

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Alignment to National Standards: This packet, entitled *Application of Content*, provides evidence to support:

Georgia PSC: 1.1 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.

Georgia PSC: 1.3 Providers ensure that **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).

CAEP Standard One – The provider ensures that candidates develop a deep understanding of the critical concepts and principles of their discipline and, by completion, are able to use discipline-specific practices flexibly to advance the learning of all candidates at the appropriate progression levels in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 candidates and their families.

CAEP Standard: R1.2 Content

R1.2 Content The provider ensures candidates are able to **apply their knowledge of content** at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. **Outcome data can be provided from a Specialist Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1.**

How Alignment is assured: The Assistant Dean of Assessment & Accreditation, in consultation with Program/Discipline Chairs, aligns the evaluation measures and assessment tasks with CAEP, State, InTASC, and appropriate Technology Standards. The Assistant Dean coordinates and maintains alignments and adherence to multiple Georgia state laws and policy regulations. All Standards have been maintained utilizing Excel Spreadsheets, Qualtrics, and Class Climate Survey by Scantron; however, maintenance was transferred to a suite of digital assessment tools on Watermark – VIA in fall 2021. The Assistant Dean of Assessment and Accreditation will maintain a standards database so that alignments can accommodate updates to standards, program competencies, courses, or assessments.

Evidence Overview

Use of Assessment as Part of the Quality Assurance System: These assessments reside in all courses required in all initial licensure programs to assist candidates as they observe, participate in a wide range of in-school teaching experiences, and develop the skills necessary to be an effective teacher. Candidates progress through these courses each in a diverse setting prior to candidate teaching. These multilayered assessment purposes are to provide evidence of candidate mastery in the Application of Content.

Data from these assessments as part of the overall Quality Assurance System (QAS) are disseminated, discussed, and reviewed across multiple users and information-sharing platforms. Program Chairs lead their faculty in analysis of program data for program reports to Senior Vice President for Academic and Candidate Affairs and the Provost's office. Data are shared annually with mentor teachers, candidates, and Principals. The School of Education (SOE)

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Assessment Committee reviews these data each year to inform continuous improvement. As another example, the Office of Institutional Research routinely analyzes rates of candidate assessment completion.

Furthermore, Program Chairs use these internal and external data to determine which performance tasks need clarifications, rubric revisions, or assessment revisions to better address program competencies. These changes are noted in their continuous improvement plans. Finally, once all data has been shared with stakeholders, including the SOE Advisory Board, feedback is solicited and changes are implemented based on recommendations and needs.

Details of Assessment Administration: Georgia Gwinnett College (GGC) utilizes multiple systems to meet the required standards by state and national accrediting bodies. The SOE has a three-tiered system to collect, monitor, report, and analyze candidate success in all programs offered at GGC. These systems allow us to collect varied assessment data and instruments aligned to the INTASC standards and our School of Education (SOE) learning domains and outcomes. These assessments can be classified as internal and external assessments.

Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards CAPS: The CAPS is a state adopted assessment utilized to evaluate teacher candidates aligned to the 10 INTASC standards and progressions.

Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA): CDPA is utilized to monitor disposition behaviors aligned to the INTASC standards.

Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA): The edTPA is to provide credible evidence that each candidate can: construct and deliver a multi-week instructional unit or learning segment; construct challenging, meaningful classroom assessments; effect student pre- to post-test learning gains; analyze and reflect on experience to promote personal professional growth; and become a strong contributing member of the teaching profession.

How the Evaluation is used to Measure Candidate Progress: The chart below identifies how evidence provides data to inform, modify, evaluate, and monitor candidate progress.

Assessment	Measures Candidate Progress
Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards (CAPS)	<p>The CAPS is used by field and clinical college supervisors and mentor teachers to assess the classroom teaching performance of teacher candidates during field and clinical experiences. It is used in all courses in which field or clinical experiences are required. The administration of this instrument has been designed so that teacher candidates and candidate teachers can demonstrate growth and development in teaching skills overtime or the arc of the program. The evaluation occurs during Semesters 1 thru 4. Passage of this assessment at each transition point is an EPP certification requirement.</p> <p>These data serve as evidence of how candidates are performing on the ten standards on the CAPS instrument. These ten standards align with the INTASC standards required for EPP's to incorporate in their program and curriculum. The candidates are evaluated by their mentor teacher and faculty supervisor on all ten standards by year 2 in the SOE. These program data are aggregated and disaggregated to determine the strengths and gaps in programs and curriculum. Data analysis occurs at the end of every academic year in each</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College Standard One Evidence Set 2 R1.2 Application of Content

	program/discipline area. All faculty members are involved in this wave 1-3 data analysis to determine the focus areas for each program. A Wave 1-3 data analysis report with a continuous improvement matrix is linked here as evidence. The continuous improvement plan is implemented in each program and evaluated the spring of each academic year for success and continued areas for needed improvement.
Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA)	The results are used to mentor candidates and support their progression in the program. The EPP will use the results for continuous program improvement.
Educator Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA)	Students are given a copy of the program assessment edTPA handbook at the beginning of their junior year and tasks are reviewed and practiced as student's progress through the EPP. During the final semester of student teaching students complete the edTPA portfolio for submission to external grading through Pearson. Field supervisors oversee the students' completion of the portfolio and the digital drop of the final finished portfolio. The EPP uses the results to make changes to field-based instruction and courses requirements as well as to provide support for teacher candidates as they progress through the practice tasks.

Evidence and Analysis - Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards (CAPS)

Purpose: The Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards (CAPS) rubric is used by field and clinical college supervisors and mentor teachers to assess the classroom teaching performance of teacher candidates during field and clinical experiences. It is used in all courses in which field or clinical experiences are required. The administration of this instrument has been designed so that teacher candidates and candidate teachers can demonstrate growth and development in teaching skills overtime or the arc of the program. This rubric is administered during Semesters 1 thru 4. Passage of this assessment at each transition point is an EPP certification requirement.

These data serve as evidence of how candidates are performing on the ten standards on the CAPS instrument. These ten standards align with the INTASC standards required for EPP's to incorporate in their program and curriculum. The candidates are evaluated by their mentor teacher and faculty supervisor on all ten standards by year 2 in the SOE. Program data are aggregated and disaggregated to determine the strengths and gaps in curriculum. These data analysis occur at the end of every academic year in each program/discipline area. All faculty members are involved in the wave 1-3 data analysis to determine the focus areas for each program. A Wave 1-3 data analysis report with a continuous improvement matrix is linked as evidence for your viewing. The continuous improvement plan is implemented in each program and evaluated the spring of each academic year for success and continued areas for needed improvement.

Directions Delivered to the Candidate: In the Fall semesters of the program, candidates are given the EPP handbook which defines and explains the CAPS requirements. This handbook contains all the rubrics used to evaluate their performance in their field experience. The CAPS instrument is part of the EPP handbook and the requirements for the instrument including directions can be found beginning on page 82, Appendix C. The first-semester field supervisor reviews the CAPS with the candidates they supervise; they explain and review the ten standards and explain what implementation of these standards looks like when they are in their field placement. The field supervisor evaluates the teacher candidate each time they are observed, gives feedback, and completes reports at midterm and end of the semester based on their areas of strength and needs.

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Evaluation Instrument: Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards (CAPS) Instrument

CAPS Rubric for Evaluation- All Programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
	Exemplary	Proficient	Needs Development	Ineffective
<p>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 2.1 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4 InTASC Standard: 4</p> <p><i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually demonstrates extensive content and pedagogical knowledge, enriches the curriculum, and guides others in enriching the curriculum. <i>(Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and the needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently demonstrates understanding of curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge, and student needs, or lacks fluidity in using the knowledge in practice.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inadequately demonstrates understanding of curriculum, subject content, pedagogical knowledge and student needs, or does not use the knowledge in practice.</p>
<p>Standard 2: Instructional Planning</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 InTASC Standard: 7</p> <p><i>The teacher candidate plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the needs of all students.</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually seeks and uses multiple data and real-world resources to plan differentiated instruction to meet the individual student needs and interests in order to promote student accountability and engagement. <i>(Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently plans using state and local school district curricula and standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to address the differentiated needs of all students.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently uses state and local school district curricula and standards, or inconsistently uses effective strategies, resources, or data in planning to meet the needs of all students.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate does not plan, or plans without adequately using state and local school district curricula and standards, or without using effective strategies, resources, or data to meet the needs of all students.</p>
<p>Standard 3: Instructional Strategies</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 2.2 CAEP Standard: 1.1 InTASC Standard: 8 IEE Goal: 2</p> <p><i>The teacher candidate promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning and to facilitate the students' acquisition of key knowledge and skills.</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually facilitates students' engagement in metacognitive learning, higher-order thinking skills, and application of learning in current and relevant ways. <i>(Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</i></p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently promotes student learning by using research-based instructional strategies relevant to the content to engage students in active learning, and to facilitate the students' acquisition of key skills.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently uses research-based instructional strategies. The strategies used are sometimes not appropriate for the content area or for engaging students in active learning or for the acquisition of key skills.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate does not use research-based instructional strategies, nor are the instructional strategies relevant to the content area. The strategies do not engage students in active learning or acquisition of key skills.</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College
Standard One Evidence Set 2
R1.2 Application of Content

CAPS Rubric for Evaluation- All Programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
	Exemplary	Proficient	Needs Development	Ineffective
Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction SOE Outcome: 5.1 CAEP Standard: 1.4 InTASC Standard: 2 The teacher candidate challenges and supports each student's learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.	<p>The teacher candidate continually facilitates each student's opportunities to learn by engaging him/her in critical and creative thinking and challenging activities tailored to address individual learning needs and interests. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently challenges and supports each student's learning by providing appropriate content and developing skills which address individual learning differences.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently challenges students by providing appropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate does not challenge students by providing appropriate content or by developing skills which address individual learning differences.</p>
Standard 5: Assessment Strategies SOE Outcome: 3.1 CAEP Standard: 1.2 InTASC Standard: 6 IEE Goal: 8 The teacher candidate systematically chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.	<p>The teacher candidate continually demonstrates expertise and leads others to determine and develop a variety of strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population and guides students to monitor and reflect on their own academic progress. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate systematically and consistently chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies and instruments that are valid and appropriate for the content and student population.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently chooses a variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies or the instruments are sometimes not appropriate for the content or student population.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate chooses an inadequate variety of diagnostic, formative, and summative assessment strategies or the instruments are not appropriate for the content or student population.</p>
Standard 6: Assessment Uses SOE Standards: 3.2, 3.3 CAEP Standard: 1.2 InTASC Standard: 6 IEE Goals: 5, 8 The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.	<p>The teacher candidate continually demonstrates expertise in using data to measure student progress and leads others in the effective use of data to inform instructional decisions. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate systematically and consistently gathers, analyzes, and uses relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, and to provide timely and constructive feedback to both students and parents.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently gathers, analyzes, or uses relevant data to measure student progress, inconsistently uses data to inform instructional content and delivery methods, or inconsistently provides timely or constructive feedback.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate does not gather, analyze, or use relevant data to measure student progress, to inform instructional content and delivery methods, or to provide feedback in a constructive or timely manner.</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

CAPS Rubric for Evaluation- All Programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
	Exemplary	Proficient	Needs Development	Ineffective
<p>Standard 7: Positive Learning Environment</p> <p>SOE Outcomes: 1.2, 2.4 CAEP Standard: 1.1 InTASC Standard: 3 IEE Goal: 4</p> <p>The teacher candidate provides a well- managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually engages students in a collaborative and self- directed learning environment where students are encouraged to take risks and ownership of their own learning behavior. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently provides a well- managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently provides a well- managed, safe, and orderly environment that is conducive to learning and encourages respect for all.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inadequately addresses student behavior, displays a negative attitude toward students, ignores safety standards, or does not otherwise provide an orderly environment that is conducive to learning or encourages respect for all.</p>
<p>Standard 8: Academically Challenging Environment</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 2.4 CAEP Standard: 1.4 InTASC Standard: 3, 5</p> <p>The teacher candidate creates a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self-directed learners.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually creates an academic learning environment where students are encouraged to set challenging learning goals and tackle challenging materials. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently creates a student- centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels and students are self- directed learners.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently provides a student-centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels or where students are self- directed learners.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate does not provide a student- centered, academic environment in which teaching and learning occur at high levels, or where students are self-directed learners.</p>
<p>Standard 9: Professionalism</p> <p>CAEP Standard: 1.2, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 9, 10</p> <p>The teacher candidate exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually engages in a high level of professional growth and application of skills and contributes to the development of others and the well-being of the school and community. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate consistently exhibits a commitment to professional ethics and the school's mission, participates in professional growth opportunities to support student learning, and contributes to the profession.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently supports the school's mission or seldom participates in professional growth opportunities.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate shows a disregard toward professional ethics or the school's mission or rarely takes advantage of professional growth opportunities.</p>
<p>Standard 10: Communication</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 4.2 CAEP Standards: 1.5, 3.3 InTASC Standards: 9, 10 IEE Goals: 1, 5</p> <p>The teacher candidate communicates effectively with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate continually uses communication techniques in a variety of situations to proactively inform, network, and collaborate with stakeholders to enhance student learning. (Teacher candidates rated as Exemplary continually seek ways to serve as role models or teacher leaders.)</p>	<p>The teacher candidate communicates effectively and consistently with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, and other stakeholders in ways that enhance student learning.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inconsistently communicates with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, or other stakeholders or communicates in ways that only partially enhance student learning.</p>	<p>The teacher candidate inadequately communicates with students, parents or guardians, district and school personnel, or other stakeholders by poorly acknowledging concerns, responding to inquiries, or encouraging involvement.</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Assurance of Reliability and Validity: The CAPS instrument has been validated and reported as reliable in the following research report.

Validity:

Face validity, content validity, criterion-related validity, construct validity, and face validity were established by the University of Georgia by Tracy Elder, Atakan Ata, and Stephen E. Cramer 2016.

Reliability:

The University of Georgia established a Cronbach's alpha of 0.898 by Tracy Elder, Atakan Ata, and Stephen E. Cramer 2016. Training and inter-rater reliability for the SOE for GGC was established on 8.15.18. Thirty-five faculty were trained, and the Intra-class Correlation Average Measures was 0.804. Training and inter-rater reliability for mentor teachers was established on 7.19.16. Sixteen mentor teachers were trained, and the Intra-class Correlation Average Measures was 0.672. Inter-rater reliability for 29 faculty was repeated on 10.2.19, and the Intra-class Correlation Average Measures was 0.762. Instrument training and inter-rater reliability will be completed with faculty and mentor teachers each academic year. An ideal Intra-class Correlation Average Measures is 0.8. We will continue to train faculty and mentor teachers to work toward this goal each year.

Presentation of Data: Those data demonstrating candidates' performance on this assessment are provided here Candidate Assessment of Performance Standards (CAPS).

Analysis and Interpretation: After reviewing these data, for the year 2018-2019, the mean was 34 out of 40 total points for all year two completers, with 98% of candidates meeting the required score of three (proficient) by the time they completed their program of study. In the 2019-2020 year, the mean was 33 out of 40 points, with 97% meeting proficiency; the mean for the 2020-2021 academic year was 32 out of 40, with 97% meeting proficiency. Therefore, all candidates were successful in their teaching observations and clinical experience.

Looking at the CAPS data disaggregated by program, all candidates performed well in all rubric indicators from the 1st to 4th semester. The candidates meeting proficiency on the CAPS instrument were 70% or above from 2018-2020. However, in 2020-2021 the candidates in the 1st semester in Special Education, English, History, Biology, Chemistry, and Math demonstrated percent met rates lower than 70%. However, they increased in semesters 2-4, and all were above a 90% proficiency rate by the time they completed their program of study. GGC will continue to evaluate these data to ensure all candidates are successful on the 10 CAPS standards aligned to the INTASC standards.

Evidence and Analysis - Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA)

Purpose: The Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment (CDPA) rubric is used by field and clinical college supervisors and mentor teachers to assess the professional dispositions exhibited by teacher candidates. This rubric is administered during Semesters 1 thru 4. The Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric includes candidates' personal, interpersonal, professional, instructional, and socio-cultural attitudes and behaviors. Data are collected for every course with a required field and clinical experience. Passage by meeting this assessment's expected level of performance at each transition point is an EPP certification requirement.

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

These data serve as evidence of how candidates are performing on the 24 rubric indicators on the CDPA instrument. These 24 standards align with INTASC standards Nine: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and Ten: Leadership and Collaboration. The students are evaluated by their mentor teacher and faculty supervisor on all 24 indicators during years 1 and 2. These data are aggregated and disaggregated by the program to determine candidates' strengths, and gaps in programs of study. Data analysis occurs at the end of every academic year in each program/discipline area. All faculty members are involved in the wave 1-3 data analysis to determine the focus areas for each program. A Wave 1-3 data analysis report with a continuous improvement matrix is linked as evidence for your viewing. The continuous improvement plan is implemented in each program and evaluated the spring of each academic year for success and continued areas for needed improvement.

Directions Delivered to the Candidate: In the Fall semesters of the program, candidates are given the EPP Handbook. The EPP Handbook contains all the rubrics used to evaluate their teaching behaviors and dispositions in their field experience. The CDPA instrument is part of the handbook. The first-semester field supervisor reviews the CDPA with the candidates they supervise; they explain and review the 24 rubric indicators and explain what implementation of these indicators looks like when they are in their field placement. The field supervisor evaluates the teacher candidate each time they are observed, gives feedback, and completes reports at midterm and end of the semester based on their areas of strength and needs.

Evaluation Instrument: Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA) Instrument

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>1. Integrity - Teacher candidate abides by professional codes of ethics for teaching and demonstrates ethical conduct and integrity in his/her actions. S/he is a person of good reputable character. S/he always maintains confidentiality.</p> <p><i>SOE Outcome: 1.1</i> <i>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3</i> <i>INTASC Standard: 9</i> <i>IEE Goal: 6</i></p>	<p>Teacher candidate behaves in such a way that initial certification would be denied or suspended, such as failure to report potential child abuse, inappropriate conduct with students, use of alcohol on school premises (see <i>state's code of ethics</i> for relevant state(s) for complete list).</p>	<p>Teacher candidate behaves in such a way to warrant a reprimand, warning, or monitoring.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate abides by professional codes of ethics of the state(s) in which he/she plans to teach and demonstrates ethical conduct and integrity in his/her actions. S/he is a person of good reputable character. S/he always maintains confidentiality.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate abides by professional codes of ethics of the state(s) in which he/she plans to teach and demonstrates ethical conduct and integrity in his/her actions. S/he is a person of reputable character. S/he always maintains confidentiality, and candidate exemplifies behavior that represents the education profession with dignity and integrity.</p>
<p>2. Interaction with Students - Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate relationships with students. *Reference your state's code of ethics for teaching if clarification on "appropriate</p>	<p>Teacher candidate interacts negatively with students, such as yelling or screaming at a student and/or belittling students.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate may struggle with managing a class of students and possibly resort to yelling at the class. Or, s/he fails to maintain an appropriate relationship with</p>	<p>Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate relationships with students.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate and caring relationships with students and has good rapport with all students.</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College
Standard One Evidence Set 2
R1.2 Application of Content

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
relationships with students” is needed. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 9		students, such as taking on a “friend role” without maintaining a sense of authority.		
3. Attitude & Demeanor - Teacher candidate maintains a positive attitude and demeanor. S/he is flexible, professional, and enthusiastic. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3	Teacher candidate is negative about the school, administration, and/or students. S/he is resistant to changes, causing complications by word or actions. S/he demonstrates an unprofessional attitude.	Teacher candidate is professional in attitude and demeanor, but does not exhibit enthusiasm. Candidate may seem apathetic or speak freely of discontent with the school, administration, and/or students.	Teacher candidate maintains a positive attitude and demeanor. S/he is flexible, professional, and enthusiastic.	Teacher candidate maintains a positive attitude and demeanor and encourages others to do so as well. S/he is flexible, professional, and enthusiastic.
4. Communication - Teacher candidate communicates effectively and professionally in all domains (verbal, nonverbal, written, technologically) and with tact. SOE Outcome: 4.2 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 8 IEE Goals: 1, 5	Teacher candidate communicates unprofessionally or without tact, or does not communicate at all. Candidate does not use accepted conventions or vocabulary when communicating.	Teacher candidate fails to contact parents or guardians for needed intervention or only communicates with parents or guardians solely about students’ poor performance or behavior. Candidate may use technology for communication but uses it ineffectively (e.g. teacher website is not updated regularly). Candidate may not speak clearly or loudly, or may be inconsistent with use of accepted conventions and vocabulary.	Teacher candidate communicates effectively and professionally in all domains (verbal, nonverbal, written, technologically) and with tact, using accepted conventions and vocabulary. Candidate may choose to use text messaging app or a website to communicate with parents, but does so with weekly or bi-weekly updates. Candidate is prompt with communicating with parents or guardians regarding students’ good performance or behavior.	Teacher candidate communicates effectively and professionally in all domains (verbal, nonverbal, written, technologically) and with tact, using accepted conventions and vocabulary. Candidate may choose to use text messaging app or a website to communicate with parents, but does so with weekly or bi-weekly updates. Candidate is prompt with communicating with parents or guardians regarding students’ performance or behavior, both for areas needing improvement and areas of progress or excellence. S/he communicates with a personal tone and care when interacting with parents or guardians and students.
5. High Expectations for All Students - Teacher candidate is committed to student learning and believes all students can learn. S/he holds high expectations for all students. SOE Outcome: 1.2 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 2 IEE Goal: 4	Teacher candidate has low expectations for some students, demonstrated in ways such as attitude toward students, lowering standards for some students, spending less time assisting lower achieving students, etc.	Teacher candidate expresses a belief that all students can learn but limits teaching style primarily to one method.	Teacher candidate is committed to student learning and believes all students can learn. S/he holds high expectations for all students, demonstrated by effort to plan and provide instruction to reach a variety of learners.	Teacher candidate is committed to student learning and believes all students can learn. S/he holds high expectations for all students and tailors learning opportunities to capitalize on all students’ academic abilities, cultural experiences, and backgrounds.
6. Attendance/Punctuality - Teacher candidate is always	Teacher candidate is tardy to school or class	Teacher candidate is tardy to school/class no	Teacher candidate is always present and on	Teacher candidate is always present and on

Georgia Gwinnett College
Standard One Evidence Set 2
R1.2 Application of Content

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>present and on time to work/school, meetings, and events.</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3</p>	more than twice in a semester; is absent without an excuse or permission; exceeds the number of allowable absences; and/or is tardy to or does not attend school meetings.	more than twice in a semester and/or only attends or is tardy to required meetings.	time to work/school, meetings, and events.	time to work/school, meetings, and events. Candidate also attends non-mandatory supporting activities or events, such as school dances or sporting events.
<p>7. Dependability & Reliability- Teacher candidate demonstrates consistency in tasks and responsibilities; s/he is considered to be reliable and dependable by peers, professors, and mentor teachers.</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3</p>	Teacher candidate leaves tasks unfinished; s/he has developed a reputation of being unreliable.	Teacher candidate is inconsistent with completion of tasks and responsibilities.	Teacher candidate demonstrates consistency and follow-through in tasks and responsibilities; s/he is considered to be reliable and dependable by peers, professors, and mentor teachers.	Teacher candidate demonstrates consistency and follow-through in tasks and responsibilities; s/he is regarded as an example of reliability and dependability in all dealings with peers and the entire school community.
<p>8. Interaction with Adults - Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate and professional relationships with adults (includes parents, colleagues, etc.).</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10</p>	Teacher candidate interacts in an unacceptable manner with adults; for example, s/he might use vulgar or inappropriate language in a professional setting, yell at or harass another adult, or have inappropriate physical contact with another adult.	Teacher candidate appears uncomfortable around parents, colleagues, etc. and interacts at a minimal level.	Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate and professional relationships with adults (includes parents, colleagues etc.).	Teacher candidate interacts positively and maintains appropriate and professional relationships with adults (includes parents, colleagues, etc.). S/he seeks out opportunities to foster a positive and professional relationship with adults within the school community.
<p>9. Collaboration - Teacher candidate works collaboratively with colleagues and is a valuable member to the team. S/he is cooperative and a team player who is willing to assist and accept responsibilities.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 4.2 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10 IEE Goal: 1, 5</p>	Teacher candidate is unwilling to work with other candidates, mentor teacher(s), or school personnel. Or, s/he is aggressive toward other candidates.	Teacher candidate has difficulty working collaboratively. Issues of gossip, pettiness, or other poor team-member characteristics may be present. S/he inconsistently or may not carry his/her weight on collaborative projects/work.	Teacher candidate works well with other candidates, mentor(s), or school personnel. S/he is a responsible and cooperative team member. S/he carries his/her weight on collaborative projects/work.	Teacher candidate works well with other candidates and mentor(s). S/he is a responsible and cooperative team member and actively contributes to an atmosphere of collegiality. S/he initiates collaboration, carries his/her weight on collaborative projects/work, and is willing to take on a reasonable amount of responsibility to help the team accomplish its goals.
<p>10. Organization & Preparedness - Teacher candidate organizes classroom to optimize learning and provides academically challenging learning environment. S/he is well-prepared for teaching.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 5.1 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 3</p>	Teacher candidate does not have lessons planned prior to teaching. Or, candidate's organization of the lesson or classroom is chaotic in such a way that impedes student learning and/or leads to boredom.	Teacher candidate has lessons loosely planned. Structure of lesson, classroom management, and/or classroom organization may lead to a loss of instructional time or boredom. Candidate may not have all supplies needed for lesson.	Teacher candidate organizes classroom to optimize learning. S/he is well- prepared for teaching and always has lessons planned beforehand. S/he always has needed supplies for activities and instruction, and candidate plans for an academically challenging learning	Teacher candidate organizes classroom to optimize learning. S/he is well- prepared for teaching and always has lessons planned beforehand. S/he always has needed supplies for activities and instruction, and organizes and implements lessons that ensure learning

**Georgia Gwinnett College
Standard One Evidence Set 2
R1.2 Application of Content**

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
			environment.	opportunities provide students with an academically challenging and engaging learning environment.
<p>11. Teachability and Adaptability - Teacher candidate demonstrates a willingness to learn and/or grow professionally and has a commitment to improving his/her practice. S/he adapts to change and accepts constructive criticism and feedback well.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 5.1 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standards: 9, 10</p>	<p>Teacher candidate does not acknowledge or accept feedback from professors or mentor(s) and/or is rude upon receiving constructive criticism. And/or, s/he resists changes implemented by school administration or mentor and is unwilling to change/grow as a professional.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate has difficulty in receiving feedback from professors or mentor(s). And/or, s/he is not openly receptive of changes implemented by school administration or mentor.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate demonstrates a willingness to learn and/or grow professionally and has a commitment to improving his/her practice. S/he is open to consulting relevant literature and reflects upon his/her own practice. S/he adapts to change and accepts constructive criticism and feedback well.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate maintains a positive and teachable attitude that is contagious and impacts classmates and colleagues in a way that boosts morale. S/he consults relevant literature, reflects upon his/her own practice, and shares what he/she learns with peers and/or mentor. S/he accepts constructive criticism and feedback well, considers feedback thoughtfully and critically, and modifies practice with feedback in mind.</p>
<p>12. Content Knowledge - Teacher candidate stays current in field and understands potential biases within his/her content areas. S/he values critical thinking.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 2.1 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 4</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses outdated teaching materials or biased materials intentionally. S/he is uncompromising about his/her opinion about or selections/choices of the content.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses outdated teaching materials or biased materials unintentionally, without questioning and/or expressing concern. S/he fails to appreciate that knowledge is dynamic and shows little evidence of critical thinking.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate is proficient in content knowledge, stays current in field and understands potential biases within his/her content area, expressed in the consistent selection of current and unbiased materials. S/he values critical thinking.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate stays current in field and understands potential biases within his/her content areas, demonstrated by intentional curriculum material selection and robust lessons that challenge students to think critically about the content. S/he values critical thinking, and is, thus, eclectic in practice.</p>
<p>13. Cultural Sensitivity - Teacher candidate shows respect for and an understanding of a student's or other person's diversity, including respect of differences in race, class, gender, ability, culture, religion, and sexuality.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 1.2 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 2 IEE Goal: 4</p>	<p>Teacher candidate discriminates against certain student(s); s/he makes racial/religious/other slur or demeaning joke(s); s/he does not work with a particular demographic of students.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate interacts more frequently with students who identify with or look/believe like s/he; or gender inequity might be present within the classroom (e.g., boys may be called on more than girls and vice versa).</p>	<p>Teacher candidate shows respect for and an understanding of a student's or other person's diversity, including respect of differences in race, class, gender, ability, culture, religion, and/or sexuality.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate creates an atmosphere that models and teaches students to appreciate and respect differences among people, including a respect for and understanding of differences in race, class, gender, ability, culture, religion, and/or sexuality.</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College
Standard One Evidence Set 2
R1.2 Application of Content

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>14. Assessment - Teacher candidate uses assessments ethically, makes appropriate accommodations, and uses a variety of assessments with his/her students.</p> <p>SOE Outcomes: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 6 IEE Goals: 5, 8</p>	<p>Teacher candidate does not make necessary accommodations on assessments, or s/he uses unfair or unethical assessment practices.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses assessments that do not align exactly with the learning objectives, or uses inconsistent assessment practices, or does not use multiple assessment measures. S/he struggles with implementing approved accommodations for assessments. Candidate does not always follow school policies when reporting grades to students and parents.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses assessments ethically, makes appropriate accommodations, and uses a variety of assessments, including formative assessments, with his/her students. Candidate reports assessment results to students and parents/guardians based on school policy.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses assessments ethically, makes appropriate accommodations, uses a variety of assessments, including formative assessments, with his/her students, and follows school policies for reporting grades. Candidate also uses assessment results to help students set goals for their learning.</p>
<p>15. Fairness - Teacher candidate makes fair decisions based on data/evidence; s/he treats students fairly and equitably.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 1.1 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 6</p>	<p>Teacher candidate treats some student(s) unfairly based on stereotypes.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate treats all students equally without reference to available data/evidence; and/or does not provide equitable educational opportunities tailored to students' needs. Candidate assumes fair means equal.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate makes fair decisions based on data/evidence; s/he treats students fairly and equitably, providing equitable educational opportunities tailored to students' needs.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate makes fair decisions based on data/evidence; s/he treats students fairly and equitably, providing equitable educational opportunities tailored to students' needs. S/he is an advocate for equity and fairness within his/her school, encouraging colleagues and students to treat all students fairly.</p>
<p>16. Use of Technology - Teacher candidate understands and practices legal and ethical boundaries for technology. S/he uses technology to enhance student learning and communicates efficiently. Misuse of cell phone and/or social media is not an issue with the candidate.</p> <p>SOE Outcome: 2.3 CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 9 IEE Goal: 3 ISTE Educator Standards: 3, 5, 6</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses technology in a way that violates school's policies; allows students to access non-lesson related websites; and/or teacher candidate hosts a social media forum that violates the school's policy.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate uses cell phone for calls or texting during instructional time or time with students.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate understands and observes legal and ethical boundaries for technology. S/he uses technology to enhance student learning and communicate efficiently. Misuse of cell phone and/or social media is not an issue with the candidate.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate understands and observes legal and ethical boundaries for technology. S/he uses technology to enhance student learning and communicate efficiently. Misuse of cell phone and/or social media is not an issue with the candidate. S/he maintains a professional and ethical demeanor in all technological platforms or all media s/he uses and teaches students and/or peers how to use technology safely and ethically.</p>
<p>17. Time management - Teacher candidate plans effectively, manages time well, submits work in a timely manner, and meets deadlines.</p>	<p>Teacher candidate submits work late or not at all, or misses deadlines more than twice in a semester. Planned lessons are poorly executed, with significant</p>	<p>Teacher candidate submits work late or misses a deadline no more than twice in a semester. Time management of lessons are weak at the start or</p>	<p>Teacher candidate plans effectively, manages time well, submits work in a timely manner, and meets deadlines. Lesson transitions are paced efficiently, with minimal to</p>	<p>Teacher candidate plans effectively, manages time well, and is proactive in meeting deadlines by turning in work early. Lesson transitions are planned and paced</p>

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
CAEP Standard: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 7	instructional time lost and/or wasted.	end of lessons, with some instructional time lost getting the lesson started or with students ending early without clear instructions of how to use any extra time.	no loss of instructional time.	efficiently, maximizing instructional time. S/he assists peers in organizing and managing time.
18. Self-Control - Teacher candidate displays composure and self-control and demonstrates the capacity to handle stress. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 9	Teacher candidate has an outburst of anger, walks out of the class/meeting/school in anger or frustration, or displays behaviors indicative of inability to handle stress.	Teacher candidate discusses frustration and stress in front of students or demeans students, mentor, school, university, or colleagues.	Teacher candidate displays composure and self-control and demonstrates the capacity to handle stress. S/he may discuss frustration or struggles with mentor.	Teacher candidate displays composure and self-control and demonstrates the capacity to handle stress in a productive manner, and may discuss frustration or struggles with mentor. S/he is quick to listen and look for a positive solution and does not react rashly. S/he assists peers in managing the stress that comes with teaching.
19. Professional Appearance - Teacher candidate dresses according to school policy and presents him/herself in a professional manner. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3	Teacher candidate violates the school dress code more than twice in a semester or after being reprimanded. S/he is unkempt, wears t-shirts or clothes that support inappropriate content for the school setting (e.g. messages of hate, drugs, sex, etc.).	Teacher candidate breaks school dress code policy no more than twice in a semester; for example, candidate may wear a skirt, dress, or shirt that is too short; wrinkled clothes; shoes not allowed in the policy.	Teacher candidate dresses according to school policy and presents him/herself in a professional manner.	Teacher candidate dresses according to school policy and presents him/herself in a professional manner, and is considered a role model for professional appearance and presentation of self.
20. Initiative - Teacher candidate displays initiative, creativity, and resourcefulness. S/he is intrinsically motivated. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10	Teacher candidate is unable to get started on a task, even with support. S/he is unable to find a solution to a problem, even with support. Candidate appears to lack motivation.	Teacher candidate needs support in getting started on tasks. S/he appears to be extrinsically motivated.	Teacher candidate displays initiative, creativity, and resourcefulness. S/he is intrinsically motivated.	Teacher candidate displays initiative, creativity, and resourcefulness. S/he is intrinsically motivated, voluntarily assisting mentor teacher. Candidate helps peers think creatively and involves them in resolving issues and becoming more resourcefulness in finding solutions.
21. Professional Judgement - Teacher candidate demonstrates professional judgement and makes professional decisions consistently. CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 9	Teacher candidate makes a questionable professional decision more than twice in a semester. S/he is unprofessional among classmates, teachers, and mentors.	Teacher candidate makes a questionable professional decision no more than twice in a semester.	Teacher candidate demonstrates professional judgement and makes professional decisions consistently.	Teacher candidate demonstrates professional judgement, makes professional decisions consistently, and is a role model for peers with regard to professional judgement; s/he may be sought out by others for wise counsel/guidance.
22. Passion for Teaching - Teacher candidate is	Teacher candidate is apathetic toward teaching	Teacher candidate demonstrates passion	Teacher candidate is committed, passionate,	Teacher candidate is committed, passionate,

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric (CDPA)- All programs, ELED, SPED, MGED, TCP				
Rated Item(s)	1	2	3	4
	Unacceptable	Needs Development	Proficient	Exemplary
<p>committed, passionate, and enthusiastic with regard to teaching.</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10</p>	and his/her students.	or commitment to teaching, but may not exhibit both. Candidate may also lack enthusiasm for the profession.	and enthusiastic with regard to teaching.	and enthusiastic with regard to teaching. S/he exhibits the passion in such a way that is contagious to peers. Students and mentors comment on the passion and/or positive impact of the teacher candidate.
<p>23. Commitment to School - Teacher candidate supports the school mission and vision, is dedicated to the employer/school, and understands and follows policies, procedures, and rules.</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10</p>	The candidate openly complains and speaks negatively about the school and/or breaks a policy, procedure or rule more than twice in a semester.	The teacher candidate's commitment to the school's mission and vision is not evident; his/her actions are ambiguous and inconsistent. Candidate might break a minor policy, procedure or rule, but no more than twice in a semester.	Teacher candidate supports the school mission and vision, is loyal to the employer/school, and understands and follows policies, procedures, and rules.	Teacher candidate supports the school mission and vision; is loyal to the employer/school, and understands and follows policies, procedures, and rules. His/her commitment is seen in an outward display of enthusiasm for the school mission and students. For example, candidate might assist in fundraiser activities, community events, and activities to improve public relations.
<p>24. Problem Solving Ability - Teacher candidate is an active problem solver.</p> <p>CAEP Standards: 1.1, 3.3 InTASC Standard: 10</p>	Teacher candidate exacerbates existing problems and/or does not contribute to solutions.	Teacher candidate tends to overlook problem and/or avoid working toward a solution to problems when presented.	Teacher candidate is an active problem solver.	Teacher candidate is an active problem solver. S/he is known as a go-to person among peers for good ideas and solutions.

Permissions: The Candidate Dispositions Performance Assessment Rubric may be used without permission within individual teacher preparation programs, but with appropriate credit accorded to the authors. The authors retain the copyright to the instrument.

Authors' Contact Information: Comfort Afolabi, Ph. D. - Comfort.Afolabi@usg.edu Winifred Nweke, Ph. D. - Winifred.Nweke@clayton.edu Tasha Perkins, Ph. D. - Tperkins@shorter.edu

Assurance of Reliability and Validity: The CDPA instrument has been validated and reported as reliable in the following research report by the authors listed below.

Validity:

To establish content validity, Lawshe's (1975) method was employed. © 2017 Comfort Afolabi; Winifred Nweke; Tasha Perkins -- ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Reliability:

Internal consistency reliability was established (0.96). © 2017 Comfort Afolabi; Winifred Nweke; Tasha Perkins -- ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. Training and inter-rater reliability was established on 5.16.18 and continued on 8.15.18. An ideal Intra-class Correlation Average Measures is 0.8. Thirty-four faculty were trained each time with Intra-class Correlation Average Measures of 0.771 and 0.843, respectively. Training and inter-rater reliability for mentor teachers was established on 7.19.16. Thirteen mentor teachers were

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

trained, and the Intra-class Correlation Average Measures was 0.717. Inter-rater reliability for 27 faculty was repeated on 10.2.19, and the Intra-class Correlation Average Measures was 0.798. Instrument training and inter-rater reliability will be completed with faculty and mentor teachers each academic year. Ideal Intra-class Correlation Average Measures is 0.8. We will continue to train faculty and mentor teachers to work toward this goal each year.

Presentation of Data: Data demonstrating candidates' performance on this assessment are provided here Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA)

Analysis and Interpretation: After reviewing these data, for the year 2018-2019, the mean was 81 out of 96 total points for all year two completers, with 98% of candidates meeting the required score of three (proficient) by the time they completed their program of study. In the 2019-2020 year, the mean was 82 out of 96 points, with 97% meeting proficiency, and the mean for the 2020-2021 academic year was 81 out of 96, with 98% meeting proficiency. Therefore, all candidates were successful in their teaching observations and clinical experience.

CDPA data disaggregated by program show candidates performed well in all rubric indicators throughout the program from 1st to 4th semester. Candidates meeting proficiency on the CDPA instrument were 70% or above from 2018-2021. However, in 2020-2021 candidates in the 1st semester in all programs of study demonstrated percent met rates lower than 70%. However, they increased in semesters 2-4, and all were above a 97% proficiency rate by the time they completed their program of study. GGC will continue to evaluate these data to ensure all candidates are successful on the 24 CDPA rubric indicators aligned to the INTASC standards.

Evidence and Analysis - Educator Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA)

Purpose: The edTPA is a content-specific performance assessment that evaluates a standard set of teaching principles, teaching behaviors, and pedagogical strategies focused on specific content learning outcomes for P-12 students. SCALE's extensive Review of Research on Teacher Education provides the conceptual and empirical rationale for edTPA's three-task design and the rubrics' representation of initial competencies required to teach. The assessment systematically examines an authentic teaching cycle aimed at subject-specific student learning goals, using evidence derived from candidates' practice in their student teaching or internship placement. The teaching cycle, captured by the three tasks that compose an edTPA portfolio, includes 1. Planning, 2. Instruction, and 3. Assessment of student learning.

Authentic and job-related evidence includes lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments, assessments, student work feedback, and unedited video instruction recordings. Also assessed through the three tasks are candidates' abilities to develop their students' academic language and to justify and analyze their teaching practices.

[All 27 edTPA handbooks](#) share approximately 80% of their design, assessing pedagogical constructs that underlie the integrated cycle of planning, instruction, and assessment. And the other 20% feature key subject-specific components of teaching and learning drawn from the content standards for student learning and pedagogical standards of national organizations. For example, consistent with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics standards, the elementary, middle childhood, and secondary mathematics versions of edTPA require candidates to demonstrate subject-specific, grade-level appropriate pedagogy in mathematics. The assessment requires that the

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

central focus of their learning segment supports students' development of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and problem-solving/reasoning skills of a standards-based topic; and that their lesson design includes mathematics-pertinent language demands and supports; and that assessments provide opportunities for students to demonstrate the development of mathematics concepts and reasoning skills.

The edTPA data serves as evidence of how candidates perform on the 15 or 18 rubrics on the edTPA instrument. The edTPA rubrics align with INTASC standards One through Nine, including the Learner and Learning, Content Knowledge, and Instructional Practice. Candidates are evaluated by an outside scorer who is an expert in the field. These data are aggregated and disaggregated by program to determine our candidates' strengths, and gaps in programs of study. Data analysis occurs at the end of every academic year in each program/discipline area. All faculty members are involved in the wave 1-3 data analysis to determine the focus areas for each program. A Wave 1-3 data analysis report with a continuous improvement matrix is linked as evidence for your viewing. The continuous improvement plan is implemented in each program and evaluated the spring of each academic year for success and continued areas for needed improvement on the edTPA.

Directions Delivered to the Candidate: The edTPA is crosswalked with our mission and vision for the School of Education at GGC in our edTPA Manual. Candidates are introduced to the edTPA in small increments from the first year to the end of their student teaching. At the beginning of year one, electronic handbooks are provided for each program of study to enrolled candidates through a safe and secure D2L site. Then in year two, candidates receive an edTPA manual that provides many helpful tips and outlines the process for edTPA development during student teaching. There are resources to help them sequentially complete the portfolio, including the cost, what happens if they fail, and how they can get further support if needed. The D2L site and the instructors and field supervisors support candidates by providing additional tools and graphic organizers in their course shells when teaching the necessary skill set to be successful. For example, in 4600B, candidates are taught how to plan an assessment, analyze data, and determine the next steps. At the end of the semester, the instructor then shows the candidates the pieces of the assessment task and their relation to the edTPA portfolio. The same is done in many courses across semesters one through four.

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Summary Chart of the Crosswalk between edTPA and the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards

edTPA Tasks	edTPA Rubrics	InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards			
		Category 1: The Learner and Learning (Standards 1-3)	Category 2: Content (Standards 4-5)	Category 3: Instructional Practice (Standards 6-8)	Category 4: Professional Responsibility (Standards 9-10)
Task 1: Planning	1: <i>Planning for Content Understandings</i>	2, 3	4	7, 8	
	2: <i>Planning to Support Varied Student Needs</i>	1, 2	4	7, 8	
	3: <i>Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning</i>	1, 2	4	7	
	4: <i>Identifying and Supporting Language Demands</i>	1, 2	4, 5	8	
	5: <i>Planning Assessments to Monitor And Support Student Learning</i>	1		6, 8	
Task 2: Instruction	6: <i>Learning Environment</i>	2, 3		8	
	7: <i>Engaging Students in Learning</i>	2, 3	4, 5	8	
	8: <i>Deepening Student Learning</i>	3	4, 5	8	
	9: <i>Subject-Specific Pedagogy</i>	3	4, 5	8	
	10: <i>Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness</i>				9
Task 3: Assessment	11: <i>Analysis of Student Learning</i>			6	
	12: <i>Providing Feedback to Guide Learning</i>			6	
	13: <i>Student Use of Feedback</i>			6	
	14: <i>Analyzing Students' Language Use and Content Learning</i>	1, 2	4, 5		
	15: <i>Using Assessment to Inform Instruction</i>			6, 7, 8	9

Assurance of Reliability and Validity: The edTPA instrument has been validated and reported as reliable by SCALE.

Validity: The edTPA was developed as an authentic, subject-specific, performance-based support and assessment system of a candidate's readiness to teach. Following the validity guidelines presented in the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014), this report defines the constructs assessed by edTPA. It presents evidence that examines its use and interpretations. The validity section reviews sources of validity evidence for edTPA; these include the empirical research and theory on which the development was based; the design process and content development to ensure that the assessment represents the skills, knowledge, and abilities that represent a candidate's readiness to teach; and evidence-based on content and internal structure. Results from a Confirmatory Factor Analyses (CFA) and a polytomous item response theory (IRT) model provide empirical support for the edTPA constructs of planning, instruction, and assessment.

Reliability: Educators play a critical role in the scoring of edTPA. Over 3,000 qualified teachers and teacher educators now serve as scorer trainers, supervisors, or scorers. Scorers must be P-12 teachers or teacher preparation faculty with significant pedagogical content knowledge in the field in which they score and have experience working as instructors or mentors for novice teachers (e.g., NBTPS teachers). Before becoming an official edTPA scorer, educators must go through an extensive scorer training curriculum developed by SCALE and meet qualification standards demonstrated by scoring consistently and accurately. Once scorers qualify and score operationally, they are systematically monitored during the scoring process (through quality 14 monitoring processes such as backreading, validity/calibration portfolios, and requalification exercises) to ensure that they continue to score reliably.

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

Using several different statistical tests, scorer reliability was evaluated in a random sample of 2,671 portfolios double-scored independently by two scorers. The scorers assigned either the same or adjacent scores (total agreement) in approximately 95% of all cases. Kappa n agreement rates reveal that scorers tend to assign scores within +/- 1 and rarely assign scores that differ by more than 1 point (overall kappa n reliability = .89). As in 2014 and 2015, all reliability coefficients indicate a high degree of internal consistency of rubrics to the measured construct (readiness to teach). These results are consistent with the *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing* (AERA, APA, & NCME, 2014) technical standards for licensure assessments of this type and support the use of edTPA scores as a reliable and valid estimate of a prospective teacher's readiness to teach.

Presentation of Data: Data demonstrating candidates' performance on this assessment are provided here edTPA.

Analysis and Interpretation: The edTPA has two scales for measurement. The first is an 18-rubric assessment, titled: Elementary Education of Literacy & Mathematics. The second is a 15-rubric assessment, which refers to all Special Education and our secondary Teacher Certification Programs (TCP) content-specific edTPA assessments. Therefore, edTPA data summary is presented by programs versus Educator Preparation Unit of Analysis.

After reviewing these data for Elementary Education, years 2018-2019, a 100% pass rate on the edTPA was achieved. The mean was 57 out of 90 total points for all year two completers, with 100% of candidates meeting the passing score of 48 by the time they completed their program of study. In the 2019-2020 year, the mean was 55 out of 90 points, with 100% meeting proficiency, and the mean for the 2020-2021 academic year was 51 out of 90 with 92% meeting proficiency. The drop in the edTPA data is due to the state dropping the assessment requirement. Teacher candidates were still required to take the assessment even though it was not state-mandated. This decision allowed us to complete our three-year cycle of data for accreditation. However, 92% or greater met a passing score all three years. This assessment allows us to see how well our candidates understand the teaching cycle and perform planning, instruction, and assessment in a classroom setting with students. Looking at the rubric data, we know candidates were successful but struggled the most with rubrics ten: analyzing teaching effectiveness and fourteen: analyzing students' language use and content learning. They were most successful with task 1 planning. These data support that student teachers were successful in the clinical experience.

All other programs at GGC are 15 rubric assessments. In 2018-2019 the student teachers were found to be successful in their programs of study as well. Overall, the mean for all other programs was 47 out of 75 total points for all year two completers, with 100% of candidates meeting the passing score of 38 by the time they completed their program of study. In the 2019-2020 year, the mean was 46 out of 75 points, with 100% meeting proficiency, and the mean for the 2020-2021 academic year was 41 out of 75 with 95% meeting proficiency. The drop in the edTPA data is due to the state dropping the assessment requirement. Our teacher candidates were still required to take the assessment even though it was not state-mandated. This decision allowed us to complete our three-year cycle of data for accreditation. However, 95% or greater met a passing score all three years in all programs with 15 rubrics.

Those edTPA data disaggregated by program show candidates performed well overall on the assessment. The candidates were required to meet the minimum score on all 15 or 18 rubrics to graduate at GGC from the School of Education. Ninety-two percent or greater achieved success in all programs. The rubrics the candidates struggled with are Unit-wide were rubrics ten: analyzing teaching effectiveness, and fourteen: analyzing students' language use and content learning. The candidates were proficient on all other rubrics on the edTPA. GGC will continue to

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

evaluate candidates on analyzing teaching effectiveness and academic language even though we discontinued using this key unit assessment for the 2021-2022 school year.

Focus Area Two - Candidate Dispositions Performance Standards (CDPA)

Overall, the GGC candidate performs well on the CDPA instrument; these data demonstrate that even if candidates score below a rating of three (proficient) during the 1st and 2nd semester, they are proficient by the end of their program of study. In the EPP Data tables, candidate progress on the CDPA instrument can be seen by looking at Data Table 3 of all licensure programs. These data indicate candidates are provided feedback to demonstrate growth in the ten areas on the rubric. They often struggle with attendance, punctuality, organization and preparedness, time management, content knowledge, and assessment. If candidates struggle in these areas and do not meet the expected rating based on their semester, we provide them with a Candidate Support Plan (CSP). This plan supports their growth and development as individuals in these professional dispositions of teaching. A copy of these CSP plans is kept and meetings with candidates are scheduled periodically to make sure they are demonstrating growth. They have two semesters to demonstrate growth, and most show improvement once they are supported in this process of a CSP. The Educational Program Specialist supports faculty in this role and retains the records for candidates who have CSP plans in the School of Education.

GGC evaluates all CDPA data at the end of each academic year during wave 1-3 data analysis for continuous improvement purposes. This allows further monitoring of changes made to impact greater achievement in programs. Once data analysis is reported in each program of study, GGC can determine what further

Georgia Gwinnett College

Standard One Evidence Set 2

R1.2 Application of Content

variations need to be made, and those are cited in our Continuous improvement plan, which is part of our wave three data analysis process.

After reviewing these data with candidates, it was determined that they continue to struggle with time management. Moving forward, a focus area will be to provide additional support in this area through multiple checkpoints embedded throughout this assessment.

Focus Area Three – edTPA

Overall, the GGC candidate performs well on the edTPA Portfolio; data show that even though candidates' scores have dropped, most student teachers are proficient on the edTPA in their program of study. In the Program Data tables, candidate progress on the edTPA is illustrated in Data Table 4: Educative Teacher Performance Assessment of all licensure programs. The areas they most often struggled with Unit-wide were rubrics ten: analyzing teaching effectiveness, and fourteen: analyzing students' language use and content learning. If candidates struggle and do not pass the edTPA Portfolio Assessment, the edTPA Coordinator and the field supervisor help candidates plan for a retake by reviewing the scores and determining where improvement is needed. Candidates are given guidance on the next steps and placed on a Candidate Support Plan (CSP). The CSP has dates and deadlines and the parameters of the next steps. This plan allows faculty to support their growth and development within areas of need. The edTPA Coordinator supports faculty in this role and retains the records for candidates who have CSP plans in the School of Education.

GGC evaluates edTPA data at the end of each academic year during wave 1-3 data analysis for continuous improvement purposes. This analysis allows GGC to monitor further the changes made to impact greater achievement in programs. Once data analysis is reported in each program of study, GGC determines what further variations need to be made. Those are cited in our Continuous improvement plan, part of our wave three data analysis process.