

College of Saint Mary
Rule 24 Section 2 – Artifacts 2 and 3
Key Assessments and Findings

Endorsement Program: Middle Grades - Science

Artifact 2: Data tables with summarized data for each key assessment.

Artifact 3: Provide a narrative interpretation/summary of the assessment data from the institution’s perspective.

Content Knowledge #1

Graduation GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	No completers for reporting year			9	3.472 – 4.00	3.839
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			Low number of completers, data reported with 2014-2015 completers		

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

The average MAT program graduation GPA, for the teacher candidates pursuing a Science endorsement, was a 3.84 for 2014-2015. The 3.8 GPA represents the superior evidence that is presented in response to course assessments that are aligned to the required standards. For 2015-2016, there were not enough completers on which to report.

Praxis II Test: NO TEST REQUIRED	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	NO TEST REQUIRED					
2015-2016						

*As of 2016, middle level rule does not require the Praxis Content Tests for Middle Level Endorsements.

The Praxis II Content Tests for each area became a requirement in 2015. In 2014-2015 passing of the exam was not a certification requirement though taking the exam was a program requirement. Completers after September 2015 are required to earn a passing score in order to be recommended for certification. Candidates take the test in the semester prior to beginning Clinical Practice. As of 2015-2016, there is no Content Test required for the Middle Grades endorsement.

Content Knowledge #2

Content GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	No completers for reporting year			9	2.628 – 3.540	3.114
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year			Low number of completers, data reported with 2014-2015 completers		

The Content GPA for Middle Grades endorsement completers includes all courses in Core Academic Area of the endorsement. The courses identified on the Program of Study are included in the Content GPA.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

The average Content Knowledge GPA for 2014-2015 was a 3.11. There were not enough completers in 2015-2016 on which to report this data. Comparing the candidates’ enrollment GPA with their overall CSM GPA indicated there was strong academic growth during their time in the MAT program. This can be attributed to careful individualized program planning, clear expectations, high standards, ongoing feedback, and reflection.

If a teacher candidate is identified as at-risk, a retention plan is designed and interventions are carefully monitored to help a candidate be successful. If a candidate does not show adequate progress, MAT policy states that after two Cs or any grade lower than a C, the teacher candidate is dismissed.

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 4 and 7.2)										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported				

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

There were not enough completers on which to report the data.

**Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation
Master's Program – 2014-2015**

INSTRUCTION: Reading/Writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussion - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.14 (N=7)	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.29 (N=7)	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0%

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, we were pleased that no students in the MAT program, who were seeking a Science endorsement, received a score in the unacceptable range and over 70% of the teacher candidates were in the proficient or exemplary range on all of the indicators. The data supports our confidence that our teacher candidates are well prepared to deliver their content in the classroom.

Learner/Learning Environments

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 1, 2, 3 and 7.3)										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported				

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

There were not enough completers on which to report the data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Intellectual Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.14 (N=7)	28.57%	57.14%	14.29%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Personal Development - Incorporates opportunities for social development				
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
LEARNER DEVELOPMENT: Social Growth - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
PLANNING: Pre-assessment - Uses a variety of tools to determine student's ability and prior knowledge				
3.14 (N=7)	28.57%	57.14%	14.30%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Expectations - Has high expectations for all student learning				
3.29 (N=7)	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Performance - Requires students to apply knowledge in authentic settings				
3.57 (N=7)	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Student needs - Modifies instructional approaches and materials for students with special needs				
2.86 (N=7)	42.86%	0%	57.14%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Resources - Uses IEP and/or consults with special education, reading or ESL teachers				
2.86 (N=7)	42.86%	0%	57.14%	0%

MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Instructional strategies - Uses strategies such as visuals, graphic organizers, gestures, and appropriate communication modifications to better teach all students				
3.29 (N=7)	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Classroom climate - Helps students respect contributions made by diverse learners in the classroom				
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0%
MEETING NEEDS OF ALL STUDENTS: Curriculum - Includes multiple perspectives when presenting and assessing curriculum content				
3.29 (N=7)	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Climate - Conducts a friendly, energetic, and businesslike classroom				
3.43 (N=7)	57.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Organization - Organized with planning and thus instruction – students have clearly communicated expectations				
3.43 (N=7)	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Time management - Uses all of class time efficiently				
3.00 (N=7)	28.57%	42.86%	28.57%	0%
MANAGEMENT MOTIVATION: Motivation/Engagement - Creates an engaging learning environment where students are on task and interested in the learning				
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Oral Projects - well when teaching; is confident and articulate when teaching				
3.43 (N=7)	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%
COMMUNICATION: Written - Writes professionally with clarity, conciseness, and attention to detail				
3.57 (N=7)	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, there were no scores in the unacceptable range. Areas of strength included requiring candidates to apply knowledge in an authentic setting, organized planning and instruction, and oral/written communication. All teacher candidates demonstrated exemplary and proficient scores in these areas.

Out of the 18 indicators, there were only two in which the majority of the teacher candidates scored in the developing range. It is noted that there is an area of growth in two of the five indicators related to meeting the needs of all candidates. Modifying instruction to meet the needs of candidates with the input from IEP resources is a skill set that will develop over time in the classroom. This insight brings a level of awareness to an area that could be emphasized further in MAT coursework. There has since been an additional text added to SPE 501 that will offer additional resources on differentiation in the classroom.

Case Study (Sections 1, 4, 5)								
Section 1: Contextual Factors								
(Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters - 30 points possible 2014-15 and Fall/Spring 2015-16)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				28.11 (N=9)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			
Section 4: Design for Instruction								
(Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters - 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				37.44 (N=9)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making								
(Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				19.44 (N=9)	77.78%	22.22%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, 88.9% of the teacher candidates scored in the partially met or met range on sections 1 and 4. A total of 100% of the teacher candidates scored in the met or partially met range on section 5. One candidate scored in the not met range on sections 1 and 4. It should be noted that this is the same candidate (see Language Arts portfolio) who consistently lacked detail on multiple sections of the case study.

For 2015-2016, there were only two completers at the graduate level. The data for these completers was included with the 2014-2015 completers.

Instructional Practices - Knowledge

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 6.1 and 7.1)										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported				

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

There were not enough completers on which to report.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
PLANNING: Knowledge of professional literature - Applies knowledge from the professional literature				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Discussions - Uses higher order questions to promote student learning				
3.14 (N=7)	57.14%	0%	42.86%	0%

Graduate:

All MAT teacher candidates in clinical practice are expected to achieve at the developing or proficient levels for their clinical experiences. It is important to remember that they are in the process of cultivating their teaching skill set. If a teacher candidate receives unacceptable ratings and/or additional feedback on significant areas of growth, the teacher candidate will be required to repeat the clinical placement in the upcoming semester before a recommendation for certification can be made.

For 2014-2015, no teacher candidates scored in the unacceptable range. A total of 86% of the teacher candidates were recognized as proficient and exemplary in applying knowledge from the professional literature. A total of 57% of teacher candidates were recognized as being exemplary in using higher order questions to promote student learning. Using higher order questioning within instruction is often a skill that develops over an extended period of time.

Case Study (Sections 3 and 4)								
Section 3: Assessment Plan (Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters - 30 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				28.67 (N=9)	66.67%	33.33%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			
Section 4: Design for Instruction (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters - 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 20 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				37.44 (N=9)	77.78%	11.11%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all candidates met or partially met the requirements for section 3. All but one met or partially met the requirements for section 4. This is the same teacher candidate who consistently lacked detail in multiple sections of the case study. The candidate provided sufficient evidence that he/she was capable of designing instruction, there was just a deficiency in his/her ability to reflect on the process in the required depth, as requested by the rubric.

For 2015-2016, there were only two completers at the graduate level. The data for these completers was included with the 2014-2015 completers.

	Bachelors - Senior Research Paper (10 points possible)				Masters - HPT Literature Review (100 points possible)			
	Mean	Exceeded	Met	Not Met	Mean	Exceeded	Met	Not Met
2014- 2015	No completers for reporting year				94.63 (N=8)*	50.0%	50.0%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers, data reported with 2014-2015 completers			

*One student completed the HPT Literature Review in 2009 - Data is not on record.

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all eight of the candidates met or exceeded the standards for the literature review paper. There were no candidates who did not meet the standards.

For 2015-2016, there were only two completers at the graduate level. The data for these completers was included with the 2014-2015 completers.

Instructional Practices - Effectiveness

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 5, 6.2, 8, 11)										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported				

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, there were not enough completers on which to report the data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
PLANNING: Organization of plans - Is well organized with written daily and unit plans				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
PLANNING: Appropriate plans - Uses plans that are appropriate to student level and background. Meets state standards				
3.43 (N=7)	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Content Knowledge - Explains content accurately and clearly				
3.43 (N=7)	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%
PLANNING: Choices of content - Uses appropriate content materials and tools of inquiry				
3.43 (N=7)	57.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0%
PLANNING: Student experiences - Engages students in meaningful learning experiences where they can construct their own knowledge using a wide array of tasks and materials				
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Formative - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.43 (N=7)	42.86%	57.14%	0%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Summative - Uses summative evaluations based on multiple measures which give an accurate accounting of learning				
3.43 (N=7)	57.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0%
ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION: Measurements - Produces valid and reliable measurements of instructional objectives				
3.57 (N=7)	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Print - Uses textbooks effectively and other readings/text to supplement instruction				
3.57	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%

(N=7)				
TECHNOLOGY: Non-print - Uses white/chalk board, projector, charts, etc. effectively				
3.43 (N=7)	57.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0%
TECHNOLOGY: Electronic - Provides continuous appropriate feedback to students				
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Reading/writing - Uses and teaches a variety of reading and writing strategies to help students learn content				
3.14 (N=7)	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Variety - Uses a variety of appropriate teaching strategies to help students attain knowledge that is usable and applicable				
3.29 (N=7)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%
INSTRUCTION: Critical Thinking - Implements quality inquiry learning experiences that require students to analyze, connect and investigate concepts and problems				
3.29 (N=7)	57.14%	14.29%	28.57%	0%

Graduate:

In 2014-2015, no teacher candidates scored in the unacceptable range on the clinical evaluation. More than 70% scored in the proficient or exemplary categories. Some areas of strength were using lesson plans which were appropriate for students' level and background, producing reliable and valid measurements of instructional practices, and using text to supplement instruction.

Case Study (Sections 5, 6, and 7)								
Section 5: Instructional Decision Making (Bachelors - 9 points possible, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 15 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				19.44 (N=9)	77.78%	22.22%	0%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			
Section 6: Analysis of Student Learning (Bachelors - 12 points, Masters – 20 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 30 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				15.44 (N=9)	55.56%	11.11%	33.33%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			
Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters – 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 80 points possible Spring 2016)								
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				36.22 (N=9)	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, all of the teacher candidates met or partially met the standard for section 5. For section 6, more than half met or partially met the requirement. For section 6, those that had point deductions were candidates who were lacking depth or were missing a piece of data for the case study. All, but one, met the requirements for section 7. This candidate was missing a connection to the analysis of instruction and therefore had points deducted.

For 2015-2016, there were only two completers at the graduate level. The data for these completers was included with the 2014-2015 completers.

Professional Responsibility

NDE Clinical Evaluation (Standards 9 and 10)										
	Bachelors Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare	Masters Mean	Consistent	Frequent	Occasional	Rare
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year					Reported on MAT Clinical Evaluation table below				
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year					Low number of completers (N=2), data not reported				

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2015-2016, there were not enough completers on which to report the data.

Masters of Arts in Teaching Clinical Evaluation Master's Program – 2014-2015				
COMMUNICATION: Interpersonal - Is approachable, assertive, and helpful				
Mean	Exemplary	Proficient	Developing	Unacceptable
3.71 (N=7)	71.43%	28.57%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Collegiality - Frequently seeks and offers assistance to other teachers				
3.71 (N=7)	71.43%	28.57%	0%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: School staff - Utilizes school staff and teacher assistants appropriately				
3.57 (N=7)	71.43%	14.29%	14.29%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Parents - Has professional formal and informal contact with parents				
3.43 (N=7)	57.14%	28.57%	14.29%	0%
COOPERATION/COLLABORATION: Community - Utilizes community resources; becomes a part of the surrounding community				
3.57 (N=7)	71.43%	14.29%	14.29%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Professional Association - Associates with other professional; attends meetings, joins professional societies, reads relevant literature				
3.57 (N=7)	71.43%	14.29%	14.29%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reflection - Changes practice based on input from others and then reflection				
3.57 (N=7)	57.14%	42.86%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Legal/ethical - Uses classroom practices that are legal and ethical				
3.86 (N=7)	85.71%	14.29%	0%	0%
PROFESSIONALISM: Reliable - Completes work in a timely manner, meets all professional expectations				
3.57 (N=7)	71.43%	14.29%	14.29%	0%

Graduate:

In 2014-2015, there were no candidates rated in the unacceptable range. More than 85% of all of the candidates scored at the exemplary or proficient range on all indicators. Only 1 out of 7 was rated in the developing category in 5 of the 9 indicators. With a low number of students, the percentages appear skewed and only reflect minor occasional deficiencies. A total of 100% of the teacher candidates were rated proficient or exemplary on 4 of the 9 indicators.

Case Study (Section 7)								
Section 7: Reflection and Self-Evaluation (Bachelors - 12 points possible, Masters – 40 points possible 2014-15 and Fall 2015, 80 points possible Spring 2016)								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014-2015	No completers for reporting year				36.22 (N=9)	66.67%	22.22%	11.11%
2015-2016	No completers for reporting year				Low number of completers (N=2 Fall 2015), data reported with 2014-2015 completers			

Undergraduate:

There were no completers at the undergraduate level for the reporting years.

Graduate:

For 2014-2015, 88.9% met or partially met the requirements for section 7 of the case study. Only one student did not meet the requirements. This candidate was missing a connection to the analysis of the instruction in her reflection.

For 2015-2016, there were only two completers at the graduate level. The data for these completers was included with the 2014-2015 completers.

Overall Proficiency

Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey (2015 and 2016)																		
Endorsement – Middle Grades																		
	Reporting Year - 2015									Reporting Year - 2016								
	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		Total
Indicator 1.1	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4		0.00%	2	50.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 1.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	0.00%	1	0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 1.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	0.00%	1	0.00%	1	25.00%	1	0.00%	4
Indicator 2.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	0.00%	1	00.00%	1	0.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 2.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 3.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 3.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 3.3	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.2	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 4.3	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 5.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 5.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 6.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 6.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.2	2	50.00%		0.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 7.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 8.1	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 8.2	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 8.3	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 9.1	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.2	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.3	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 9.4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4	3	75.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1	25.00%	4
Indicator 10.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 10.2	1	25.00%		0.00%	3	75.00%		0.00%	4	1	25.00%	2	50.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4
Indicator 11.1	1	25.00%	1	25.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%	4	2	50.00%	1	25.00%	1	25.00%		0.00%	4

Due to the small number of completed surveys, the data represented in the chart above may or may not directly connect to the endorsement area within this folio. All of the first year teacher survey data was compiled together due to low numbers.

The 2015 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey produced a small number of completed surveys. It is important to note that the left side of the data table represents 2013-2014 graduates. None of the previous data from the key assessments 1-6 represents data from these new teachers. It is expected that first year teachers would be rated in the occasional or frequent range on all of the indicators listed. For 2015, three of the four first year teachers were rated occasional or higher on all of the indicators. There was one exception where a new teacher was rated as rare on two of the indicators. The program is unaware of the circumstances related to the dispositional concerns of that teacher. The program records were reviewed, and at no time did this candidate demonstrate a deficiency in dispositions during his/her time in the program.

The 2016 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey also produced a small number of completed surveys. In reviewing the individual data, it appears that the majority (75%) of the new teachers were rated at occasional or higher on all of the indicators. There was one new teacher who was rated as rare on many of the indicators. During his/her time in the program there were some minor dispositional concerns and lack of depth in required coursework. There were some opportunities to advise this candidate of existing concerns. Within the data represented in this folio, his/her data scores on the case study, the research paper and the clinical evaluation did not provide significant areas of concern.