools as well as schools striving for such designation and record descriptions, strengths, and questions. Recommendations and reflections generated following school visits provide opportunities for “real world” practical integration of best practices as well as provide opportunities for candidates to brainstorm innovations to implement in their future “reality”.

Part II: Case Study Development and Analysis: Readings and experiences provide the foundation for the creation of an in depth case study where students will (a) create cases reflecting theories of adolescent development and organizational structures aligned or intentionally not aligned with TWB and STW, (b) analyze cases of others through peer review, (c) communicate appropriate feedback to peers, (d) analyze and revise their own cases and finally, (e) orally present their work and lead discussion.

AMLE Standard 5: Middle Level Professional Roles (Elements A, B, & D)

Candidates reflect on their experiences on teaching teams and serving as mentors both in their student teaching and with their mentoring experiences (field experience as part of MIED656). In addition, during their school visits, they interview and observe middle school teachers and then reflect on these experiences using the STW and TWB frameworks. Candidates are led to synthesize the readings assigned throughout the semester in conjunction with school visits to allow them to become, “informed advocates for effective middle level educational practices and policies (Standard 5) while the post observation planning for their own classrooms allows opportunities for candidates to “use their professional leadership responsibilities to create equitable opportunities for

MIED APT 2019

<p>all young adolescents" (Standard 5). These plans serve as sample artifacts in the project section designed to prepare candidates for the teacher evaluation system adopted in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Ultimately these plans will be implemented as our candidates transition into their role as beginning teachers. Throughout their involvement in the middle level education program, our candidates are expected to maintain positive, professional dispositions. While visiting schools and working with students, candidates are expected to conduct themselves with utmost professionalism particularly when asked to provide feedback regarding strengths and weaknesses to schools striving for STW designation.</p> <p>Part III: Professional Development Portfolio: Student develop a portfolio modeled on the requirements of the State of Virginia for teacher evaluation which serves as a culmination of their preparation and development. www.doe.virginia.gov/teaching/performance_evaluation/). Students will (a) identify examples for standards; (b) defend selection incorporating critical perspectives on teaching, behavior and professional competence; and (c) orally present their work.</p>	
--	--

Reliability and Validity Information

Test taker motivation is not a concern in the Middle Education MAT program. There are no low-stakes assessments being used as key assessments. The Praxis Subject Assessment exam is required both by the state of Virginia (for licensure) and by the Department of Middle, Secondary and Mathematics Education in order for a candidate to be eligible for graduation. The course embedded assessments are required to pass the respective courses; completion is required to pass, and good effort correlates with higher course grades, so students tend to work hard on their projects.

The Final Profile of Student Teaching form emerged as the product of a workgroup comprised of representatives from area colleges with teacher education programs. The purpose of the form was to have a single document among four schools so that area public schools which host student teachers would not have to be trained on different forms for different host institutions. An extensive training process and manual are provided to all cooperating classroom teachers to facilitate rater agreement.

Spring 2017 Profile of Student Teaching data were examined for rater agreement and leniency. A total of 171 mid-block ratings and 168 final ratings of student teachers were used for the analysis. Only data for those students with a complete set of ratings – from both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, were used in this study. For each of the 34 three-point items on the scale, rater agreement (exact agreement of scores) ranged from 53% to 76% for mid-block ratings, and 56% to 74% on the final ratings.

Instructional faculty involved with administering and scoring the TWS/STC meet at least once a semester to discuss scoring issues and reach consensus. All faculty use the same scoring rubric and strive for consistency in rating. Based on revisions made by the summer work groups, assessment instructors, Drs. Carbaugh and Haraway, lead this discussion and support faculty in the grading of the sections of the TWS/STC. This opportunity to participate in these discussions helped both faculty and students to have a deeper understanding of classroom assessment within the TWS/STC experience.

Face validity is offered in the detailed discussion of alignment with AMLE standards (see chart above).

Commented [BY-b11]: Validity and reliability are the foundation upon which accurate and reliable inferences can be made from the assessment scores. The following narrative provides validity evidence from public report of ETS about the Praxis Subject assessment. The program also achieved moderate-high inter-rater reliability estimates for the Profile of Student Teaching instrument. It is evident that the program put a lot of effort into the instrument development.

This section corresponds to Element III.E. To strengthen this area, the program may consider providing validity and reliability evidence for all the assessment instruments.

Praxis Subject Assessment validity data

The table below contains data for JMU students who took the Praxis Subject Assessment tests required for licensure in Middle Education compared to the national sample. Data are for the 2018-19 academic year (9/1/2018 – 8/31/2019) as students who student taught in Fall 2019 would have had to have passed both subject area assessments prior to the start of their student teaching placement.

	All Examinees	Examinees who received relevant training at JMU
Middle School English Language Arts (Test Code: 5047)		
Number of examinees	2,786	5
Highest observable score	199	180
Lowest observable score	107	165
Mean	162	173
Average performance range	154-171	172-177
Middle School Mathematics (Test Code: 5169)		
Number of examinees	5,393	14
Highest observable score	200	193
Lowest observable score	100	150
Mean	167	180
Average performance range	158-180	178-188
Middle School Social Studies (Test Code: 5089)		
Number of examinees	1,948	5
Highest observable score	200	182
Lowest observable score	100	145
Mean	165	165
Average performance range	153-179	162-170
Middle School Science (Test Code 5440)		
Number of examinees	2,888	12
Highest observable score	200	180
Lowest observable score	100	117
Mean	156	157
Average performance range	144-171	152-164

The data in the table above were retrieved from the ETS user database. Further analysis of the records included in the JMU column indicate that there are additional data that are not reflected in the Praxis Subjects Assessment data presented later in the report (in other words, *N* is higher for JMU in above table than in the tables below).

IV. Objective Accomplishments/Results

Provide a description of your program’s assessment results for the last two years. Provide an interpretation of the program’s assessment results. What do these results mean for you and your faculty? In your interpretation, refer back to your objectives/instructional methods and expectations of results.

MIED APT 2019

A. Praxis Subject Area Assessment Data –The tables below show test information and student data for the various subject tests. Praxis Subject Area Assessments must be passed prior to the start of student teaching. Student teaching occurs in the fall semester of the MAT year; therefore, the subject area assessments must be taken the academic year PRIOR to the MAT year.

Commented [BY-b12]: The assessment results are nicely presented for each instrument with appropriate statistical analysis. The presentation of the results corresponds to Element IV.A.

To strengthen this area, the program may consider link the assessment results back to each SLO together with the desired results. Doing so would enable the program to infer about students' performance on each SLO – whether they are scoring high on each assessment and whether they are meeting the expectations.

Middle School English/Language Arts (5047)

Passing score: 164

Test administration dates	n examinees	Composite Score Mean (sd) Range	n passed test on first attempt	% passed on first attempt	n passed test -- TOTAL	% passed -- TOTAL
2017-18	3	169.7 (5.0) 154-175	2	67%	3	100%
2018-19	2	178.5 (2.1) 177-180	1	50%	2	100%

Commented [BY-b13]: Assessment results for multiple years are present for all the assessments. This corresponds to Element IV. B.

To strengthen this area, the program may consider to illustrate history of results for all the assessments.

Middle School Mathematics (5169)

Passing score: 165

Test Administration Dates	n examinees	Composite Score Mean (sd) Range	n passed test on first attempt	% passed on first attempt	n passed test -- TOTAL	% passed -- TOTAL
2017-18	3	169.7 (5.0) 165-175	3	100%	3	100%
2018-19	3	176.3 (4.0) 172-180	2	67%	3	100%

Middle School Science (5440)

Passing score: 150

Test Administration Dates	n examinees	Composite Score Mean (sd) Range	n passed test on first attempt	% passed on first attempt	n passed test -- TOTAL	% passed -- TOTAL
2017-18	11	163.7 (12.3) 134-183	7	64%	10	91%
2018-19	11	160.7 (9.9) 150-180	9	82%	11	100%

Middle School Social Studies (5089)

Passing score: 160

Test Administration Dates	n examinees	Composite Score Mean (sd) Range	n passed test on first attempt	% passed on first attempt	n passed test -- TOTAL	% passed -- TOTAL
2017-18	3	173 (1)	3	100%	3	100%

MIED APT 2019

		172-174				
2018-19	4	170.3 (8.5) 162-182	4	100%	4	100%

Interpretation. Evidence from the data tables provided above suggest that the program is preparing our candidates well to meet the standards for licensure. Passing the Praxis Subject Assessment is a gate for continuation into graduate school since students are not allowed to take beyond 12 graduate credit hours until they have passed this assessment.

The Praxis Subject Assessment exams are tests of *content* knowledge (provided in our candidates' academic majors), not *pedagogical* knowledge (provided in the College of Education). While the data suggest some of our candidates do not pass this exam, ultimately ALL of our candidates pass the exam before they are permitted to take more than 12 hours of coursework in their graduate program. Consequently, we have no concerns about our candidates' content knowledge as they will have passed the Praxis Subject Assessment exam well in advance of entering their student teaching internships.

It is important to note that some of our candidates sign up for the Praxis Subject Assessment exam before they complete all of their content courses in their IDLS concentrations. Their goal is not necessarily to pass the exam but to get a sense of what the test is like and to find out where they score poorly so that they can then enroll in the appropriate content courses.

Many of our candidates who do not pass the Praxis Subject Assessment on their first attempt report they did not invest enough time preparing for the test and simply underestimated the depth and breadth of content covered on the exam. Failing their first attempt serves as a real "wake-up call" for them to invest the necessary time and effort to successfully pass that exam during a subsequent attempt. As noted above, 100% of our candidates ultimately pass the exam, and we feel like our candidates are receiving adequate preparation for passing the Praxis Subject Assessment exam in their respective IDLS concentrations.

B. Teacher Work Sample/Student Teaching Capstone Performance Data

Teacher Work Sample Sections	Fall 2017 N=11	Fall 2018 N=12	Student Teaching Capstone Sections	Fall 2019 N=13
Contextual Factors (5 items) Passing Score= 12	M = 13.68 sd =.93	M = 13.68 sd =1.86	Contextual Factors (3 items) Passing Score=7	M = 8.46 sd = 0.78
Learning Goals and Assessment Plan (6 items) Passing Score = 14.5	M = 16.14 sd = 1.23	M = 16.58 sd = 1.31	Learning Goals and Assessment Plan (5 items) Passing Score =12	M = 14.07 sd = 1.38
Design for Instruction (7 items) Passing Score = 17.5	M = 16.07 sd = 1.12 *Passing score =14.5	M = 18.83 sd = 2.76	Design for Instruction (4 items) Passing Score = 9	M = 11.0 sd = 1.35
Instructional Decision Making (5 items) Passing Score = 11	M = 13.39 sd = .92	M = 12.50 sd = 1.17	Instructional Decision Making (3 items) Passing Score =7	M = 11.5 sd = 0.71
Analysis of Student Learning (7 items) Passing Score = 16.5	M = 18.64 sd = 1.60	M = 18.58 sd = 2.54	Analysis of Student Learning (4 items) Passing Score = 9	M = 11.08 sd = 1.50

Commented [BY-b14]: The program interpreted the assessment results for each instrument by reasoning the increase of the passing percentage between the first attempt and the last attempt. This corresponds to the APT rubric Element IV.C.

To strengthen this area, the program may consider to interpret assessment results at each SLO level and invite multiple faculty members to participate in the interpretation.

MIED APT 2019

Reflection and Self-Evaluation (5 items) Passing Score = 12	$M = 13.27$ $sd = 1.19$	$M = 13.25$ $sd = 1.66$	Reflection and Self-Evaluation (2 items) Passing Score = 4.5	$M = 5.69$ $sd = 0.63$
---	----------------------------	----------------------------	--	---------------------------

Interpretation.

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS)/Student Teaching Capstone (STC) is completed during student teaching and serves as the product we represent to the Graduate School that stands in lieu of the Master’s thesis or comprehensive exam. Each summer, MSME faculty complete an annual evaluation of this project. In summer 2019, using feedback from student teachers, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and clinical faculty members, these faculty implemented several revisions to the current TWS project and modified this key assessment to become the Student Teaching Capstone. Over time, the Teacher Work Sample evolved from a nationally-recognized model to a model more closely aligned with the identified AMLE standards and JMU College of Education requirements. Therefore, this project no longer closely modeled the national TWS and it was decided to implement a change in name starting in Fall 2019. The major revisions to the former TWS/STC document included the combination and/or elimination of required components within each section of the overall project. These changes were made to address repeated concerns from all stakeholders regarding the enormity of the project and the stresses of having to complete all data collection within a 6-8 week time frame. By reducing and/or consolidating the project requirements, we hope to alleviate these concerns and allow our student teachers to place a greater focus on the day-to-day operations within the instructional setting while developing the skills of a reflective practitioner.

The continued high percentage of candidates who successfully complete each section of the STC/TWS suggests our candidates are making the important connections between instructional planning, implementation, and assessment that we expect of them upon exiting our program. As evidenced by the data in the table above, our students have met or exceeded the minimum passing score for all rubric criteria (and nine rubric categories aligned to AMLE Standards 1-2) for this assessment. Receiving scores that are well above the minimum passing scores reflect the rigorous revision and growth in students over the course of the entire semester (mastery learning). The data provides evidence for meeting the AMLE standards. This key assessment is required of all Middle Education candidates. The assessment, scoring guides and data charts are aligned with the AMLE SPA standards in depth, breadth, and specificity as discussed in Section B above. The depth, breadth, and specificity of this assessment is evident by how it is imbedded in the student teaching experience. The TWS/STC requires candidates to grapple with middle-level curriculum in terms of standards, learning goals and assessments that take young adolescent learning needs into consideration, all within authentic middle school settings. The TWS/STC also requires students to both plan and reflect upon developmentally appropriate, responsive middle-level curriculum and instruction in an authentic middle school setting. Finally, the TWS/STC prompts students to reflect and justify how this work relates to their teaching performance in an authentic middle school setting as well as in their future middle-level education careers.

C. Final Profile of Student Teaching Performance

Note: students have more than one student teaching placement in a semester and more than one rater evaluates each student. Assuming a student does two placements over the semester and that all rating forms are submitted, there are four forms per student. Therefore, the *N* indicated at the top of each column is number of scores, not number of individuals.

Rubric/Number of items	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

MIED APT 2019

	N=43	N=40	N=31
Does Not Meet Expectations (DNM) Developing Towards Expectations (DE) Meets Expectations (ME) Exceeds Expectations (EE)			
A. Professional Knowledge (3 items)	DE -- 2% ME -- 66% EE -- 32%	DE -- 5% ME -- 65% EE -- 30%	DE -- 3% ME -- 81% EE -- 16%
B. Assessment of and for Student Learning (4 items)	DE -- 2% ME -- 60% EE -- 37%	DE -- 1% ME -- 66% EE -- 33%	DE -- 4% ME -- 77% EE -- 19%
C. Instructional Planning (6 items)	DE -- 3% ME -- 73% EE -- 24%	DE -- 2% ME -- 73% EE -- 25%	DNM -- <1% DE -- 4% ME -- 85% EE -- 10%
D. Learning Environment (4 items)	DE -- 2% ME -- 60% EE -- 38%	ME -- 64% EE -- 36%	DE -- 2% ME -- 76% EE -- 22%
E. Instructional Delivery (7 items)	DE -- 5% ME -- 67% EE -- 28%	DE -- 4% ME -- 70% EE -- 26%	DE -- 5% ME -- 80% EE -- 15%
F. Reflection for Student Academic Progress (3 items)	DE -- 5% ME -- 60% EE -- 35%	ME -- 80% EE -- 20%	DE -- 3% ME -- 82% EE -- 15%
G. Professionalism (5 items)	ME -- 62% EE -- 38%	DE -- 1% ME -- 66% EE -- 33%	DE -- 4% ME -- 82% EE -- 14%

Profile of Student Teaching Performance INTERPRETATION

In middle grades education, student teaching is completed during the fall semester of the MAT program in which our candidates demonstrate and hone their instructional planning, implementation, and assessment competencies in ways that suggest to the program faculty our candidates are ready to enter the profession as beginning teachers.

Occasionally, a few of our candidates struggle during student teaching as they find they cannot meet all of the demands of being a teacher in today's classrooms. For those students who struggle, we provide extra support during student teaching that is designed to scaffold their success. However, not all of our candidates achieve success. In those few cases, we provide additional remediation by placing them in an extended practicum the following semester that, upon its successful completion, permits them to repeat student teaching. Given the significant demands being made of teachers today, we are pleased such a high percentage of our candidates are successfully meeting those demands during their student teaching internships.

D. Motivation and Management Project

Project Components	Spring 2019 N=14
Spatial arrangement	Target – 13 Acceptable - 1
Classroom routines and procedures	Target – 13 Acceptable - 1
Classroom rules and expectations/ redefining “fair”	Target – 11 Acceptable - 3
Clarity, scholarship and workmanship	Target – 9 Acceptable - 5
Learning environment	Expert - 10 Acceptable - 2
Classroom routines, policies, procedures	Expert - 9 Acceptable - 3
Curriculum and instruction as motivation and management	Expert - 10 Acceptable - 2
Accommodations for students with special language and learning needs	Expert - 11 Acceptable - 1
Ready for distribution to stakeholders	Expert - 10 Acceptable - 2

E. School Structure and Organization Project

Criterion (points possible)	Spring 2019 N = 14 Mean (sd) Range	Spring 2020 N = 12 Mean (sd) Range
Developmental Descriptions (70)	69.36 (1.45) 65-70	64.17 (4.57) 59-70
Learning environment (25)	24.43 (0.85) 23-25	23.83 (1.43) 22-25
Curriculum and Instruction (25)	24.43 (0.84) 23-25	23.92 (1.59) 21-25
Learner Differences (25)	24.64 (0.79) 23-25	23.83 (2.08) 20-25
Professional Development and Reflection (25)	24.29 (0.88) 23-25	24.17 (1.90) 20-25
Middle School Philosophy and Foundations TWB/STW (50)	48.57 (12.23) 45-50	50.0 (0.0) All scores were 50
Teacher Evaluation Portfolio (100)	98.21 (3.17) 90-100	100.0 (0.0) All scores were 100

Interpretation.

MIED APT 2019

Candidates completed the first two sections of the Middle School Philosophy and Foundations assessment (Part I). Section c was completed by applying the readings based on their recollections from their student teaching experiences. Data (indicated with *) from spring 2020 did not include new school visits as these were cancelled due to COVID19.

Spring 2020 data was influenced by the online learning environment as a result of COVID19. Students worked together virtually to create, peer review, revise, and present their case studies (Part II) and their teacher evaluation binders (Part III). That said, student performance met or exceeded expectations. Ironically, the virtual environment allowed greater opportunities for students to engage in additional revisions following presentations. Data provided indicate initial and revised scores where applicable.

V. Dissemination

Describe how your assessment results are shared with your faculty and others concerned with your program. Illustrate how your assessment results are incorporated in the planning and governance structure of your program.

The MSME department typically holds two day-long faculty “retreats” each academic year at which the results of its two key assessments (Praxis Subject Assessment exams and TWS/STC projects) are shared and discussed. To facilitate the discussions about key assessment data, Praxis Subject Assessment and TWS/STC data compiled from the College of Education’s electronic data management system (Tk20), are forwarded to the MSME department faculty approximately one week prior to each retreat.

During 2016, the MSME department faculty was thoroughly engaged in using the results of key assessments to reflect upon our current middle (and secondary) education program and plan future innovations with respect to how we teach and assess our students. First and foremost, our faculty used key assessment data to inform the writing of Specialized Professional Association (SPA) report, namely Association for Middle Level Education. A team of three faculty members specializing in specific areas prepared these reports for submission on September 15, 2016. In these reports, we described each key assessment instrument, presented data for recent candidate cohorts, and reflected upon the both the performance of our candidates and the effectiveness of our program and key assessment instruments. The discussions from which the content of these reports arose was instrumental in moving our thinking forward as a department and ensuring that we were holding to our fundamental assumptions regarding assessment (for example, whether objectives aligned with AMLE standards, whether key assessments aligned with objective, and whether instruction in each course prepared students to master key assessments).

Because Praxis Subject Assessment data are indicators of candidates’ content knowledge (not pedagogy), we met with specific candidates who had not passed the Praxis Subject Assessment exam to advise about the assessment with respect to program requirements, discuss specific test-taking strategies, and highlight review exam preparation materials housed in the Education Technology and Media Center in Memorial Hall and available from local retailers. When appropriate, we also brought departmental faculty having an advising role with these students to provide further support and perspective.

Teacher Work Sample (TWS) and Student Teaching Capstone (STC) data are indicators of candidates’ pedagogical knowledge related to planning, implementing, and assessing instruction. Candidates complete the TWS/STC while enrolled in their student teaching internship (MSSE 690) and student teaching seminar (MSSE 650), in which the project undergoes comprehensive review and assessment. Much of the TWS/STC addresses practices resulting in the creation and delivery of high-quality instruction transcending all content

Commented [BY-b15]: Assessment results are shared with department faculty and the Professional Education Coordinating Committee (PECC), as well as discussed with students with special needs. The mode and details of the communication is comprehensive and clear. This corresponds to Element V.

MIED APT 2019

and extending Gagne's (1985) Events of Instruction. Because two sections of the TWS/STC (Learning Goals and Assessment Plan and Design for Instruction) have content-area relevance, respective content-area methods instructors are consulted to review the content of these sections and suggest ways candidates can apply effective techniques to their student teaching internships.

While the Middle Education program does not have an Advisory Committee, the middle education Praxis Subject Assessment test scores are discussed in meetings of the Professional Education Coordinating Committee (PECC).

VI. Uses of evaluation/Assessment Results and Actions Taken

Demonstrate how the program's assessment results have been used to contribute to program improvement and enhanced student learning and growth. Examples of program actions taken might include modification and/or additions to learning objectives, curriculum revisions, instructional delivery changes, changes in course sequencing, or increased emphasis on specific skill development. Additionally, explain any changes to the assessment process you have made this year or plan to make.

Use of TWS/STC assessment results and actions taken: In summer 2019, we used the data from the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) survey to extend the work of a departmental TWS committee first convened during the 2009-10 year. The committee was charged with continuing to hone and refine the implementation of the TWS that provides evidence our candidates having established important connections between instructional planning, implementation, and assessment.

Faculty involved with the Middle Level Education program regularly analyze data, reflect upon student progress, and revise courses and program practices to better support candidates. Our efforts are discussed below.

- ☐ To partially address questions raised about the validity of the TWS/STC, the group restructured the LGAP and ASL sections to clarify the blended assessment structure.
- ☐ The group recommended, because most candidates work through one or more revisions cycles to achieve mastery of the TWS/STC objectives, tracking the number of feedback cycles required for each candidate and each section of the project. These data might provide another way to measure each candidate's preparedness for and skill in completing the project.

Content Knowledge

In response to a few concerns raised in field placements regarding perceived gaps in content knowledge, we adjusted our program to require candidates pass the Praxis Subject Assessment in both content areas prior to beginning any student teaching placement. Middle level education candidates participate in student teaching in two eight-week blocks, one for each of the content areas in which they seek certification.

Candidates in our program receive their undergraduate degree in Interdisciplinary Liberal Studies (IDLS) with a concentration in before beginning the graduate program in education. We encourage candidates to begin taking the Praxis Subject Assessment exams beginning in their junior year or upon acceptance into the program. In order to improve our first-time pass rates, we have met with the IDLS faculty to better align the undergraduate curriculum. We plan to continue these discussions with a particular focus on orienting new IDLS faculty.

During advising, we assist candidates with interpreting table of specifications published with Praxis Subject Assessment preparatory materials as well as with individual score reports. These consultations are intended to

Commented [BY-b16]: The program developed several projects to improve student learning, including working with IDLS faculty to better align undergraduate curriculum with the M.A.T program's SLOs. The projects are explained in great detail and are directly linked to the assessment results. This corresponds to the APT rubric Element VI.A.

MIED APT 2019

help candidates understand their results and target areas of study if a retake is necessary. In some instances, faculty members have provided individual tutoring for motivated candidates who continue to struggle. In the fall of 2018, we instituted monthly evening meetings for all students in the program in order to help them understand the tests and the requirements.

Our candidates demonstrate strong skills in breaking down content into learning objectives for the middle level learner with the majority of candidates scoring at the Target level (“Fully Met”) in all rubric criteria. The criteria for “Fully Met” are rigorous and reflect multiple drafts, revisions, and growth over the course of the entire semester (mastery learning). The instructors of the TWS/STC have revised the LGAP prompt/rubric to increase clarity, as well as to collect and annotate exemplars for each section of the TWS/STC in an effort to decrease the number of drafts students complete in pursuit of “Fully Met” ratings. In addition, the curriculum of MIED 620 (Assessment in Middle Level Education) has been closely aligned with the TWS/STC to ensure that candidates have content knowledge and the ability to break content down specifically for the middle school learner.

Commented [BY-b17]: The program revised “Fully Met” for the TWS/STC assessment to increase clarity of meeting this target level. The program also collects and annotates exemplars to provide guidance for student achieving “Fully Met” criteria. It is evident that the program made moderate changes to the assessment process. This corresponds to the APT Rubric Element VI.B.

This area could be strengthened by linking the changes to the specific assessment results.

Professional Knowledge and Pedagogical Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions

Overall, our results indicated that middle level teacher candidates’ performance of professional and pedagogical knowledge, skills, and dispositions was high across assessments 3, 4, and 6. We believe that this high level of performance is due to the following factors:

- Multiple, rigorous practicum experiences. Candidates engage in four practicum courses (MIED 311, MSSE 371, and two semesters of 471) where they plan, implement, and reflect on multiple lessons and assessments. Based on feedback from candidates, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors, we have extended practicum hours, standardized expectations in the type and number of lessons required, and added guest seminars conducted by faculty during class sessions before candidates enter the field.
- Capstone focusing on Motivation and Management. The majority of students scored at the “Expert” level in all rubric categories other than “The criteria for “Expert” are rigorous and reflect revision and growth over the course of a semester (mastery learning).
- Capstone focusing on School Organization and Structure. Also, during the capstone semester, candidates usually engage in several school visits focusing on helping them identify and analyze the organization, structure, policies, and practices that are unique to middle level education. Despite several placements and a variety of involvement in middle school classrooms, candidates consistently are unaware of much of the framework and foundations that guide day to day functioning of the schools themselves. Similarly, candidates benefit from immersion in schools with the focus on aspects consistent with (or divergent from) the middle school concept. With these experiences comes an emphasis on the developmental needs of young adolescents and the school structures implemented to support middle level students. Due to COVID 19, this year’s school visits were cancelled however, one of the principals remained in touch and interacted with students in the online environment.