I. Summary of the January Check-in

Goals of the Academic Year 2018-19 action plan:
- Meet with Elementary Faculty/Staff about plan (Sep. 2018)
- Determine rubrics for the ESAs (Oct. 2018)
- Have a finalized pilot version of the rubrics (Nov. 2018)
- Have a data summit to analyze random sample of products (Jan. 2019)
- Revise and complete a second pilot round/ Create Elementary Ed steering committee (Feb.-May 2019)

Actions completed since August:
- Revised student learning outcomes (SLOs)
- Identified potential ESAs
- Developed rubrics for the ESAs

Brief statement of main results:
- Reviewed edTPA data, discussed weaknesses and strengths, and reflected on possible assessment changes
- Updated SLOs as noted on p.2 and will explore the possibility of adding a new SLO on civic engagement
- Examined Phase 3 portfolio data and decided to keep it as it is at least for spring 2019; will revisit the idea of streamlining/replacing the portfolio in spring 2019

II. Elaboration on Results

The MCEA faculty continued to improve the existing assessment system in the spring of 2019 semester. In addition to the main results reported in January, we have three major achievements in the spring semester as follows:

- Reviewed the WiFORT data of the MCEA program in the past five years and discussed possible ways to strengthen students’ performance in the test.
- Revisited the Phase 3 portfolio and decided to keep the portfolio as it is until we come up with new assessments which are fully developed to replace it. So, the program will be able to collect consistent data from the students.
- The instructors of ELEMMID 419 and READING 461 reviewed and reflected on data for the potential embedded signature assessments (i.e., the Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Lesson Plan and Running Records Assignment). Based on their review, they would like to keep the assessments in the future since they are great measurements of student learning outcomes. The instructor of ELEMMID 419 mentioned that she might slightly adjust the assignment in the fall of 2019.
Appendix

Section I: Revised Student Learning Outcomes
1. Teacher candidates will plan instruction to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students.
2. Teacher candidates will use literacy instructional practices to evaluate the needs of students and plan interventions. (Note: deleted “research based”)
3. Teacher candidates will describe the elements of a positive learning environment and implement effective management techniques to support student learning.
4. Teacher candidates will apply content knowledge and variety of discipline specific instructional strategies using appropriate academic language. (Note: added “content knowledge”)
5. Teacher candidates will collaborate effectively with colleagues, supervisors and/or community partners.
6. Teacher candidates will use effective assessment techniques by analyzing the data to inform their teaching.

Note: Explore possibility of adding a learning outcome on civic engagement

Section II: Potential Embedded Signature Assessments (ESA)
1. ELEMMID 418-Phase 3 Portfolio & Cooperating and University Supervisor evaluation based on 10 WTS
2. READING 461-ESA (Running Records Assignment) & WIFORT
3. ELEMMID 419-ESA (Culturally Relevant Pedagogy Lesson Plan) & Cooperating and University Supervisor evaluation based on 10 WTS
4. Student teaching - edTPA

Section III. Sample ESAs & Rubrics
A. READING 461 Literacy Assessment and Responsive Intervention Strategies
   • Brief Assignment Description: Coding/Students will demonstrate the ability to code a student’s piece of oral reading to determine reading accuracy and use of cueing systems. Analysis/Students will demonstrate the ability to determine a student’s strength(s) and weakness(es) based on analysis of a running record.
   • Assignment Alignment with SLOs: 2 and 6 (possibly 4)
   • Assignment Rubric: The rubric for these two assignments are included on pp.3-4.

B. ELEMMID 419 Elementary School Seminar
   • Brief Assignment Description: Students will prepare and implement a lesson plan with an emphasis on culturally relevant teaching during their field placement. Students will complete the lesson plan guiding questions and develop a full lesson plan addressing all components. After delivering the lesson plan, students will complete a brief reflection. Students will determine the specific content area in conjunction with their mentoring teacher and field supervisor as appropriate.
   • Assignment Alignment with SLOs: 1, 2,3 and 6
   • Assignment Rubric: Rubric used for this assessment will be taken from edTPA rubrics 1 – 5. Please see pp. 5-6.
Running Records – Coding

Directions for Coding Assignment:
1. Watch the video in class, marking the record using the procedure and marking system learned in class. Check it on the second viewing. Use pencil and a good eraser to complete this assignment.
2. Score the protocol by recording any errors in the “e” column and any self-corrections in the “SC” column.
3. Provide subtotals on all the pages and the total for all errors and self-corrections on the last page.
4. Calculate the accuracy percentage as practiced in class (formula below). On front page of the protocol, show your accuracy percentage calculation. Clearly identify the percentage accuracy.
5. Calculate the self-correction ratio as practiced in class (formula below). On the front page of the protocol, show your self-correction ratio and the self-correction ratio.
6. Make a copy of your protocol for the remaining running record assignments.

Rubric for Part I: (total of 50 points) [Class Objective #5: Administer, analyze, and interpret group and individual screening and diagnostic assessments).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Exemplary (A range)</th>
<th>Proficient (B range)</th>
<th>Basic (C range)</th>
<th>Minimal (D range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coding</td>
<td>Coding is done accurately &amp; completely using the scoring practiced in class.</td>
<td>Coding is done accurately using the scoring practiced in class.</td>
<td>Coding is completed but not done using required coding conventions (F &amp; P).</td>
<td>Coding is incomplete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy Percentage &amp; Self correction (SC) Ratio</td>
<td>Accuracy rate and SC ratio are accurate, calculations shown, and correctly formatted.</td>
<td>Accuracy rate and SC ratio included on protocol and are reasonable based on coding.</td>
<td>Accuracy rate and SC ratio are inaccurate or incomplete.</td>
<td>Accuracy rate and/or SC ratio are not included on protocol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Writing</td>
<td>Coding and notes are written in pencil; protocol is neat and complete (acceptable for placement in school file).</td>
<td>Coding and notes are written in pencil; some is difficult to read due to incomplete erasures or cross outs.</td>
<td>Coding and notes are written in ink or other non-erasable material; erasures/sloppy coding make it difficult to read.</td>
<td>Coding and notes are sloppy and difficult or impossible to read.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Objectives: 2 [partial]: Teach and assess the concepts of phonological awareness and phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, demonstrating an understanding of the developmental, overlapping nature of literacy development. 5 [partial]: Administer, analyze, and interpret group and individual screening and diagnostic assessments. 9. [partial]: Prepare for concepts on the Wisconsin Foundations of Reading Test (WFOR) required for licensure.

Scoring Guidelines:
Coding: 20 points
Accuracy % and SC ratio: 20 points
Quality of Writing: 10 points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Exemplary (A range)</th>
<th>Proficient (B range)</th>
<th>Basic (C range)</th>
<th>Minimal (D range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution of points within each category are the same as found on the syllabus [note that + and – are included in the ranges:

A: 90 - 100
B: 80 - 89
C: 70 - 79
D: 60 – 69

Please note that within each grade level range, the grades will vary depending on clarity of writing and accuracy of responses.
Running Records — Analyzing Errors

Directions for the Analysis Assignment:

1. Based on this sample of the student’s reading, write a paragraph in which you identify a specific example of one strength of the child’s use of one of the cueing system (strategic processing) and explain why you selected the example you did.

2. Based on this sample of the student’s reading, identify one weakness within the child’s visual cueing system that he lacks in order for him to move beyond the first letter (or individual letter level) to identify unfamiliar words.

3. If you took this running record as part of a lesson, what would you compliment the child on, and what would be your teaching point for the next lesson or two?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>One strength is appropriately identified (meaning cue) and there is at least one correct, specific example to support it.</td>
<td>Strength is appropriately identified (meaning cue) with general statements to support it.</td>
<td>Strength is not a (meaning cue) and/or stated strength is inaccurate based on the evidence.</td>
<td>Strength is inaccurate or not supported with evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>One weakness is appropriately identified (visual cue) and there is at least one correct, specific example to support it.</td>
<td>Weakness is appropriately identified (visual cue) and there is at least one correct, specific example to support it.</td>
<td>Weakness is appropriate with only general support and/or stated weakness is not supported by the evidence.</td>
<td>Weaknesses are inaccurate or incomplete or not supported with evidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Lesson (compliment and teaching point)</td>
<td>Both teaching point and compliment are appropriate, accurate and clearly explained; teaching point specifically addresses most immediate need.</td>
<td>Both teaching point and compliment are appropriate with some explanation; they are specific to the student and have adequate explanation.</td>
<td>Either teaching point and compliment are appropriate with limited explanation; they are stated in general terms.</td>
<td>Missing either teaching point or compliment, or they are too general to be useful in guiding the next lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of Writing</td>
<td>Written in academic style; no or minimal errors; double spaced.</td>
<td>Written in academic style; few errors; double spaced</td>
<td>Written in informal style with significant errors and/or not double spaced.</td>
<td>Writing is unacceptable for academic writing — errors interfere with understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Class Objectives: 5. (partial): Analyze and interpret individual screening and diagnostic assessments. 9, (partial): Prepare for concepts on the WFOR required for licensure.

Scoring Guidelines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Exemplary (A range)</th>
<th>Proficient (B range)</th>
<th>Basic (C range)</th>
<th>Minimal (D range)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The distribution of points within each category are the same as found on the syllabus [note that + and – are included in the ranges:

A: 90 - 100
B: 80 - 89
C: 70 - 79
D: 60 – 69

Please note that within each grade level range, the grades will vary depending on clarity of writing and accuracy of responses.
**Literacy Planning Rubrics**

**Rubric 1: Planning for Literacy Learning**

*How do the candidate’s plans build students’ understanding of an essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text and the skills that support that strategy?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1*</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction focus solely on literacy skills without any connections to an essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text. OR There are significant content inaccuracies that will lead to student misunderstandings. OR Standards, objectives, and learning tasks and materials are not aligned with each other.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction support student learning of skills with vague connections to the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing text with clear connections to skills.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans for instruction build on each other within a meaningful context that supports learning of the essential literacy strategy for comprehending OR composing test with clear AND consistent connections to related skills.</td>
<td>Candidate’s plans build an authentic connection between reading and writing. Candidate explains how she will use learning tasks and materials to lead students to independently apply the essential literacy strategy AND related skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs**

*How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students’ literacy learning?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no evidence of planned supports. OR Candidate does not attend to ANY INSTRUCTIONAL requirements in IEPs and 504 plans.</td>
<td>Planned supports are loosely tied to learning objectives or the central focus of the learning segment.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus with attention to the characteristics of the class as a whole.</td>
<td>Planned supports are tied to learning objectives and the central focus. Supports address the needs of specific individuals or groups with similar needs.</td>
<td>Level 4 plus: Supports include specific strategies to identify and respond to common developmental approximations or misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate's justification of learning tasks is either missing OR represents a deficit view of students and their backgrounds.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies learning tasks with limited attention to students' prior academic learning OR personal, cultural, or community assets.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' learning tasks OR personal, cultural, or community assets.</td>
<td>Candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students' learning tasks AND personal, cultural, or community assets.</td>
<td>Candidate's justification is supported by principles from research and/or theory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language demands identified by the candidate are not consistent with the selected language function OR task.</td>
<td>Language supports primarily address one language demand (vocabulary, function, syntax, discourse).</td>
<td>General language supports address use of two or more language demands (vocabulary, function, syntax, discourse).</td>
<td>Targeted language supports address use of vocabulary, language function, AND one or more additional language demands (syntax, discourse).</td>
<td>Language supports are designed to meet the needs of students with different levels of language learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Level 2</th>
<th>Level 3</th>
<th>Level 4</th>
<th>Level 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The assessments only provide evidence of students' use of skills.</td>
<td>The assessments provide limited evidence to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy OR related skills during the learning segment.</td>
<td>The assessments provide evidence to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy AND related skills during the learning segment.</td>
<td>The assessments provide multiple forms of evidence to monitor students' use of the essential literacy strategy AND related skills throughout the learning segment.</td>
<td>The assessments are strategically designed to allow individuals or groups with specific needs to demonstrate their learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>