

Williams Baptist University Key Assessment – Candidate Dispositions Assessment

All initial licensure programs – both undergraduate and graduate

Undergraduate -2 Cycles of the Previous Disposition Assessment Data– 1 Cycle (Pilot) of Revised Disposition Assessment Data

Graduate – MAT Program - 1 Cycle (Pilot) of Revised Disposition Assessment Data

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>CAEP Standards Addressed Highlighted in green throughout the document</p> | <p>R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4 R2.1, R2.3 R3.2, R3.3 R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4</p> |
| <p><u>InTASC / ARTS Standard Alignment</u></p> | <p>InTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 Arkansas Teaching Standards (ARTS) 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10</p> |
| <p><u>TESS Components</u> (Arkansas assessment based on the nationally recognized Danielson Framework for Teaching) Danielson Alignment to InTASC https://www.isu.edu/media/libraries/college-of-education/advising/FFT-IN-Tasc.pdf</p> | <p>Arkansas-- Teacher Excellence Support System (TESS) 1a, 1c, 1d, 2a, 3a, 3c, 3e, 4a, 4c, 4d, 4e, 4f</p> |
| <p><u>ISTE Standards for Teachers</u></p> | <p>1 Learner, 2 Leader, 4 Collaborator, 6 Facilitator, 7 Analyst</p> |
| <p><u>Table of Contents</u> <u>CAEP Sufficiency Criteria for EPP Created Assessments</u> <u>Administration and Purpose</u> <u>Content of Assessment</u> <u>Scoring</u> <u>Data Reliability</u> <u>Data Validity</u> <u>Data Review and Use</u> <u>Stakeholder Involvement</u> <u>Continuous Improvement</u> <u>Technology and ISTE Alignment</u> <u>Alignment to the Mission of the WTEP</u></p> | <p><u>Candidate Dispositions Assessment Document</u> <u>Undergrad Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions</u> <u>MAT Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions</u> <u>Data Pilot One Cycle PP2 revised assessment– graduate MAT</u> <u>Data Pilot One Cycle PP1 revised assessment – undergrad aggregate</u> <u>Data Pilot One Cycle PP2 revised assessment – undergrad aggregate</u> <u>Data Pilot One Cycle PP2 revised assessment –undergrad disaggregated</u> <u>Data Two Cycles PP2 previous assessment— undergrad aggregate</u> <u>Data Two Cycles PP2 previous assessment— undergrad disaggregated</u> <u>Validity Study Partners for Candidate Dispositions Assessment</u> <u>Professional Growth Plan Instructions and Candidate Sample</u> <u>Sample Responses on <i>Compare & Reflect</i> Assignment</u> <u>References</u></p> |

CAEP Sufficiency Criteria for Evaluation of EPP-Created Assessments

Administration and Purpose

The *Candidate Dispositions Assessment* is a key assessment **administered across all undergraduate programs at three key progression points** from the Introduction to Teaching course, ED 2203, through the final internship semester. (CAEP R3.2) The Williams Teacher Education Program (WTEP) has monitored candidate dispositions at the undergraduate level since teacher education was added to the curriculum at WBU in the 1980s.

As part of the CAEP self-study process, the **revised dispositions assessment was added to the graduate MAT program at two key progression points**. (CAEP R5.4) The data presented in this document represent two cycles of undergraduate data from a previous version of the assessment that was used from 2010-2020, as well as one cycle of pilot undergraduate and graduate from the revised *Candidate Dispositions Assessment* that was EPP-researched and created in 2021. (CAEP R5.1)

The administration and purpose, along with the components of the revised *Candidate Dispositions Assessment* defined by the WTEP faculty, were **research-based and intentionally planned to foster awareness and reflection** in teacher candidates. (CAEP R3.2, R5.1, R5.2, R5.4) Three research-based assumptions guided the WTEP faculty in creating and implementing the dispositions assessment.

- 1) Teacher professionalism should be a focus of every teacher education program despite the lack of a universal definition of professionalism (Creasy, 2015).
- 2) Teacher dispositions can be taught (Cummins & Asempapa, 2013).
- 3) Teacher dispositions can improve through purposeful coursework that fosters candidate awareness and reflection (Yost, 1997).

Purpose: The purpose of the *Candidate Dispositions Assessment* is to provide opportunities for candidates to be intentional, reflective, and growing in their professional dispositions. (CAEP R1.4) Thus, candidates reflect on, rate, and provide evidence of the development of their professional dispositions in practice (CAEP R1.4). The defined progression points also provide a system for faculty, cooperating teachers, and internship supervisors to assess and monitor the teacher candidate's development of professional educator dispositions (CAEP R2.3, R3.2, R3.3, R5.1).

Alignment to the Mission of the WTEP

The WTEP faculty planned the administration of the candidate disposition assessment to specifically align with the three pillars of the mission of the WTEP to **prepare professional educators who are intentional, reflective, and growing in their teaching practice**. The dispositions assessment **requires candidates to be intentional to** identify behaviors associated with six key areas of professionalism, rate themselves in the six areas on an ongoing basis to track development, plan for their professional development, and collect evidence to support their growth in

Administration and Purpose, (continued)

professionalism. Throughout the program, as candidates interact with the dispositions assessment, candidates have multiple **opportunities to reflect on** their development in the six key professional dispositions, the quality of evidence they collect to support their ratings, and differences in faculty ratings of their dispositions as compared to self-ratings. Finally, candidates **track and document their growth** in the six key professional dispositions and plan and implement resources on a professional growth plan that addresses key areas.

Administration:

The assessment is administered at multiple, key progression points in the program to monitor and support the development of professional dispositions that are standards-based and associated with effective teaching. The progression points were chosen by the CAEP Leadership Team to identify and address candidates' areas of weakness and exemplary actions related to the development of critical teacher dispositions. (CAEP R3.2) The process of administration is explained below in the *Undergraduate Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions* and *Graduate Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions*. (CAEP R5.1)

Three Progression Points in Undergraduate Programs (see detailed outline of progression points below)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate self-assessment with evidence • Faculty-rated assessment with evidence • Compare & Reflect assignment to compare the ratings and plan for improvement • <i>Professional Growth Plan</i> is created and implemented by candidates |
| 2) Admission to the WTEP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate self-assessment with evidence • Interview committee-rated assessment with evidence • Compare & Reflect assignment to compare the ratings and plan for improvement |
| 3) ED 4526 Clinical Internship I | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate self-assessment with evidence • Interview committee-rated assessment with evidence • Compare & Reflect assignment to compare the ratings and plan for improvement |
| ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching ED 4183 Integrated Methods & Classroom Management ED 4333 Educational Technology ED 4113 Study of the School (capstone) ED 4133 Measurement & Evaluation (capstone) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful opportunities for candidates to build evidence of teacher dispositions are provided in these courses. • Candidates are directed and supported in reflecting upon and building the evidence of their professional dispositions through coursework. |

Administration and Purpose, (continued)

Two Progression Points in Graduate MAT Program (see detailed outline of progression points below)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) MAT 5043 Effective Teaching OR MAT 5013 Educational Characteristics | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate self-assessment with evidence • Faculty-rated assessment with evidence • Compare & Reflect assignment to compare the ratings and plan for improvement |
| 2) MAT 5113 Clinical Track OR MAT 5123 Clinical Track | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate self-assessment with evidence • Interview committee-rated assessment with evidence • Compare & Reflect assignment to compare the ratings and plan for improvement |
| MAT 5063 Diversity in Education MAT 5073 Ed. Law & Ethics MAT 5093 Modern Technology and others | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purposeful opportunities for candidates to build evidence of teacher dispositions are provided in these courses. • Candidates are directed and supported in reflecting upon and building the evidence of their professional dispositions through coursework. |

While the progression points are the key points for monitoring progress in the development of professional dispositions, the awareness of and reflection upon the six components of the assessment are woven throughout the coursework. Thus, candidates build an explicit basis for judgement of the assessment components.

The basis for judgement of assessment components is made explicit to candidates through multiple measures in ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching prior to the disposition assessment being activated by the professor and the student. The measures include:

- In groups, students make a list of characteristics of an effective instructor (CAEP R1.4).
- Once the list is made and shared with another group, students begin to cite evidence of these characteristics.
- Students are then introduced to the purpose of a disposition and how the disposition is used throughout WTEP.
- Students participate in a jigsaw activity to carefully examine one component. In this examination, students align the component to the InTASC standards, ARTS, and TESS domain elements (CAEP R1.3). In addition, students collaboratively generate ideas for evidence of the component for Williams' students and certified teachers.
- Students collaborate with another group in order to cross check the alignment to InTASC, ARTS standards and TESS (CAEP R1.3).
- Each group then presents a summary of the component analyzed. The class generates ideas in groups for evidence. This evidence is shared with the class. Discussion of valid evidence is conducted.

- After each component is discussed, individual reflection time is provided for students to record ideas for their personal evidence.
- A self-assessment is then activated by the professor. Each student records evidence of each component and rates themselves on each component (CAEP 3.2).
- The professor also completes a disposition assessment on each student, citing evidence on each component (CAEP 3.2).
- The student is provided copies of the self-assessment and professor’s assessment. In a Google Form reflection, students compare the self-evaluation and the professor’s feedback. The students are asked to identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, students are required to identify two areas to focus attention on for professional growth (CAEP 1.4).
- Beginning in Fall 2021, scenarios will be provided to the students in order to practice rating of the components prior to the self-assessment piece. (CAEP R5.4)

Content of Assessment

The [Candidate Dispositions Assessment](#) has six components based on current research about professional dispositions for novice teachers (Creasy, 2015; Cummins & Asempapa, 2013). The components were purposefully chosen by WTEP faculty to ensure that candidates and faculty could evaluate them during undergraduate and graduate preparation while in coursework and internship experiences. (CAEP R5.2)

The component content alignment table shown below explicitly identifies the alignment of the assessment components to the CAEP Standards, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium standards ([InTASC](#)), the Arkansas Teaching Standards ([ARTS](#)), Teacher Excellence Support System ([TESS](#))*, and International Society of Technology in Education ([ISTE](#)) Standards for Educators.

The assessment components are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, TESS (Danielson Framework for Teaching), and the Arkansas Teaching Standards (ARTS). (See alignment table below) (CAEP R5.2)

| See performance-level criteria for each component on the Candidate Disposition Assessment Document | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--|
| Component 1 | Professional Preparation | CAEP R1.2, R1.3, R1.4 TESS 1A, 1C, 1D, 4D 4F InTASC/ARTS 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 ISTE 2, 4, 7 |
| Component 2 | Professional Responsiveness | CAEP R1.4 TESS 3E, 4A, 4D, 4E InTASC/ARTS 9, 10 |
| Component 3 | Professional Maturity | CAEP R1.1, R1.2, R1.4 TESS 1A,1C, 2A, 4E, 4F |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| Content of Assessment, (continued) | | | InTASC/ARTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10 |
| | Component 4 | Professional Presentation | CAEP R1.1, R1.4 TESS 2A, 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC/ARTS 3, 9, 10 ISTE 2, 4, 6 |
| | Component 5 | Professional Communication | CAEP R1.4 TESS 3A, 3C, 4C InTASC 9 ISTE 4 |
| | Component 6 | Professional Growth | CAEP R1.4 TESS 4A, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC 9, 10 ISTE 1, 2, 4 |
| | <p>*TESS is an Arkansas state teacher assessment that mirrors the <i>Danielson Framework for Teaching with 4 domains and 22 components</i>. The <i>Danielson Framework for Teaching</i> is a nationally-recognized professional tool that identifies those aspects of a teacher’s responsibilities that have been documented through empirical studies and theoretical research as promoting improved student learning (Danielson, 2013). Danielson created the framework to capture “good teaching” in all of its complexity. The Arkansas TESS Rubric is based on Charlotte Danielson’s Framework for Teaching and provides a shared vocabulary and understanding of high-impact instructional practices which provide learning and growth possibilities for every Arkansas student (Arkansas Department of Elementary and Secondary Education website TESS page, 2021).</p> | | |
| Scoring | <p>Protocols for scoring the Candidate Disposition Assessment: The assessment is used to evaluate the dispositions of teacher candidates in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. Teacher candidates will self-assess at the identified progression points (see details about the graduate and undergraduate progression points). WTEP faculty, internship supervisors, and cooperating teachers will also assess candidate dispositions at specific intervals in the process. At each progression point, candidates will complete the <i>Compare & Reflect</i> Assignment to compare the faculty ratings with their self-assessment ratings on the six components of the dispositions assessment. (CAEP R2.1, R2.3, R3.2)</p> <p>Revised Candidate Dispositions Assessment Piloted in Spring 21 Proficiency levels on the revised <i>Candidate Dispositions Assessment</i> are on a scale of 1-3 with 1=Needs improvement, 2=Developing, and 3=Effective. (view performance-based criteria on the assessment below)</p> | | |

Scoring, (continued)

The target level of performance at all points except the final progression point is *Level 2 Developing*. The target level for candidates at the end of the program, Progression Point 3 for undergraduate and Progression Point 2 for graduate candidates, is *Level 3 Effective*. Candidates scoring below the target levels will develop an informal plan to improve with input from WTEP faculty or the internship supervisor.

Actionable feedback is provided to candidates in both the undergraduate and graduate programs at Progression Point 1 through the WTEP faculty member teaching the introductory course outlined in the graduate and undergraduate progression points below. The faculty will rate students and describe the evidence to support their ratings. The faculty-rated disposition will be provided to candidates to enable them to complete the *Compare & Reflect* Assignment.

Actionable feedback is provided to undergraduate candidates at Progression Point 2 by the WTEP Admission Interview Committee, who will interact with the candidate during the admission interview as the candidate presents the evidence to support their self-assessment of the dispositions.

Actionable feedback is provided to undergraduate and graduate candidates at Progression Point 3 clinical internship by the WTEP internship supervisor and cooperating teacher. The [basis for judgment of assessment components](#) will be made explicit to candidates and faculty through detailed calibration training described above in the *Administration and Purpose* section of this document. The criteria for quality evidence to support candidate and faculty ratings will also be made explicit in the calibration training.

Previous Candidate Dispositions Assessment used prior to the revision in Spring 21 (no longer in use)

Proficiency levels on the previous version of the assessment were on a scale of 1-10 with 1-2=Unsatisfactory, 3-5=Basic, 6-8 Proficient, and 9-10 Distinguished. The directions for faculty and students included the following scale:

Explanation of Scoring Criteria:

Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10

Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 8

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 7

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 6

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3

Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2

Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1

Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | <p>On the previous disposition assessment, the target level of performance at all progression points in the undergraduate program was 6, which is the lowest score on the proficient range of 6-8. Candidates scoring lower than 6 were provided support by WTEP faculty. Improvement was marked by a follow-up disposition rating in the following semester. The previous instrument was not used in the graduate program. The previous instrument was retired in Spring 21 when the revised dispositions assessment was piloted. Performance-based indicators were added to the revised assessment in Spring 21. (CAEP R5.4)</p> |
| <p>Data Reliability</p> | <p>During the CAEP self-study process, the WTEP CAEP Leadership Team identified the lack of studies to verify the reliability of the <i>Candidate Dispositions Assessment</i>. In 2010, when the rubric was developed by WTEP faculty, WBU was being reviewed by NCATE and these data were not required. Thus, the inter-rater reliability was not determined when the assessment was developed.</p> <p>The CAEP Coordinator and Education Coordinator met in Spring 2020 to begin the process of conducting an inter-rater reliability study for the assessment. (CAEP R5.2) Plans were underway when Covid shut down the university and faculty energy and efforts shifted to developing and implementing a response plan to the Covid crisis. The CAEP Leadership Team decided to focus the efforts on conducting the content validity study. A plan that will be implemented in Fall 21 has been developed to increase the reliability of the data from this assessment. See the plan below in the Continuous Improvement section of this document. (CAEP R5.4)</p> |
| <p>Data Validity</p> | <p>As part of the self-study process, a weakness was identified in the validity of the previous <i>Candidate Dispositions Assessment</i> that was in use prior to 2021. The assessment was revised to align with standards, a content validity study was conducted, and the revised assessment was piloted in Spring 21 in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4)</p> <p>Alignment to Standards (see alignment table above)</p> <p>The assessment was piloted in Spring 2021. The assessment rubric components were thoughtfully aligned with CAEP, InTASC, TESS (Danielson Framework for Teaching), and the Arkansas Teaching Standards (ARTS). (CAEP R5.2)</p> <p>According to Choppin and Meuwissen (2017), alignment of assessment components to established professional standards helps to ensure content validity. The input of practitioners in the field along with the alignment with accepted national and state standards ensures that the assessment components are relevant and represent the standards of professionalism expected by professional educators.</p> <p>Content Validity Study</p> <p>According to Ayre and Scally (2014), another way of achieving content validity is through a formal validity study that involves a review of the individual components of the assessment. The WTEP Leadership Team conducted a</p> |

**Data Validity,
 (continued)**

validity study using the widely accepted Lawshe method in Spring 2021. (CAEP R5.2, R5.3) The process of evaluating the content validity of an instrument outlined in Lawshe (1975) and further developed by Ayre and Scally (2014) was used. The WTEP established a **content validity panel made up of 23 internal and external stakeholders**, including area administrators, classroom teachers, WTEP faculty, completers, and current teacher candidates. (see panel members chart below) (CAEP R5.3)

The **panel members were invited to complete a Google form** on which they were asked to review the six components of the *Candidate Disposition Assessment* and rate them into one of three categories. **Rubric components were rated** as either “essential to the success of a beginning teacher”, “useful but not essential,” or “not necessary for the success of a beginning teacher.” Components rated as “essential” by a critical number of panel members, as outlined by Ayre and Scally (2014), remained a part of the rubric. In addition to the ratings, the form invited the panel members to provide **actionable feedback** to improve the rubric. **The Google form had a response rate of 78% with 18 out of 23 responses.** (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)

The **Content Validity Ratio (CVR) for each of the rubric components is summarized below** (see CVR results chart). The CVR formula outlined in Ayre and Scally (2014) was used to analyze the results of the ratings, $CVR = (n_e - N/2)/(N/2)$. In that formula, n_e is number of respondents rating “essential,” and N is total number of respondents. Ayre and Scally (2014) established the critical value for 18 respondents as a CVR of .44. **As shown in the chart below, all rubric components met the critical value of .44.** The validity study data were reviewed by the CAEP Leadership Team as part of a full-day data review meeting on May 4, 2021. Results of the Google form **included stakeholder feedback**. The team reviewed all stakeholder feedback and acted upon recommendations to clarify the language of the performance levels. Overlap was identified in component 2 and component 6, and the assessment was adjusted to remove the overlap in the performance levels. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4) A summary of the results is shown below, but a more detailed analysis and stakeholder feedback can be reviewed in the [Validity Study Results Data Chart](#).

Summary of Content Validity Study Results (CAEP R5.2)

| Disposition Assessment Component See components above | Content Validity Ratio $CVR = (n_e - N/2)/(N/2)$ |
|---|--|
| 1 | 0.89 |
| 2 | 1.00 |
| 3 | 0.89 |
| 4 | 0.55 |
| 5 | 0.89 |
| 6 | 0.89 |

Compared to critical value for 18 respondents at 0.44 (Ayre & Scally, 2014).

Data Review and Use (Quality Assurance)

Three cycles of data are available in this document for the undergraduate programs including:

[Data Pilot One Cycle Progress Point 1 revised assessment – undergraduate aggregate](#)

[Data Pilot One Cycle Progress Point 2 revised assessment – undergrad aggregate](#)

[Data Pilot One Cycle Progress Point 2 revised assessment –undergrad disaggregated](#)

[Data Two Cycles Progress Point 2 previous assessment— undergrad aggregate](#)

[Data Two Cycles Progress Point 2 previous assessment— undergrad disaggregated](#) (CAEP R5.1)

One cycle of data is available in this document for the MAT graduate program including:

[Data Pilot One Cycle Progress Point 2 revised assessment– graduate MAT](#)

The data will be collected at the identified [progression points](#) described in the *Administration* section of this document.

Before the review and revision of the assessment, the progression point data was reviewed by the faculty teaching ED 2203, the Education Coordinator, and the Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator. Candidates scoring below the target level on the previous disposition were counseled and a plan for improvement was informally discussed. Candidates were not responsible to provide evidence to support improvement. Candidates did not complete a self-assessment or reflect on their development or progression.

Continuous Improvement – Data Review and Use Beginning Spring 21

A more robust system of review and use of the data was developed by the CAEP Leadership Team and WTEP teacher candidates. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4)

Candidate review and use of data

At all progression points, candidates will review and use the data from their self-assessments and faculty-rated dispositions assessments to complete the *Compare & Reflect Assignment* (see *Process Used to Monitor Candidate Dispositions* for [graduate](#) and [undergraduate](#) programs). Candidates will develop a *Professional Growth Plan* in ED 2203 based on the results of the dispositions assessment, choose resources such as podcasts, articles, webinars, or teacher interviews, to grow in their selected area.

(see examples of the [Compare & Reflect Assignment](#) and [Professional Growth Plan](#) below) (CAEP R1.4, R3.2)

Candidates will have multiple interactions with their dispositions assessment as they progress from their first education course to clinical internship through the planned process and progression points. Candidates will not only provide evidence to support their ratings but will be intentional and reflective about their growth in the

**Data Review and Use
(continued)**

professional dispositions. In ED 2203, the admission interview, and clinical internship, candidates will have opportunities to articulate their evidence and growth to professionals in the field of education. This is a level of efficacy and ownership that did not exist in the previous process used before the revision in Spring 21. (CAEP R1.4, R2.3, R3.2)

Faculty and stakeholder review and use of data

Faculty review and use of data is outlined in detail in the *Process Used to Monitor Candidate Dispositions* document below.

At undergraduate **progression point 1**, candidates will complete the compare and reflect assignment and submit it to the faculty member teaching ED 2203 for inclusion in the candidate's digital file. The reflection is reviewed by the faculty member teaching ED 2203 to determine if the candidate needs additional support. (CAEP R3.2, R5.1)

At undergraduate **progression point 2**, the WTEP faculty interview committee members discuss the evidence, compare the candidates' ED 2203 dispositions assessment, and determine the ratings by consensus to complete the dispositions assessment on each interview candidate. If disposition ratings are a concern, the committee may establish conditions for improvement with conditional acceptance granted. Disposition assessments will be submitted to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the candidates' digital files. (CAEP R3.2, R5.1)

During ED 4183 Integrated Methods and ED 4113 Study of the School, faculty members will provide opportunities for candidates to document evidence of the six components of the [Candidate Dispositions Assessment](#) through specific coursework, including pre-clinical field experiences, teaching a video lesson, completing a professional growth plan, and completing a capstone professional development project. (CAEP R3.2, R5.1)

At undergraduate **progression point 3**, the WTEP Internship Supervisor will meet with the Cooperating Teacher to review and discuss the candidate's self-assessment ratings. The supervisor and teacher will come to consensus and rate the intern on the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. If it is determined that additional support is needed, the supervisor and teacher will provide the necessary support. (CAEP R2.3, R3.2, R5.1)

Exit Interview

Upon completion of clinical internship, the candidate will discuss their growth from Introduction to Teaching to Internship during the exit interview. Candidates will develop a plan for continued growth for any of the six components that are not rated at the Effective Level.

These data, disaggregated by program, will be reviewed by the CAEP Leadership Team and program faculty to make decisions about program quality and the need for revisions to address any negative trends in the data. (CAEP R3.2, R5.1, R5.4)

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Improved data review process – Google Drive folders were created for all undergraduate and graduate programs, and data will be disseminated through the data folders. Program Chairs will use the data folders to conduct review meetings with their program faculty at the beginning of the fall semester. Program faculty will complete a data review feedback form in Google Drive for each program to share their analysis of the data. The CAEP Leadership Team and selected stakeholders from the Education Advisory Committee will meet to review the feedback forms from the program-level data review meetings, and decisions will be made based on the review of the data. If decisions require the action of the WTEP Faculty Council, the action items will be presented in a council meeting for discussion and vote. (CAEP R5.1, R5.3, R5.4)</p> |
| <p>Partnership and Stakeholder Involvement</p> | <p>The <i>Candidate Dispositions Assessment</i> was created by WTEP faculty in collaboration with professional educators from seven public school districts, the Arkansas Virtual Academy, and the Northeast Arkansas Education Cooperative. Feedback from the panel members who participated in the Content Validity Study in Spring 21 were also considered in establishing the validity of the assessment components. Revisions were made to the dispositions assessment based on the feedback from the panel members. The stakeholder feedback can be viewed below on the Validity Study Results Data Chart. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3)</p> <p>WTEP Teacher Candidates Candidates enrolled in both ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching and ED 4113 Study of the School (capstone) participated in the alignment of the assessment to professional teaching standards from InTASC, ARTS, TESS, and ISTE. Candidates participated in brainstorming sessions and provided feedback on the types of quality evidence that candidates might present for each component of the assessment. (R5.2, R5.3)</p> <p>CAEP Leadership Team from the WTEP The leadership team members include department chairs and Methods course instructors from all undergraduate programs, the MAT program dean, the Education Coordinator, and the Education Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator. Team members researched and developed the revised teacher disposition assessment to create the draft that was presented for feedback to faculty, teacher candidates, and external stakeholders. The leadership team conducted the content validity study and made necessary changes to the assessment based on stakeholder feedback. The detailed timeline of this work can be viewed below in the continuous improvement timeline for the assessment. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Arkansas Deans' Council The Education Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator consulted with members of the Arkansas Council of Deans of Colleges of Education to research best practices for candidate dispositions and the processes used at other Arkansas universities. Much insight was gained that contributed to the first draft of the assessment. Several deans shared the revision process used at their institutions to create a valid and reliable dispositions assessment. (CAEP R5.2, 5.3)</p> |
| <p>Technology and ISTE Alignment (CAEP R1.3)</p> | <p>Specific elements of the process used to monitor and support candidate dispositions require candidates to model and apply national technology standards established by the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). (CAEP R1.3)</p> <p>Technology Progression Point 1 – Candidates enrolled in ED 2203 create a digital teaching portfolio using Google Sites. Candidates use the portfolio to compile artifacts to demonstrate their effective teaching from the introductory course to the final internship semester. Progression Points 1-3 At Progression Point 1, 2, and 3, the self and faculty-rated dispositions assessments will be added to the digital portfolio. Candidates will access the artifacts on the portfolio in both the Admissions and Exit Interviews to articulate and support their growth in professional dispositions.</p> <p>ISTE Alignment (quoted text is from the ISTE Standards) <u>ISTE Standard 1 Learner</u> – Candidates “<i>set professional learning goals</i>” after the Compare & Reflect assignment at Progression Point 1. (CAEP 1.4) <u>ISTE Standard 2 Leader</u> – Candidates “<i>seek out opportunities for leadership</i>” as they gather artifacts to support their development of professional dispositions. Participation in the WTEP campus student group Williams Educator Organization (WEO) was cited as evidence on multiple candidate self-assessments in Spring 21. (CAEP 1.4) <u>ISTE Standard 4 Collaborator</u> – Candidates have opportunities to “collaborate with professionals” to “discover and share professional resources.” At progression point 1, candidates collaborate with ED 2203 faculty to build a Professional Growth Plan based on their dispositions assessment results. At progression point 2, candidates collaborate with Admission Interview Committee members to articulate their evidence of development. During the interview, the faculty share resources for growth to support areas of weakness or continue to build areas of strength. At progression point 3, during internship, candidates collaborate with the WTEP internship supervisor and the cooperating teacher to discover and share professional resources in a collaborative professional environment. (CAEP 1.4)</p> |

| <p>Technology & ISTE Alignment, continued</p> | <p><u>ISTE Standard 6</u> Facilitator- Candidates “facilitate learning through technology” while addressing the evidence for dispositions assessment component 6 and building the PGP at progression point 1. Evidence submitted by candidates on the PGP and Component 6 demonstrates that candidates use online podcasts, webinars, professional journals, and social media sites created by teachers on platforms like Intstagram, Twitter, and TikTok, to facilitate professional learning through technology. (CAEP R1.3, R1.4)</p> <p><u>ISTE Standard 7</u> Analyst – Candidates have opportunities to “understand and use data” to “achieve professional learning goals.” Candidates review the scoring data for their professional dispositions generated by both themselves and faculty at all progression points for dispositions, and respond to that data by setting goals and working to produce artifacts to support their continued development of professional dispositions. (CAEP 1.4)</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|---|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|---|
| <p>Continuous Improvement</p> | <p>The CAEP self-study process led the CAEP Leadership Team to review and revise the Candidate Dispositions Assessment and the progression points (CAEP R3.2) at which candidate dispositions are measured. The previous disposition was used consistently from Spring 2010 through Spring 2021 when the CAEP Leadership Team embarked on efforts to improve the validity and reliability of the assessment. The revised assessment was piloted in Spring 21. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.4)</p> <p>A detailed timeline and description of the review and revision process for the <i>Candidate Disposition Assessment</i> follows in the chart below. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="514 878 1759 1474"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="514 878 827 951">Timeline of Review</th> <th data-bbox="827 878 1136 951">Reviewed By</th> <th data-bbox="1136 878 1451 951">Discussion/Limitations Identified</th> <th data-bbox="1451 878 1759 951">Outcomes</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="514 951 827 1273"> <p>Spring 2019</p> </td> <td data-bbox="827 951 1136 1273"> <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1136 951 1451 1273"> <p>Faculty do not provide comments to support their ratings of student dispositions. Students are not made aware of their disposition ratings unless there is a rating below</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1451 951 1759 1273"> <p>Decision was made to begin researching dispositions assessments that have more clearly defined performance levels and a simpler scale for scoring. Department Chair and Education Coordinator began reviewing dispositions assessments from other institutions and Watermark EDA in Fall 2019. (CAEP R5.4)</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="514 1273 827 1474"> <p>Fall 2019</p> </td> <td data-bbox="827 1273 1136 1474"> <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1136 1273 1451 1474"> <p>In early Fall 2019, after attending CAEPcon, in Washington, DC, the department chair met with the education coordinator and ED 2203 faculty to discuss the sufficiency</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1451 1273 1759 1474"> <p>Decision was made that a search for a proprietary disposition assessment would be conducted by the Education Coordinator and Department Chair. Watermark was contacted</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | Timeline of Review | Reviewed By | Discussion/Limitations Identified | Outcomes | <p>Spring 2019</p> | <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> | <p>Faculty do not provide comments to support their ratings of student dispositions. Students are not made aware of their disposition ratings unless there is a rating below</p> | <p>Decision was made to begin researching dispositions assessments that have more clearly defined performance levels and a simpler scale for scoring. Department Chair and Education Coordinator began reviewing dispositions assessments from other institutions and Watermark EDA in Fall 2019. (CAEP R5.4)</p> | <p>Fall 2019</p> | <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> | <p>In early Fall 2019, after attending CAEPcon, in Washington, DC, the department chair met with the education coordinator and ED 2203 faculty to discuss the sufficiency</p> | <p>Decision was made that a search for a proprietary disposition assessment would be conducted by the Education Coordinator and Department Chair. Watermark was contacted</p> |
| Timeline of Review | Reviewed By | Discussion/Limitations Identified | Outcomes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Spring 2019</p> | <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> | <p>Faculty do not provide comments to support their ratings of student dispositions. Students are not made aware of their disposition ratings unless there is a rating below</p> | <p>Decision was made to begin researching dispositions assessments that have more clearly defined performance levels and a simpler scale for scoring. Department Chair and Education Coordinator began reviewing dispositions assessments from other institutions and Watermark EDA in Fall 2019. (CAEP R5.4)</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Fall 2019</p> | <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> | <p>In early Fall 2019, after attending CAEPcon, in Washington, DC, the department chair met with the education coordinator and ED 2203 faculty to discuss the sufficiency</p> | <p>Decision was made that a search for a proprietary disposition assessment would be conducted by the Education Coordinator and Department Chair. Watermark was contacted</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Continuous Improvement, (continued)</p> | | | <p>criteria for EPP-created instruments. The dispositions assessment did not have established validity.</p> | <p>about the EDA and costs associated with adoption. (CAEP R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Fall 2019</p> | <p>Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, Watermark Representative, and Academic Dean</p> | <p>The Watermark representative presented the proprietary disposition assessment (EDA) created by Watermark. He discussed the validity and reliability of the instrument and faculty training, as well as the overall cost for the WTEP.</p> | <p>The cost of the EDA was prohibitive for the WTEP. Additionally, the quoted cost did not include rights to create a digital copy of the assessment which would mean the use of paper copies only for the disposition assessment. Decision was made to create a new EPP-created disposition and conduct the necessary validity studies. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Spring 2020</p> | <p>Department chair/CAEP Coordinator, Education Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty.</p> | <p>The current process used to collect and review dispositions assessment data was discussed, and suggestions to improve it were discussed. The process in Fall 19 and before was that the disposition assessment was introduced in ED 2203 Intro to Teaching, and students were asked to reflect on their professional dispositions but did not formally self-assess. Students were not taking ownership in the assessment of or improvement of their professional dispositions.</p> | <p>A more formal process was adopted in which students completed a self-assessment of dispositions in ED 2203 Intro to Teaching for the first time in Fall 2020. Students completed a Google Form to rate their dispositions. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Fall 2020</p> | <p>Education Coordinator, Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator, and Intro to Teaching faculty</p> | <p>Department Chair and Intro to Teaching faculty shared the research they had done concerning dispositions. Current literature concerning professional</p> | <p>Six components were selected for the new disposition. The decision was made to require students to present evidence to support their</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|
| <p>Continuous Improvement, (continued)</p> | | | dispositions, disposition assessments from other institutions, and InTASC, TESS, and ISTE standards were reviewed. | self-ratings in an attempt to make the assessment a meaningful reflective and professional growth experience. Performance levels aligned to InTASC/ARTS were mapped out for the six components, and a draft was created. The draft will be shared with candidates and feedback sought from students in Intro to Teaching and the Capstone courses. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4) |
| | <p>Fall 2020</p> | <p>WTEP Faculty Council, Education Coordinator, Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator</p> | <p>Draft of the new disposition was shared with faculty council members for their review. The newly formed CAEP Leadership Team was introduced, and specific members of the council were asked to serve on the leadership team. Progression points to monitor dispositions were discussed but no final decision was made.</p> | <p>Faculty response to disposition draft was positive. The consensus was that the revised disposition would be much more user friendly for both students and faculty. The performance levels and simplified rating scale were approved by the council. The MAT program has not been assessing candidate dispositions but will begin in Spring 21. The content validity study will be conducted by the CAEP Leadership Team in Spring 21. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Early Spring 21</p> | <p>CAEP Leadership Team (includes Department Chairs from all undergraduate programs, Methods Instructors, MAT Program Director, Education Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator, and the Education Coordinator)</p> | <p>Reviewed the draft of the CAEP Workbook. Plans to attend CAEPcon were discussed. Evidence planning for all 5 standards was discussed. The Department Chair shared the research on content validity studies.</p> | <p>The steps of the Content Validity Study were developed. A list of stakeholders was created for the upcoming content validity study. The Education Coordinator and Department Chair will send the invitations to</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| <p>Continuous Improvement, (continued)</p> | | | | <p>stakeholders to review the disposition content through a Google form that was created.</p> <p>The Candidate Disposition Assessment will be piloted in Spring 21 at two progression points in the undergraduate programs – ED 2203 Intro to Teaching and Admission Interview.</p> <p>The Candidate Disposition Assessment will be piloted at one progression point in the MAT program – Completion of the Clinical Track course. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Spring 21</p> | <p>CAEP Leadership Team (includes Department Chairs from all undergraduate programs, Methods Instructors, MAT Program Director, Education Department Chair and CAEP Coordinator, and the Education Coordinator)</p> | <p>The CAEP Coordinator shared the results of the Content Validity Study. (See validity study results)</p> <p>The team reviewed the CVR for each of the six components. The team reviewed and discussed the stakeholder comments about the performance levels.</p> | <p>All six assessment components had a Content Validity Ratio within the critical value established in the literature. (see CVR values chart)</p> <p>Stakeholders made recommendations to clarify the language of the performance levels. Overlap was identified in component 2 and component 6, and the assessment was adjusted to remove the overlap in the performance levels.</p> <p>New progression points were determined for both undergrad and MAT. The progression points and student-provided evidence will align with our WTEP focus to prepare candidates to be intentional, reflective, and growing professionally.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <p>Continuous Improvement, (continued)</p> | | | | <p>Faculty calibration training will be planned for Fall 2021 and will include WTEP faculty, cooperating teachers, Internship supervisors, and MAT faculty. (CAEP R5.1, R5.2, R5.3, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Spring 21 Pilot</p> | <p>ED 2203 Intro to Teaching and Admission Interview Information Session.</p> | <p>Students were trained in the components of the assessment and held discussions to decide upon quality evidence of each dispositional component.</p> | <p>Students were trained on the basis for judgment for disposition components and required to complete the self-assessment and submit to the Education Coordinator for admission interview candidates or the Intro to Teaching faculty if enrolled in ED 2203. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Spring 21 Pilot</p> | <p>WTEP Interviews – including faculty interview committee and students applying for admission</p> | <p>Admission interview candidates presented their self-assessment ratings and evidence as part of the admission interview process.</p> | <p>Student reflection on the disposition components was evident. The students were intentional in choosing and sharing their evidence to support their ratings. The data were analyzed by the Intro to Teaching Faculty, and feedback was provided to students. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4)</p> |
| | <p>Spring 21 Pilot</p> | <p>ED 2203 Intro to Teaching</p> | <p>Faculty rated candidates on the dispositions assessment and provided evidence to support their ratings. Students completed the self-assessment of their dispositions and submitted to faculty.</p> | <p>Students completed a Compare & Reflect assignment in which they compared the faculty ratings to their own ratings on the six components of the disposition. (See sample student responses to the Compare & Reflect Assignment)</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| <p>Continuous Improvement, (continued)</p> | <p>Summer 2021</p> | <p>Education Coordinator and Department Chair/CAEP Coordinator</p> | <p>Data for the pilot study in both the undergraduate and graduate programs were compiled and prepared for faculty review.</p> | <p>The pilot cycle of data will be presented to the CAEP Leadership Team at the beginning of the Fall 2021 semester for review.</p> |
| | <p>Fall 21 Timeline for continued improvement</p> | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Candidate Disposition Assessment pilot study results will be reviewed by the CAEP Leadership Team. The progression points in both the undergraduate and graduate programs will be reviewed and decisions about online or paper delivery of the assessment will be made. (CAEP R5.1) • The disposition assessment final draft and the planned progression points for the undergraduate and graduate program will be presented to the WTEP Faculty Council in early fall for a vote. • Faculty Calibration training for the assessment will be conducted face-to-face by Intro to Teaching faculty and is required for WTEP Faculty Council members and internship supervisors. A video of the calibration training will be created for MAT candidates in the online graduate program and cooperating teachers. • The reliability of the instrument will be a focus. The planned inter-rater reliability study is described above in the Data Reliability section of this document. • Student calibration training will continue to be done every semester in ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching and at the Admission Interview Information Session. • The Candidate Disposition Assessment will be administered at the revised progression points in both undergraduate and graduate programs. (CAEP R3.2) • Candidates enrolled in ED 2203 will add a tab for “Dispositions” on the Google Site teaching portfolio created in the course. The self and faculty-rated assessments from Progression Points 1-3 will be uploaded to the site. Folders will be created on the dispositions page for the artifacts related to progression points 1, 2, and 3. Students will compile evidence throughout their program to support their growth in each of the six components of the dispositions assessment. The Google Site portfolio is used during the admission and exit interviews to share artifacts and evidence of effective teaching. (CAEP R1.3) • Data were disaggregated by program for Spring 21. However, to provide for more detailed analysis of candidate performance, disaggregation of the data by gender and first generation college student designation are planned for data cycles beginning in Fall 2021. (CAEP R5.1, R5.4) | | | |

Candidate Disposition Assessment – (Revised 5/4/21 after Validity Study and Stakeholder Feedback)



WILLIAMS
 BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

Student Name _____ Semester _____

Completed by _____ Date _____

Progression Point Completed:
 Check one

Undergraduate: ED 2203 Intro to Teaching Admission to WTEP Clinical Internship

Graduate: Point 1 MAT 5043/MAT5013 Point 2 MAT Clinical Track

WTEP Teacher Disposition Assessment
 Launch a Life with Purpose

| Component | Effective 3 | Developing 2 | Needs Improvement 1 | Evidence to Support the Score |
|---|--|---|---|----------------------------------|
| <p>Professional Preparation TESS 1A, 1C, 1D, 4D 4F InTASC 4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 ISTE 2, 4, 7</p> <p>Support this score with specific evidence in the evidence column</p> | <p>The teacher candidate consistently manages available resources (time, knowledge, materials, etc.) to act appropriately and effectively in the pursuit of professional and academic goals, anticipates needs and assists others in obtaining or managing resources, and effectively seeks and obtains additional resources beyond those readily available when needed. Fulfills work criteria to the highest standards and is a role model for others. Exemplary pattern of attendance and participation. Makes timely arrangements when absence is necessary.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate consistently manages available resources (time, knowledge, materials, etc.) to achieve desired outcomes for self and/or students. Consistently fulfills work criteria. Pattern of attendance, participation, and punctuality. Makes arrangements in the case of absence.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate does not adequately manage resources (time, knowledge, materials, etc.) to achieve desired outcomes for self and/or students. Does not consistently fulfill work criteria. Pattern of absence, tardiness, or early departure. Level of participation is low.</p> | |

Candidate Disposition Assessment, continued

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| <p>Professional Responsiveness TESS 3E, 4A, 4D, 4E InTASC 9,10</p> <hr/> | <p>The teacher candidate is highly receptive to constructive criticism. Demonstrates self-reflective practices and adjusts performance accordingly. Candidate solicits feedback and resources from peers/mentors and takes action. Demonstrates initiative, flexibility, and perseverance.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate is receptive to constructive criticism, but may be inconsistent in adjusting performance to move toward expected outcomes. May independently seek resources for growth.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate is unresponsive to constructive criticism. May not acknowledge or accept responsibility for needed change in practice. May not show initiative to move toward expected outcomes.</p> | |
| <p>Professional Maturity TESS 1A,1C, 2A, 4E, 4F InTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10</p> <hr/> | <p>Teacher candidate behavior demonstrates strong confidence in their competence in the field of education. Strong patterns of professional composure and behavior that is appropriate to the circumstance. Candidate takes responsibility for their actions, and is a role model to peers and students.</p> | <p>Teacher candidate behavior demonstrates progressing confidence in their competence in the field of education. Progressing patterns of professional composure and behavior that is appropriate to the circumstance. Candidate takes responsibility for their actions.</p> | <p>Teacher candidate behavior demonstrates lack of confidence in their competence in the field of education. May exhibit inability to maintain professional composure and inappropriate patterns of behavior for the circumstance. May not take responsibility for actions or emotions.</p> | |
| <p>Professional Presentation TESS 2A, 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC 3,9,10 ISTE 2, 4, 6</p> <hr/> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates exceptional dress and appearance (including hygiene) appropriate for the classroom or professional setting.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates suitable dress and appearance (including hygiene) appropriate for the classroom or professional setting.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate does not consistently demonstrate suitable dress and appearance (including hygiene) appropriate for the classroom or professional setting.</p> | |

Candidate Disposition Assessment, continued

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Professional Communication TESS 3A, 3C, 4C InTASC 9 ISTE 4</p> <p>_____</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates strong patterns of writing and speaking with appropriate clarity, fluency, grammar, and body language. Presents organized thoughts that are consistently appropriate for the setting. Role model for peers concerning effective communication.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates progressing patterns of writing and speaking with appropriate clarity, fluency, grammar, and body language. Presents organized thoughts that are mostly appropriate for the setting. May demonstrate some grammar errors, but often self-corrects.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates ineffective patterns of writing and speaking with appropriate clarity, fluency, grammar, and body language. Written communication consistently has inaccurate structure, spelling, punctuation, or grammar. May not demonstrate a desire to improve or self-correct.</p> | |
| <p>Professional Growth TESS 4A,4D,4E, 4F InTASC 9,10 ISTE 1,2,4</p> <p>_____</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates strong responsibility for professional growth. Actively seeks and takes advantage of professional learning opportunities and applies new knowledge to improve performance. Shares professional resources with peers and demonstrates leadership in professional and classroom settings.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates consistent responsibility for professional growth. Consistently takes advantage of professional learning opportunities and applies new knowledge to improve performance.</p> | <p>The teacher candidate demonstrates inconsistent responsibility for professional growth. May not take advantage of professional learning opportunities. May not apply new knowledge to improve performance.</p> | |

Revised 5/4/21

Revised Candidate Disposition Assessment – Graduate Aggregate Data – Pilot Cycle (Spring 2021)
MAT Progression Point 2 – Clinical Track

Aggregate data is shown below for the 6 MAT program candidates enrolled in Clinical Track courses in Spring 2021.

Data were not disaggregated because the MAT is one program rather than multiple programs.

Aggregate Data –Master of Arts in Teaching Program

| Component Number | Disposition Component & Standards Alignment | Mean Candidate Self – Assessment n=6 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=6 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
|------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | | Spring 2021 Pilot | |
| 1 | Professional Preparation TESS 1A, 1C, 1D, 4D 4F InTASC 4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 ISTE 2, 4, 7 | 2 | “I still see areas that I can improve my professional preparation. I am learning to prioritize, and I am often having to rush in my preparation. However, I developing a system that works for me, and I am able stay on top of parent communication, my grades are always updated in a timely manner and I leave my classroom prepared in case a sub needs to take over.” | 2.2 | “Deliberate discussions on addressing the student learning outcomes in course syllabi.” “Responses to prompts about professional preparation in MAT 5043 Effective Teaching.” “Responses to prompts in MAT 5113 about addressing goals for establishing a culture of learning.” |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness TESS 3E, 4A, 4D, 4E InTASC 9 InTASC 3,5,9,10 | 2.4 | “I take criticism well. I like to hear what I can do better to get a better result the next time I have to tackle a task.” | 2.8 | “Response to feedback on video lesson.” “Detailed response to professional responsibility reflection in MAT 5113.” |
| 3 | Professional Maturity TESS 1A,1C, 2A, 4E, 4F InTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10 | 2 | “I am fairly young, so I need to make sure there is a distinct line of professionalism when it comes to my students. “ | 2.3 | “Confidence exhibited during video lesson.” “Response to discussion 3 in MAT 5093 Modern Technology.” |
| 4 | Professional Presentation TESS 2A, 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC 3,9,10 ISTE 2, 4, 6 | 2.4 | “For my P. E. job, I was only required to wear gym clothes for work. When I taught at the High school level, I had to dress more professionally. My Hygiene is also good.” | 2 | “Deliberate discussions on addressing professional presentations of their instructional episodes.” |
| 5 | Professional Communication TESS 3A, 3C, 4C | 2.4 | “I engage in effective and professional communication. I use professional language in all situations ensuring that | 2.2 | “Professional communication was demonstrated on all assignments.” |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| | InTASC 9 ISTE 4 | | communications are free from bias and meet the needs of diverse learners. I also effectively and accurately communicate their ideas (oral and written) and engage in active listening.” | | “Professional communication was obvious during the video presentations, through the lesson plans, and email communications with all stakeholders.” |
| 6 | Professional Growth TESS 4A,4D,4E, 4F InTASC 9,10 ISTE 1,2,4 | 2 | “I enjoy professional development. I feel as though there is always something I can learn. I could do more research in my content area to help myself be a better resource for my students.” | 2 | “Documented participation in Professional Learning Community in your school district.” “Reflections submitted on professional development activities within your school district.” |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective | | | | | |

Revised Candidate Disposition Assessment –Aggregate Data –Pilot Cycle (Spring 2021) Undergraduate Progression Point 1 – ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching

Aggregate data is shown below for all undergraduate program candidates enrolled in ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching. The data were not disaggregated by program because some candidates have not yet chosen a program in Introduction to Teaching. The data were not disaggregated by race and ethnicity because of the low number of minority candidates enrolled in ED 2203 in Spring 2021.

Aggregate Data –Candidates in ED 2203 from All Undergraduate Programs Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 1 –ED 2203 (Spring 2021 Pilot)

| | | Spring 21 Pilot | | | Spring 21 Pilot | | | |
|---|--|---|------------|-------------------|---|------------|-------------------|---|
| See performance-based criteria for each component on the <i>Candidate Disposition Assessment Document</i> | | Student Dispositions Self-Assessment n = 32 Number scoring at each performance level | | | Faculty-Rated Dispositions n = 32 Number scoring at each performance level | | | Sample Evidence Given to Support Score |
| Component Number | Disposition Component & Alignment to Standards | Effective | Developing | Needs Improvement | Effective | Developing | Needs Improvement | Student and Faculty |
| 1 | Professional Preparation TESS 1A, 1C, 1D, 4D 4F InTASC 4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 ISTE 2, 4, 7 | 2 | 24 | 6 | 2 | 18 | 12 | Student: High GPA, No missed assignments, Meet deadlines, One absence this semester but attended on Google Meet Faculty: Multiple tardies, Thorough, reflective work in observations, Balances athletics and maintains a 3.7 GPA |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness TESS 3E, 4A, 4D, 4E InTASC 9, 10 | 6 | 24 | 2 | 0 | 29 | 3 | Student: Implement feedback at school and work, seek help when needed, use constructive criticism from my coach to improve Faculty: PGP developed, Sought feedback and scheduled a meeting to do so, Improvement plans were implemented |
| 3 | Professional Maturity TESS 1A,1C, 2A, 4E, 4F InTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10 | 6 | 22 | 4 | 1 | 24 | 7 | Student: lack confidence when speaking publicly, can stay calm in presentations, successful classroom experiences while substitute teaching Faculty: No action taken on improvement plan, Strong presence in small and whole group contributions, Does not exhibit confidence in presentations |
| 4 | Professional Presentation TESS 2A, 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC 3,9,10 | 19 | 12 | 1 | 2 | 23 | 7 | Student: Wear modest and appropriate outfits, good feedback on professional dress days, good personal hygiene Faculty: Professional dress day, WEO meetings, Teacher Interview day dress, Jeans |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----|---|---|----|---|--|
| | ISTE 2, 4, 6 | | | | | | | and casual Polo were not appropriate on professional dress day |
| 5 | Professional Communication TESS 3A, 3C, 4C InTASC 9 ISTE 4 | 4 | 23 | 5 | 9 | 16 | 7 | Student: Have a habit of mumbling, put together detailed thoughts, use proper grammar in writing, working on proper grammar when speaking. Faculty: Speech filled with grammar errors, Self-correction is not observed, Content lacking in writing, Written communication includes many errors that inhibit the reader's ability to read the piece smoothly |
| 6 | Professional Growth TESS 4A,4D,4E, 4F InTASC 9,10 ISTE 1,2,4 | 3 | 22 | 7 | 2 | 30 | 0 | Student: Constructed a suitable PGP, but still have room for improvement, I read articles and view webinars, watch TED Talks outside of class, interview teachers Faculty: PGP artifacts show true learning and application to future classroom, PGP work was intentional, Plans for early graduation |

**Revised Candidate Disposition Assessment –Aggregate Data –Pilot Cycle (Spring 2021)
 Undergraduate Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP**

Aggregate data is shown below for all undergraduate programs with at least 1 candidate applying for admission to the WTEP in Spring 2021. Programs included in the aggregate data are Secondary English 7-12, Health & PE K-12, Middle Level (Math/Science) 4-8, Secondary Social Studies 7-12, and Elementary K-6. **Programs with no candidates applying for admission in these cycles of data are not included, and those are** Middle Level (Lit/Soc. Studies) 4-8 and Music Education (Vocal) K-12. The Art Education K-12 program is not included in the data because the program was eliminated in Spring 2021. The data were not disaggregated by race and ethnicity because of the low number of minority candidates applying for admission in Spring 2021.

Aggregate Data –All undergraduate programs with candidates applying for admission in Spring 21

| Component Number | Disposition Component & Alignment to Standards | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=17 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=17 |
|------------------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | See performance-based criteria for each component on the <i>Candidate Disposition Assessment Document</i> | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation TESS 1A, 1C, 1D, 4D 4F InTASC 4,5,6,7,8,9 and 10 ISTE 2, 4, 7 | 2 | 2.3 |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness TESS 3E, 4A, 4D, 4E InTASC 9, 10 | 2.4 | 2.7 |
| 3 | Professional Maturity TESS 1A,1C, 2A, 4E, 4F InTASC 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 10 | 2.3 | 2.5 |
| 4 | Professional Presentation TESS 2A, 4A, 4C, 4D, 4E, 4F InTASC 3,9,10 ISTE 2, 4, 6 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| 5 | Professional Communication TESS 3A, 3C, 4C InTASC 9 ISTE 4 | 2.2 | 2.5 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|-----|
| 6 | Professional Growth TESS 4A,4D,4E, 4F InTASC 9,10 ISTE 1,2,4 | 2 | 2.5 |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective (See assessment for performance-based criteria) | | | |

Revised Candidate Disposition Assessment – Disaggregated by Program- Pilot Cycle (Spring 2021) Undergraduate Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP

Program level data is shown below for all undergraduate programs with at least 1 candidate applying for admission to the WTEP in Spring 2021. Included are Elementary K-6, Health & PE K-12, Middle Level (Math/Science) 4-8, Secondary English 7-12, and Secondary Social Studies 7-12. Programs with no candidates applying for admission in these cycles of data are not included, and those are Middle Level (Lit/Soc. Studies) 4-8 and Music Education (Vocal) K-12. The Art Education K-12 program is not included in the data because the program was eliminated in Spring 2021.

The data were not disaggregated by race and ethnicity because only one minority candidate applied for admission in Spring 21. See [continuous improvement section](#) of this document for planned changes to the factors by which data will be disaggregated beginning in Fall 2021. (CAEP R5.4)

Disaggregated Data –Elementary K-6

Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2021 Pilot)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=7 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=7 |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation | 2.2 | “I write down my plans, but can still be forgetful.” | 2.6 |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness | 2.4 | “I will set achievable goals.” | 2.9 |
| 3 | Professional Maturity | 2.4 | “I welcome constructive criticism.” | 2.7 |
| 4 | Professional Presentation | 2.7 | “I’m always seeking to expand my professional wardrobe. I make sure to wake up early to present myself well.” | 2.9 |
| | Professional Communication | 2.3 | “I catch myself using incorrect grammar.” | 2.7 |

| | | | | |
|--|---------------------|-----|---|-----|
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | Professional Growth | 2.3 | “This semester I am working as a substitute teacher. I value this experience no matter what happens, because I can grow from it.” | 2.7 |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective | | | | |
| See performance-based criteria for each component on the Candidate Disposition Assessment Document | | | | |

| Disaggregated Data –Secondary Social Studies 7-12 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2021 Pilot) | | | | |
| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self –Assessment n=2 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=2 |
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation | 2 | “I need to use a planner or other tools to help me manage my time.” | 1.5 |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness | 2 | “I don’t always use the constructive criticism to better myself.” | 2 |
| 3 | Professional Maturity | 1.5 | “I hope my confidence and composure in wrestling transfers into teaching in my classroom.” | 2 |
| 4 | Professional Presentation | 2 | “I know how to dress for any occasion, though I never go overboard.” | 2.5 |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----|--|-----|
| 5 | Professional Communication | 1.5 | “I struggle speaking in front of new people.” | 2 |
| 6 | Professional Growth | 2 | “I am not taking advantage or applying new information.” | 1.5 |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective | | | | |

| Disaggregated Data –Middle Level (Math/Science) 4-8 | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------------|
| Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2021 Pilot) | | | | |
| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self –Assessment n=3 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=3 |
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation | 1.7 | “I consistently plan on completing my work, but my time management is lacking, causing me to fall behind.” | 2 |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness | 2.3 | “I’ve sought out help from Mrs. Wooldridge and other students.” | 3 |
| 3 | Professional Maturity | 2.7 | “I take responsibility for my actions and work constantly to better myself.” | 2.7 |
| 4 | Professional Presentation | 2 | “I tend to dress casually, but will change accordingly.” | 2.3 |
| 5 | Professional Communication | 2.3 | “I sometimes use wrong grammar in writing and am prone to use informal language at the wrong time.” | 2.7 |
| 6 | Professional Growth | 2 | “I need to implement more of the advice given to me.” | 2.7 |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective | | | | |

Disaggregated Data –Health & Physical Education K-12

Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2021 Pilot)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self –Assessment n=4 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=4 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation | 2 | 2.3 | “I make arrangements when I know I’ll be absent and I am on time to most things.” |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness | 2.5 | 2.5 | “I collaborate well and I’ve met my Praxis requirements quickly.” |
| 3 | Professional Maturity | 2 | 2.3 | “I’ve been selected by teachers to aid other students.” |
| 4 | Professional Presentation | 2.3 | 2.5 | “Because of my military background, I present a confident professional image.” |
| 5 | Professional Communication | 2.3 | 2.5 | “I’ve passed my EPE exam and am comfortable speaking in a classroom setting.” |
| 6 | Professional Growth | 1.5 | 2.5 | “I’ve volunteered as a coach, done substitute teaching, and lead a Sunday school class.” |

Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective

Disaggregated Data –Secondary English 7-12

Revised Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2021 Pilot)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self –Assessment n=1 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=1 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot | Spring 2021 Pilot |
| 1 | Professional Preparation | 2 | 3 | “Sometimes struggle with overloading my schedule.” |
| 2 | Professional Responsiveness | 3 | 3 | “Constantly researching article databases to adjust performance.” |
| 3 | Professional Maturity | 2 | 3 | “I feel behind because I haven’t taken as many Education classes as I have English.” |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|---|---|---|
| 4 | Professional Presentation | 2 | 3 | “I’ve begun buying ‘teacher clothes,’ but I only have a few good outfits.” |
| 5 | Professional Communication | 3 | 3 | “Made A’s in Advanced Grammar and Speech.” |
| 6 | Professional Growth | 2 | 3 | “I’ve grown through leadership positions such as RA, Student Ambassador, and team captain.” |
| Scale: 1 = needs improvement; 2 = developing; 3 = effective | | | | |

**Previous Candidate Disposition Assessment – Undergraduate Aggregate Data 2 Cycles (Spring 2020 - Fall 2020)
 Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP**

Aggregate data from the previous assessment (before revision in Spring 2021) is shown below for all undergraduate programs with at least 1 candidate applying for admission to the WTEP in Fall 2020 and Spring 2020. Programs included in the aggregate data are Secondary English 7-12, Health & PE K-12, Middle Level (Math/Science) 4-8, Middle Level (Lit/Soc. Studies) 4-8, Secondary Social Studies 7-12, and Elementary K-6. The Music Education (Vocal) K-12 and Art Education K-12 programs are **not included because no candidates from those programs applied for admission in Spring or Fall 2020.**

The data **were not disaggregated by race** and ethnicity because of the low number of minority candidates applying for admission in Spring and Fall 2020.

Note: The Art Education K-12 program was eliminated in Spring 2021 due to consistent low enrollment.

| Component Number | Previous Disposition Components (before revisions in Spring 21) | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=11 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=6 | Mean Faculty-Rated Dispositions n=11 | Mean Faculty-Rated Dispositions n=6 |
|------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | Spring 2020 | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | Fall 2020 |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity Work is completed with attention to detail, is sequential and logical. Shows evidence of thoughtful analysis of the assignment. Work shows that adequate time and planning were allocated. Seeks new resources and additional information to complete work. Asks questions showing interest. | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | 9 | 8.5 | 8.7 |
| 2 | In Class Performance Demonstrates a positive attitude towards teaching and learning. Actively engaged and interested in class activities. Volunteers to respond to questions. Participates in discussions. Stays focused. Has done necessary preparation for class. Shows initiative in class activities. | | 8.8 | 8.4 | 8.5 |
| 3 | Communication Skills Uses correct grammar in oral and written communication. Communication is free of offensive or inappropriate language. Uses language to express ideas effectively regardless of the age of the listener. | | 9.2 | 8 | 8 |
| 4 | Responsibility Consistently attends class and is on time. Notifies instructor in advance or arranges to meet instructor following a missed class. Gives reason for absence. Meets all deadlines and completes assignments. Accepts criticism and makes necessary changes. | | 8.8 | 8.4 | 8.5 |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies Knows school rules and policies. Follows them consistently. Understands the purpose of regulations and respects their intent. Accepts responsibility for personally following them in his/her dress, behavior, etc. | | 9.7 | 8.5 | 8 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|-----|-----|-----|
| 6 | Professional Appearance Presents a clean, well-groomed appearance when representing WBU on and off campus. (during observation assignments, events, etc.) | | 9.7 | 7.3 | 7.8 |
| 7 | Personal Integrity Is honest in dealing with others. Dependable in keeping personal and professional confidences. Can be counted on to follow through and keep his/her word. Shows self to be a person of strong character. A good role model. | | 9.8 | 8.6 | 8 |
| 8 | Group Work Willingly works with others. Contributes ideas and efforts to the group. Welcomes feedback from others. Listens to others and respects their views and needs. Relates well to others and promotes group success. | | 9.3 | 9.2 | 8.2 |
| SCALE | Explanation of Scoring Criteria: Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10 Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 8 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 7 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 6 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1 Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA | | | | |

**Previous Candidate Disposition Assessment – Disaggregated by Program- 2 Cycles (Spring 2020 - Fall 2020)
 Undergraduate Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP**

Program level data is shown below for all undergraduate programs with at least 1 candidate applying for admission to the WTEP in Spring 2020 and Fall 2020. Included are Elementary K-6, Health & PE K-12, Middle Level (Math/Science) 4-8, Middle Level (Lit/Soc. Studies) 4-8, Secondary English 7-12, and Secondary Social Studies 7-12. Programs with no candidates applying for admission in these cycles of data are not shown, and those are Music Education (Vocal) K-12 and Art Education K-12. The data were not disaggregated by race and ethnicity because no minority candidates were interviewed for admission in Spring or Fall 2020.

Disaggregated Data –Health & Physical Education K-12

Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=2 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=3 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=2 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=3 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | 8.5 | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | “I am currently taking an online course. To maintain an A in that class I have to pay very close attention to due dates and announcements. I have to use resources to complete my weekly discussions and assignments. Also, I have to plan out and spend a reasonable amount of time on my online work. Since it is strictly online, I have to pay very close attention and always be on top of my work.” | 8.5 | 9 | “I have only known her since the beginning of the current semester. After the first small quiz, she came by my office for help in content as well as study habits, preparation. She continues to score well on the quizzes and major tests.” |
| 2 | In Class Performance | 8 | | “I am always focused in class. I put everything away that I don’t need. I listen and take notes of what the teacher is discussing. Although, I can always do a better job at being more vocal in my | 8.5 | 9 | “she is always engaged and appears to be focused on the material we are discussing.” |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----|--|--|-----|-----|---|
| | | | | classes. I am not always the first one to answer questions. I second guess myself sometimes when it comes to those situations.” | | | |
| 3 | Communication Skills | 8.5 | | “Grammar in any form of communication is important to me. I always want people to be able to know what I’m saying and how to take it. I never want people to take what I say the wrong way. With that being said, I make sure to express myself very clearly and make sure everyone is able to understand what I am saying and how I’m saying it.” | 7 | 9.3 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 4 | Responsibility | 9.5 | | “I am very consistent when it comes to going to classes. I usually show up to class 5 to 10 minutes early. I am a student athlete, so I try my best to notify my instructors at least a week in advance when we are traveling. I also email them again the day of travel just to be thorough. The only time I miss classes are for school related absences, sickness, or family emergencies. I am always available to get with my instructor and make up anything that I may have missed.” | 8.5 | 9 | “She is always present and the fact that she does well on daily quizzes indicates that she is always prepared.” |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | 9.5 | | “I have never gotten in trouble with the school. I am aware of the responsibilities I am supposed to have. Being an athlete I am held accountable.” | 7 | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----|--|---|-----|-----|---|
| 6 | Professional Appearance | 10 | | “My physical appearance is always presentable. Being a student athlete, we travel to several different places. I make sure that I am properly dressed and that I am always respectful. We are representing our school everywhere we go and I want to be dressed and have a good appearance for anyone we may come in contact with.” | 7.5 | 6.7 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | 9.5 | | “This is a quality that I strive to achieve. The people who are closest to me know that they can trust me with anything. One on one conversations stay strictly between me and the other person. Several people ask for my advice and I give them my honest opinion. I respect everyone and I never judge anyone.” | 7.5 | 9.3 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 8 | Group Work | 8.5 | | “Group work is a big asset in softball. I like hearing my teammates' ideas on and off the field.” | 7.5 | 9.3 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

SCALE

Explanation of Scoring Criteria:

Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10

Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 8

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 7

Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 6

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4

Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3

Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2

Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1

Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA

| Disaggregated Data –Elementary K-6 | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020) | | | | | | | |
| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=2 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=3 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=2 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=3 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | 10 | Candidates did not assess themselves on dispositions until Fall 2020 | “When completing assignments or activities for my classes, I do my best to properly complete the assignment. I use information that I know and have learned to do my work the best that I can. I find myself asking questions in my classes (and in life) to things I am confused or unsure about. I believe it is important to try your best, no matter what.” | 8.5 | 8 | “Every assignment she submits shows evidence of content knowledge and thoughtful responses.” |
| 2 | In Class Performance | 9 | | “I really am enjoying my education courses this year. I find myself learning so much about how to teach so many different subjects. I actively listen and participate in class. I ask questions and take part in discussions.” | 7.5 | 8.7 | “I can always count on her to volunteer to model something, participate in discussions, share her thinking, and participate in every activity we do.” |
| 3 | Communication Skills | 10 | | “When responding or communicating with someone you always want to have a good representation of yourself. Anywhere you go you leave an impression and it's up to you to leave a good or bad impression. No | 7 | 7.3 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-----|--|---|-----|-----|--|
| | | | | offensive/inappropriate language is necessary.” | | | |
| 4 | Responsibility | 8.5 | | “As far as criticism goes, I'm always wanting feedback and to know how I can improve. I want to be the best version of myself when it comes to responsibilities.” | 8 | 7.7 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | 10 | | “I do take rules very seriously. The rules of Williams I do my best to abide by them. I believe rules are important, and even when I don't understand why - rules have a purpose. I hold myself responsible for my actions and the way I behave.” | 8 | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 6 | Professional Appearance | 10 | | “I think that I present a clean, well-groomed appearance when representing WBU on campus and off campus. Again, first impressions are everything.” | 7.5 | 7.3 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | 10 | | “I'd like to consider myself trustworthy and a person that can be considered dependable. I'm honest and I do represent a person of strong character.” | 7.5 | 8 | “She consistently proves to be a hardworking, thoughtful, and enjoyable student to teach.” |
| 8 | Group Work | 10 | | “I like to work with others. If anything I think that this provides an opportunity to collaborate and get more feedback on work. Again, I want to be the best version of myself and I can receive feedback without getting my feelings hurt. There is | 8.5 | 8.7 | “She is always listening and taking in others' points.” |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | always room for improvement. “ | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------------------|--|--|--|

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

SCALE

Explanation of Scoring Criteria:

- Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10
- Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 8
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 7
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 6
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3
- Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2
- Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1
- Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA

Disaggregated Data – Middle Level (Math / Science) 4-8

Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=1 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=2 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=1 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=2 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | 9 | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | “I am a very detail oriented person. I have very good time management.” | 9 | 8.5 | “Her work in regular and online classes demonstrates very intentional work. “ |
| 2 | In Class Performance | 9 | | “I always try to be positive in all that I do, especially in the education world. I always try to participate in class and be actively engaged. If there is something to be done before class, I make sure to have it completed so that I am prepared.” | 9 | 7.5 | “Emma is a leader in conversations! She readily participates and promotes discussions with new ideas or questions.” |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|----|--|---|---|-----|---|
| 3 | Communication Skills | 10 | | “I normally have very good grammar in written and oral communication. I do not use offensive or inappropriate language. I know how to talk to all different age groups appropriately.” | 8 | 6 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 4 | Responsibility | 10 | | “I have very good attendance and am always punctual. I do have to miss classes for golf, and I am very good about communicating with my teachers in advance of when I will be gone and what I can do to make up for class.” | 8 | 8.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | 10 | | “I am a Resident Assistant so I know the school rules pretty well. I try to follow and enforce these rules at all time to be a good role model for my peers. If I do something wrong, I always take responsibility for my actions.” | 8 | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 6 | Professional Appearance | 9 | | “I dress professionally when observing or doing anything with the education program.” | 7 | 7 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | 10 | | “I always pride myself in being a good role model to others. I am honest and dependable to others when they need me.” | 8 | 8.5 | “She soaks in knowledge, processes it, and then seeks more! I'm very ready to get her out into the world, so that she can start positively impacting students!” |
| 8 | Group Work | 9 | | “During group projects, I am respectful of my peers and try to give my best efforts for the group. I listen to what others have to say and contribute my own ideas in a | 8 | 7.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | | respectful manner. I want the group to succeed as a whole.” | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

SCALE

Explanation of Scoring Criteria:

- Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10
- Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 8
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 7
- Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 6
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4
- Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3
- Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2
- Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1
- Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA

Disaggregated Data –Secondary Social Studies 7-12

Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=0 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=2 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=0 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=2 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | | | 8.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 2 | In Class Performance | | | | | 7.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 3 | Communication Skills | | | | | 8.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--|--|-----|---|
| 4 | Responsibility | | | | 8.5 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | | | | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 6 | Professional Appearance | | | | 8 | “He seems to dress appropriately around campus, but I have not been involved with his observation assignments.” |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | | | | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 8 | Group Work | | | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCALE | <p>Explanation of Scoring Criteria: Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10 Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 8 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 7 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 6 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1 Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA</p> | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|

| Disaggregated Data – Secondary English 7-12 | | | | | | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020) | | | | | | | |
| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=1 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=0 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=1 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=0 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | 8 | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | 9 | | “She was very interested in the subject matter and participated in class discussions. She was always prepared for class and if she had questions she would ask for further details or explanation.” |
| 2 | In Class Performance | 10 | | | 10 | “She was always prepared for class and brought and completed all necessary requirements for the class each time” | |
| 3 | Communication Skills | 8 | | | 10 | “She always presented herself in person and during any class participation with appropriate skills needed.” | |
| 4 | Responsibility | 7 | | | 10 | “She was diligent about her attendance in class. She showed professionalism in that she was not only attending school but had a child of her own. Any events that caused her to miss class she contacted me prior to the absence and made sure to complete any work assignment she missed.” | |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | 9 | | | 10 | “She was respectful and was always in compliance.” | |
| 6 | Professional Appearance | 9 | | | 10 | “She always presented herself in appropriate presentation.” | |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | 10 | | | 10 | “I never had any concerns with this. She was attending school, had a job and a parent. She | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------|----|--|--|----|--|
| | | | | | | always presented herself in a positive manner.” |
| 8 | Group Work | 10 | | | 10 | “She was an active participant in class, asking appropriate questions and during class discussion was actively involved and led some discussions.” |

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCALE | Explanation of Scoring Criteria: Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10 Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 8 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 7 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation = 6 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1 Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|

Disaggregated Data – Middle Level (Literacy / Social Studies) 4-8

Previous Disposition Assessment – Undergrad – Progression Point 2 –Admission to WTEP (Spring 2020 – Fall 2020)

| Component Number | Disposition Component | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=0 | Mean Candidate Self-Assessment n=1 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Candidates | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=0 | Mean Faculty-Rated Disposition n=1 | Examples of Evidence & Comments from Faculty |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | | Fall 2020 | Spring 2020 | |
| 1 | Intellectual Curiosity | | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | Candidates did not assess themselves on a disposition until Fall 2020 | | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 2 | In Class Performance | | | | | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 3 | Communication Skills | | | | | 9 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

| | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|---|---|
| 4 | Responsibility | | until Fall 2020 | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 5 | Respect for Rules & Policies | | | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 6 | Professional Appearance | | | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 7 | Personal Integrity | | | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |
| 8 | Group Work | | | | 8 | Evidence to support ratings was not provided. |

Scale: 9-10 Distinguished, 6-8 Proficient, 3-5 Basic, 1-2 Unsatisfactory

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| SCALE | <p>Explanation of Scoring Criteria: Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 10 Distinguished (Exceptional behavior) = 9 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 8 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 7 Proficient (Behavior we hope all graduates will reach upon graduation) = 6 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 5 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 4 Basic (Behavior acceptable at a minimal level) = 3 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 2 Unsatisfactory (Behavior unacceptable for a future teaching professional) = 1 Cannot Respond (Criteria have not been observed) = NA</p> | | | | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|

Undergraduate Programs Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions

| Process Used to Monitor Candidate Dispositions in All Undergraduate Programs | | |
|--|--|--|
| Progression Point for Measuring Candidate Dispositions | Description of the Process at Progression Points | Timeline and Person Responsible |
| Progression Point 1 – Introduction to Teaching | | |
| <p>ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calibration training • Student self-assessment • Faculty assessment • Compare & Reflect <p>Baseline data to monitor progression</p> | <p>Students enrolled in Introduction to Teaching will attend calibration training to learn the basis for judgment of disposition components and criteria for quality evidence.</p> <p>ED 2203 students will self-assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings.</p> <p>The faculty member teaching Intro to Teaching will assess students enrolled in ED 2203 on the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings.</p> <p>ED 2203 students will complete a compare and reflect assignment to compare their ratings to the faculty ratings on each of the six components of the dispositions assessment and reflect on the similarities or differences.</p> | <p>During ED 2203</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The faculty member teaching Introduction to Teaching will conduct calibration training as part of the ED 2203 curriculum. • Students and the faculty member teaching ED 2203 will identify and document evidence of each component of the dispositions assessment throughout the course. <p>End of Course ED 2203</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students will complete the self-assessment of the six components of the dispositions assessment. The faculty member teaching ED 2203 will submit student self-assessments to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the students' digital files. • The faculty member teaching ED 2203 will provide the faculty-assessed ratings to students for the compare and reflect assignment. The faculty member will submit the faculty-rated disposition assessment to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the students' digital files. • Students will complete the compare and reflect assignment and submit it to the faculty member teaching ED 2203 for inclusion in the candidate's digital file. The reflection is reviewed by the faculty member teaching ED 2203 to determine if the candidate needs additional support. |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students will add a tab for "Dispositions" on the Google Site teaching portfolio created in ED 2203. The Progression Point 1 self and faculty-rated assessment will be uploaded to the site. Folders will be created on the dispositions page for the artifacts related to progression points 1, 2, and 3. Students will compile evidence throughout their program to support their growth in each of the six components of the dispositions assessment. |
| <p>Progression Point 2 – Admission to WTEP</p> | | |
| <p>Admission to WTEP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student self-assessment WTEP Interview Committee assessment Compare & Reflect <p>Comparison to baseline data from ED 2203 to monitor progress</p> | <p>Candidates who apply for admission to the WTEP will self-assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings.</p> <p>WTEP faculty members of the interview committee review candidate evidence and come to a consensus to rate candidate dispositions.</p> <p>Candidates complete a compare and reflect assignment to compare their ratings to the faculty interview committee ratings and reflect on the similarities or differences.</p> | <p>Upon Application for Admission Candidates submit the self-assessment ratings to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the students' digital files.</p> <p>During the Admission Interview Candidates meet with WTEP faculty interview committee members to discuss and support their self-assessed ratings.</p> <p>Following the Admission Interview The WTEP faculty interview committee members discuss the evidence, compare the candidates' ED 2203 dispositions assessment, and determine the ratings by consensus to complete the dispositions assessment on each interview candidate. If disposition ratings are a concern, the committee may establish conditions for improvement with conditional acceptance granted. Disposition assessments will be submitted to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the candidates' digital files.</p> <p>After the Admission Interview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Education Coordinator provides faculty-assessed ratings to candidates for the compare and reflect assignment. Candidates submit the compare and reflect assignment to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the candidates' digital files. The Education Department Chair and Education Coordinator will |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>view the reflection to determine if the candidate needs additional support.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will upload the self and faculty-rated Progression Point 2 Disposition Assessment to the "Dispositions" tab on the Google Site teaching portfolio created in ED 2203. |
| <p>Planned opportunities to develop evidence for disposition assessment</p> | | |
| <p>ED 4183 Integrated Methods And Capstone Courses ED 4113 and ED4133</p> | <p>As candidates progress through the WTEP, the candidate and the WTEP faculty member teaching specific courses will identify and document evidence of each component of the dispositions assessment throughout the course.</p> | <p>During ED 4183, ED 4113, and ED 4133</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty members will provide opportunities for candidates to document evidence of the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment through specific coursework, including pre-clinical field experiences, teaching a video lesson, completing a professional growth plan, and completing a capstone professional development project. • Candidates will be responsible for adding evidence to support their growth in the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. |
| <p>Progression Point 3 – Clinical Internship</p> | | |
| <p>ED 4603 Internship Seminar And ED 4536 Clinical Internship II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student self-assessment • WTEP Internship Supervisor & Cooperating Teacher • Compare & Reflect | <p>Candidates self-assess and provide evidence from the internship to support their ratings.</p> <p>The WBU internship supervisor and K-12 Cooperating Teacher review internship performance along with candidate-submitted evidence and come to consensus to rate candidate dispositions.</p> <p>Candidates will complete a compare and reflect assignment to compare their ratings to the WTEP Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher ratings on each of the six components of the dispositions assessment and reflect on the similarities or differences.</p> | <p>During ED 4603 Internship Seminar</p> <p>As candidates progress through the internship, the candidate, the WTEP Internship Supervisor, and the Cooperating Teacher will identify and document evidence of each component of the disposition assessment.</p> <p>Mid-point of ED 4536 Clinical Internship II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will self-assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings. Candidates will submit the assessment to the Education Coordinator and the WTEP Internship Supervisor. • The WTEP Internship Supervisor will meet with the Cooperating Teacher to review and discuss the candidate's self-assessment ratings. The supervisor and teacher will come to consensus and |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <p><i>Comparison to baseline data from ED 2203 and admission data to monitor progress</i></p> | | <p>rate the intern on the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. If it is determined that additional support is needed, the supervisor and teacher will provide the necessary support. The WTEP Supervisor will provide the assessment to the candidate and the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the candidate's digital file.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Candidates will upload the self and faculty-rated Progression Point 3 Disposition Assessment to the "Dispositions" tab on the Google Site teaching portfolio created in ED 2203. <p>Exit Interview The Compare and Reflect assignment will be submitted to the Education Coordinator for inclusion in the candidate's digital file. In addition, the candidate will discuss their growth from Introduction to Teaching to Internship during the exit interview. Candidates will develop a plan for continued growth for any of the six components that are not rated at the Effective Level.</p> |
|--|--|--|

MAT Progression Points for Monitoring Dispositions

| MAT Process Used to Monitor Candidate Dispositions in the Graduate Program | | |
|--|--|---|
| Progression Point for Measuring Candidate Dispositions | Description of the Process at Progression Points | Timeline and Person Responsible |
| Progression Point 1 –MAT 5043 Effective Teaching or MAT 5013 Educational Characteristics* | | |
| <p>MAT 5043 Effective Teaching OR MAT 5013 Educational Characteristics*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Calibration training ● Student self-assessment ● MAT faculty assessment ● Compare & Reflect <p>Baseline data to monitor progression</p> <p><i>*Whichever of these courses the candidate completes first depending on the enrollment date.</i></p> | <p>MAT candidates enrolled in MAT 5043 Effective Teaching or MAT 5013 Educational Characteristics* will view the video of calibration training to learn the basis for judgment of disposition components and criteria for quality evidence.</p> <p>MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* candidates will self-assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings.</p> <p>The faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* will assess candidates enrolled in the course on the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings.</p> <p>MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* students will complete a compare and reflect assignment to compare their ratings to the faculty ratings on each of the six components of the dispositions assessment and reflect on the similarities or differences.</p> | <p>During MAT 5043 or MAT 5013*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The faculty member teaching the undergrad course ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching will provide a video of the calibration training for the assessment. MAT program faculty will respond to any questions from MAT candidates. ● MAT candidates and the faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* will identify and document evidence of each component of the dispositions assessment throughout the course. <p>End of Course MAT 5043 or MAT 5013*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Candidates will complete the self-assessment of the six components of the dispositions assessment. The faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* will upload the student self-assessments to the student’s digital file in Google Drive. ● The faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* will assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings for each student enrolled in the course. The faculty member will upload the faculty assessment to the student’s digital file in Google Drive. ● The faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* will provide the faculty-assessed ratings to students for the compare and reflect assignment. ● Students will complete the compare and reflect assignment and submit it to the faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* for inclusion in the candidate's digital file. The reflection |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>will be reviewed by the faculty member teaching MAT 5043 or MAT 5013* to determine if the candidate needs additional support. Support will be planned and provided through collaboration with the MAT faculty and candidate.</p> |
| <p>Planned opportunities to develop evidence for disposition assessment</p> | | |
| <p>All Courses Taken Between the First Self-Assessment completed by the candidate and the MAT Clinical Track Courses</p> | <p>As candidates progress through the MAT, the candidate and the MAT faculty member teaching specific courses will identify and document evidence of each component of the dispositions assessment throughout the coursework.</p> | <p>During MAT 5063, MAT 5073, MAT 5043 and others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MAT faculty members will provide opportunities for candidates to document evidence of the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment through specific coursework, including teaching a video lesson utilizing best practices, comparing the Arkansas TESS Rubric Descriptors of their self-evaluation with the supervisor, illustrating an understanding of the Four Domains of Teaching Responsibility, and completing a capstone professional development project. • Candidates will be responsible for compiling evidence through coursework and their classroom practice to support their ratings and demonstrate growth in the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. |
| <p>Progression Point 2 – MAT 5113 or MAT 5123* Clinical Track</p> | | |
| <p>MAT 5113 or MAT 5123* Clinical Track</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student self-assessment • MAT Clinical Track Supervisor and the Master Teacher* assessment • Compare & Reflect | <p>Candidates self-assess and provide evidence from the clinical track teaching experiences to support their ratings.</p> <p>(MAT 5123 ONLY*) The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor and the Master Teacher will review clinical track performance along with candidate self-assessment ratings and evidence and come to a consensus to rate candidate dispositions.</p> <p>(MAT 5113 ONLY*) The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor will review clinical track performance along with candidate self-</p> | <p>During MAT 5113 or MAT 5123* Clinical Track</p> <p>As candidates progress through the clinical track, the candidate, the MAT Clinical Track Supervisor, and the Master Teacher (MAT 5123 only), will identify and document evidence of each component of the disposition assessment.</p> <p>Mid-point of MAT 5113 or MAT 5123* Clinical Track</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidates will self-assess the six components of the dispositions assessment and provide evidence to support the ratings. Candidates will submit the assessment to the MAT Clinical Track Supervisor who will review the ratings and upload the assessment to the candidate’s digital file. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Comparison to baseline data from MAT 5043 or MAT 5013 to monitor progress</p> <p><i>*MAT 5113 candidates are serving as teachers of record in a partnership school. MAT 5123 do not have teaching positions and will complete an internship with a Master Teacher in a partnership school.</i></p> | <p>assessment ratings and evidence to rate the intern on the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment.</p> <p>Candidates will complete a compare and reflect assignment to compare their ratings to the faculty ratings on each of the six components of the dispositions assessment and reflect on the similarities or differences.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (MAT 5123 ONLY*) The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor will meet with the Master Teacher to review and discuss the candidate's self-assessment ratings. The supervisor and teacher will come to a consensus and rate the intern on the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. If it is determined that additional support is needed, the supervisor and teacher will provide the necessary support. The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor will provide the faculty-rated assessment to the candidate and upload the assessment to the candidate's digital file. ● (MAT 5113 ONLY*) The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor will rate the intern on the six components of the Candidate Dispositions Assessment. If it is determined that additional support is needed, the supervisor will provide the necessary support. The MAT Clinical Track Supervisor will provide the faculty-rated assessment to the candidate and upload the assessment to the candidate's digital file. ● The compare and reflect assignment will be submitted to the MAT Clinical Track Supervisor for inclusion in the candidate's digital file. In addition, the candidate will meet with the MAT supervisor to discuss their growth from MAT 5043 or MAT 5013. Candidates will develop a plan for continued growth for any of the six components that are not rated at the Effective Level. |
|---|---|---|

Content Validity Study Results – Candidate Dispositions Assessment

| WTEP Disposition Content Validity Study Results Spring 21 | | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| The survey was sent to 23 people total, and 18 people returned it for a response rate of 78%. | | | | | Established critical value for 18 respondents is .44 CVR |
| Who responded?: WTEP Candidates/Completers = 4, WTEP Faculty = 4, Cooperating Teachers = 5, K-12 Administrators/Co-op = 5 | | | | | |
| Assessment Components | Essential for the success of a beginning teacher candidate | Useful but NOT essential for the success of a beginning teacher candidate | Not necessary for the success of a beginning teacher candidate. | Additional Feedback | Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) |
| Component 1: Professional Preparation - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment. | 94.40% | 5.60% | 0% | I'm a little unclear on the distinctions between Effective and Developing. "Act appropriately and effectively in the pursuit of professional and academic goals" becomes "to achieve desire outcomes"—what is the measurable difference? In Developing, does "Plans consistently to fulfill work criteria" mean the student plans to do it but never gets around to actually doing it? | 0.89 |
| Component 2: Professional Responsiveness - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment. | 100% | 0% | 0% | - Under DEVELOPING, I'm not sure if I understand "May independently seek resources for growth." Does the student voluntarily seek resources, or only after being instructed to do so. - Does the "May" in Developing suggest "either" of the criteria mentioned? In other words, is independent initiative a requirement for developing or is it left vague so that if a student responds to criticism really well but doesn't take initiative then she or he can be Developing? - If redirection is needed and a student teacher is not receptive to the criticism, they will remain stagnant. It is ver important to take constructive criticism and reflect and adjust. - Until a teacher understands the uniqueness of each classroom, it is very important to listen to those with more experience. | 1.00 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---|-----------|--|--------------------|
| <p>Component 3: Professional Maturity - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment.</p> | <p>94.40%</p> | <p>5.60%</p> | <p>0%</p> | <p>- We might consider replacing "field of education" here with a broader "field of study," because some faculty, particularly those who have had students in content courses rather than education courses, may not feel as qualified to comment on a teacher candidate's confidence in their competence in the field of education. - I think that this component is covered in some of the other components, so it isn't necessary for it to be its own criteria. - There is a fine line that educators must walk everyday. The challenge to be both professional and relevant and relatable to students is something I have seen people struggle with in my short time teaching.</p> | <p>0.89</p> |
| <p>Component 4: Professional Presentation - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment.</p> | <p>77.80%</p> | <p>22.2% These responses were from 2 K-12 Administrators, 1 Student, & 1 Cooperating Teacher.</p> | <p>0%</p> | <p>- It might be enough here to simply leave it at "appearance" generally rather than specifically mentioning dress and hygiene. - Suitable or Exceptional "Dress and Appearance" can be relative to individual perception, background, etc. "Suitable" means different things to different people. I know some high school teachers that teach in blue jeans. - Dress is not a one size fits all, appropriate dress for physical education is not appropriate for the classroom.</p> | <p>0.55</p> |
| <p>Component 5: Professional Communication - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment.</p> | <p>94.40%</p> | <p>5.60%</p> | <p>0%</p> | <p>This is not a huge issue, but "correct grammar" is a problematic term. Most current linguists would use the term "appropriate grammar," although "standard grammar" could work if you want to emphasize a professional standard. - We as teacher must always set the example, but we also must be able to understand our students. Their terminology and "slang" may not be correct grammatically and need correcting, but we need to understand it.</p> | <p>0.89</p> |
| <p>Component 6: Professional Growth - Please review the component shown in the image below. Then, choose the option that represents your opinion about including this item on the WTEP Dispositions Assessment.</p> | <p>94.40%</p> | <p>5.60%</p> | <p>0%</p> | <p>- I have two comments: 1) this sounds similar to Component 2, so I might sometimes have trouble distinguishing the two components (except for the new ideas of leadership and sharing, which is only in the "Effective" category of Component 6. 2) I'm a little uncomfortable with the binary between "strong" and "progressing" (not just on this component). I get the general idea, but a student who is strong in something should always be progressing. Unfortunately, I'm not sure what language would solve the issue. - Growth in an educators field is crucial to daily instruction. The majority of new knowledge can be acquired through colleagues. It is very important for novice teachers. - We should never be content, there is always something that can be improved.</p> | <p>0.89</p> |
| <p>Instrument Content Validity Index</p> | | | | | <p>0.85</p> |

WTEP Validity Study Partners for Review of Candidate Dispositions Assessment

Williams Teacher Education Advisory Board members who received the Candidate Dispositions review email on 4/15/21. Resent to those who had not responded on 4/19/21. Data finalized on 4/28/21. **Response rate was 78%.**

| Name | Contact Info | Role | Returned–Y or N |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| 1. Evet McCray-Starks | eholmes@osd1.org | Osceola High School Administrator | Y |
| 2. Lana Jean | ljean@nea.k12.ar.us, | NEA Cooperative Reading Specialist | N |
| 3. Tracy Ballard | tracy.ballard@pocahontaspsd.com | Pocahontas School District Teacher/WTEP Completer | Y |
| 4. Makayla Durham | durham26346@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Teacher Candidate | Y |
| 5. Chris Hair | chair@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Faculty | Y |
| 6. LeaAndra Foster | leaandra.foster@bobcats.k12.ar.us | WR Elementary School Principal | Y |
| 7. Melanie Spence | mspence@sloan-hendrix.com | Sloan-Hendrix School District Administrator | Y |
| 8. Angela Carlton | acarlton@nea.k12.ar.us | NEA Education Cooperative Teacher Center Coordinator | Y |
| 9. Ruby Keller | keller27464@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Teacher Candidate | Y |
| 10. Tashena Tate | Tashena.tate@bobcats.k12.ar.us | Walnut Ridge Middle School Cooperating Teacher | Y |
| 11. Kyle Roden | kyle.roden@gctsd.k12.ar.us | GCT K-12 Teacher/WTEP Completer | Y |
| 12. Kristin Allen | krallen@k12.com | AR Virtual Academy Administrator | Y |
| 13. Mary Beth Dickson | mary.dickson@bobcats.k12.ar.us | WR Elementary Teacher WTEP Completer | N |
| 14. Carlene Crawford | carlene.crawford@pocahontaspsd.com | Pocahontas Teacher WTEP Completer | Y |
| 15. Erin Gay | erin.gay@pocahontaspsd.com | Pocahontas Teacher WTEP Completer | N |
| 16. Megan Cole | cole26585@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Teacher Candidate | Y |
| 17. Amy Lucius | amy.lucius@gctsd.k12.ar.us | GCT K-12 Assistant Superintendent | Y |
| 18. Lynn Pennington | lpennington@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Faculty | N |
| 19. Bob Magee | bmagee@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Faculty | Y |
| 20. Carol Halford | chalford@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Faculty | Y |
| 21. Audrea Martin | amartin@paragouldschools.net | Paragould School District LEA Specialist | N |
| 22. Anna Langlie | langlie26352@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Teacher Candidate | Y |
| 23. Blake Perkins | bperkins@williamsbu.edu | WTEP Faculty | Y |

ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching Instructions for Professional Growth Plan and Sample Created by Student in Spring 2021

Professional Growth Plan for _____

ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching

(This should be based on your disposition self-evaluation.)

TESS Domain and Targeted Area of Growth:

Based on your Targeted Area for Growth and the selected TESS Domain write a specific professional goal that you want to achieve.

S-____ M-____ A-____ R-____ T-____

What resources will you use to ensure that you reach your professional growth goal? This can be professional learning activities in which you will engage, online webinars you will view, websites that you will use, or books that you will read, etc. (At least one resource needs to be a webinar on the topic.)

You will activate all sources before creating your artifacts.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|-------|--|-------|--|
| Podcasts | | Webinars | | Books | | Other | |
|----------|--|----------|--|-------|--|-------|--|

| Sources (Be Specific) | Justification for Use |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | |

Teacher Candidate Name: _____

Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

Instructor signature: _____ **Date** _____

Artifact Ideas:

- 1) _____
- 2) _____
- 3) _____

Progression Point 1 - PGP Artifact Submission Based on Results of Candidate Dispositions – Middle Level Candidate

Teacher Education Major: Mid-level Literacy/Social Studies

Targeted Area for Growth: Communicating with Students **TESS Domain:** 3A

Based on your Targeted Area for Growth and the selected TESS Domain write a specific professional goal that you want to achieve.

During the spring semester of 2021, I will improve my ability to communicate clearly and effectively with my students. I will seek resources to help me acquire 5 new strategies for good communication. By the end of the semester, I will document these strategies. I need to grow in this because communication is key in the classroom.

Artifact One

Description of artifact: List of things learned/going to learn about this year, like a syllabus (for reference, using Intro to Teaching)

How did this artifact assist you in professional growth and development? My students and I will be able to keep track of what will be going on in the classroom, even when I am not there to physically announce it. This will help with communication in and out of the classroom. Of course they will always be able to ask about it as well. I want my students to know what's going on at all times.

Attach a picture of your artifact or upload your actual artifact to this page.

| Tuesday | Thursday |
|---|--|
| April 6th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finish who's who ● Work on philosophy (due Thursday!) ● Introduce artifacts (due Thursday!) | April 8th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Go over philosophy rough drafts ● Go over artifacts |
| April 13th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Begin working on website | April 15th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Continue working on website |
| April 20th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finish up and prepare for semester test week | April 22nd: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Finish up and prepare for semester test week |
| April 27th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Semester test week | April 29th: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Semester test week |

Artifact Two

Description of artifact: A list of learning targets, describing what they should come out of the lesson learning

How did this artifact assist you in professional growth and development? I can help the students understand what I am wanting them to learn from the lesson by communicating with them about the outcomes. This will help me to make sure the students are getting what they need to understand and take away, and they can ask questions or provide feedback to help me understand as well. If they have viewed the targets, participated in the lecture, yet still don't understand, I can help them.

By the end of the week, we will have learned how to:

- Determine the differences between personal, reflexive, relative, and possessive pronouns
- Formulate and compare adjectives
- Determine the differences between countable, uncountable, abstract, and concrete nouns
- Formulate a good rough draft for your essays

Artifact Three

Description of artifact: Clear instructions of an assignment

How did this artifact assist you in professional growth and development? The students will have a clear understanding of what they need to accomplish in their assignment if I not only speak the instructions to them, but have it written down for them to look back on as well.

Attach a picture of your artifact or upload your actual artifact to this page.

Freestyle essay instructions:

- *Choose a topic for your essay...it can be about whatever you want it to be, as long as it is SCHOOL APPROPRIATE!*
- *Be sure to include proper grammar, punctuation, capitalization, etc.*
- *Run your paper through a grammar checking website to ensure you have everything correct!*
- *If you research and use outside sources, be sure to cite your sources with a work cited page in MLA format*
- *DO. NOT. PLAGARIZE. I will be checking your papers using Turnitin so make sure you put things into your own words.*
- *Have fun with your essay! You have free range to talk about whatever you want, whether it be about your grandma, a movie you enjoy, a celebrity, etc., so be creative and make it yours!*

Sample Responses from *Compare & Reflect Assignment* at Progression Point 1 – ED 2203 Introduction to Teaching (CAEP R1.4, R3.2)

Directions Provided to Candidates on a Google Form

Questions Responses 33

Disposition Comparison- Spring 2021

Form description

Your Name

Short answer text

Compare your self evaluation and your professor's feedback. Identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, identify two areas to focus your attention on for professional growth.

Long answer text

Samples of Student Reflections Comparing Faculty Disposition Ratings to Self-Assessment of Dispositions

Compare your self evaluation and your professor's feedback. Identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, identify two areas to focus your attention on for professional growth.

My self evaluation and my professors feedback ran in the same lines. We scored myself similarly in each category. Some of the categories I even gave myself a lower score than she did. My scores stayed in the developing category and above because I still need small parts in my education that need fixed. Professional maturity and professional growth are two categories that I need to focus my attention on. I need to become more confident in speaking in front of a class because I tend to struggle with it a lot. I also did my PGP for professional growth because sometimes I think I can solve things independently when, I need to learn to ask for help and advice in the future.

Compare your self evaluation and your professor's feedback. Identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, identify two areas to focus your attention on for professional growth.

The two areas I'm going to work on are Preparation and Communication. These two areas had a score difference between me and Mrs Wooldridge. I gave myself twos on both of these going off of other classes as well as my education courses. I have struggles in both but I have rarely missed class this semester and when I have missed I always reached out about it. I have also never been late for class. On communication I gave a two because I am getting better at catching my own mistakes and spelling errors but still have work to do. I want to improve these areas the most because they are my lowest scoring ones

Compare your self evaluation and your professor's feedback. Identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, identify two areas to focus your attention on for professional growth.

When comparing my self evaluation and my professor's we rated very similar. In areas, I was much hard on myself than her but I think that is because I believe I still need to improve. One major difference was professional communication. I ranked myself as a 1.5 and she ranked me as a 3. I believe I need to improve on my verbal communication in a casual setting. I believe I am successful in a professional setting when I have an allotted time to prepare and correct, however my grammar is deficient in a private or casual setting. Two areas I want to focus on are professional maturity and professional growth. I believe I have a lot of room to grow in each category, but I am willing to make tremendous strides to do it. I believe there is so much out there to be learned and I have only learned 0.00001% of it. I can mature by working on my confidence levels and not being afraid to take charge, say what needs said, and own my work/pep. I can grow as a professional by seeking opportunities on my own, not just the ones provided for me (WEO, etc). I can start listening to podcasts and researching ideas not only because it will help me grow, but also because I want to.

Compare your self evaluation and your professor's feedback. Identify and discuss the similarities and differences between the ratings. After reviewing, identify two areas to focus your attention on for professional growth.

For professional Maturity I gave myself a 2 and received a 1. I thought I present confident and normally do talk and add in, maybe I just need to pitch in more or be more extensive and explain what I'm saying more. For professional preparation I gave myself a 2 but received a 1. I missed class a couple times and didn't think much of it until later in the semester, **at first I thought of this class as an entry level class or gen ed. Which it is a entry level teaching class but it is more than just that, its pretty much the start of becoming a teacher** and I didn't take it as seriously as I needed to at first and realized that a little late, but I still received and retained amazing information from this class that will benefit me in the future. Also I will make sure in my next classes no matter which class it may be to make it a point to always be in class on time every day.

References

- Ayre, C., & Scally, A. J. (2014). Critical values for Lawshe's content validity ratio: revisiting the original methods of calculation. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 47(1), 79-86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0748175613513808>
- Cummins, L., & Asempapa, B. (2013). Fostering teacher candidate dispositions in teacher education programs. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 13(3), 99-119.
- Choppin, J., & Meuwissen, K. (2017) Threats to validity in the edTPA video component. *Action in Teacher Education*, 39 (1), 39-53, DOI: [10.1080/01626620.2016.1245638](https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2016.1245638)
- Creasy, K. L. (2015). Defining Professionalism in Teacher Education Programs. *Online Submission*, 2(2), 23-25.
- Danielson, C. (2013). The framework for teaching evaluation instrument, 2013 instructionally focused edition. Retrieved January, 17, 2017.
- Graham, M., Milanowski, A., & Miller J. (2012). *Measuring and promoting inter-rater agreement of teacher and principal performance ratings*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED532068.pdf>
- Kane, T. J., & Staiger, D. O. (2012). Gathering Feedback for Teaching: Combining High-Quality Observations with Student Surveys and Achievement Gains. Research Paper. MET Project. *Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation*.
- Lawshe, C.H. (1975). A quantitative approach to content validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 28, 563–575. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1975.tb01393.x
- Yost, D. S. (1997). The moral dimensions of teaching and preservice teachers: Can moral dispositions be influenced?. *Journal of teacher education*, 48(4), 281-292.