

CAEP 2 STANDARD TABLES

2.1

Table 2.1a Clinical Experience Chart

Clinical Experiences		
Pre-professional (Prior to Methods Courses)At the Pre-professional level, candidates use EPP Standards		
<p>EDUC 501: Shadowing Professionals</p> <p><i>Co-requisite: EDUC 102: Introduction to the World of the Learner</i></p> <p>(6 hours)</p>	Description	Introduces candidates to diverse instructional conditions and diverse students to deliver instruction, paying particular attention to instructional strategies used in the classroom. Candidates begin to recognize the personal, cultural and social impact of teaching in diverse conditions and diverse students. Candidates develop personal and global consciousness. Candidates begin to recognize the personal, cultural and social impact teaching has on students.
	Diversity	The demographics of partner schools for this experience include urban, suburban and rural schools with diverse socioeconomic backgrounds that represent the diaspora of Central Brooklyn.
	Technology	The teachers selected must use technology proficiently and understand its impact on learning. Candidates gain an understanding of just and fair interactions, respecting and valuing all learners. Candidates observe teachers selecting teaching methods that are aligned with student needs.
	Standards	<p>MEC Personal and Global Consciousness Standard 2.1</p> <p>MEC Standard Commitment and Care: 8.2)</p> <p>MEC Knowledge 1.7</p> <p>MEC Knowledge 1.3</p> <p>Aligned to INTASC 1,2,3,&4</p>
	Type of Assessment	Product: Reflection
	Improvements	Through TEPAC, this experience has evolved to include shadowing leadership and instructional coaches. Recommendations.
<p>EDUC 502: Observing Students in Inclusive and Special Education Settings</p>	Description	This field experience provides candidates with an opportunity to contextualize learning by identifying varying patterns of learning and development, observing special education students, as well as the content learned in the co-requisite course <i>EDUC 152 – Introduction to Special Education</i> that every learner can meet high standards and that all learners should be challenged.
	Diversity	Candidates can make comparisons of the teaching and learning experience in inclusive and special education settings.
	Technology	Candidates observe students using technology, including assistive technology, to enhance learning.

<i>Co-requisite EDUC 152- Introduction to Special Education</i> (6 hours)	Standards	MEC Knowledge Standard 1.10 & 1.11 MEC Creativity Standard: 4.4 Aligned to INTASC 3,5,9 & 10
	Type of Assessment	Product: Mock Conference/Poster Presentation during which small groups disabilities, and 2) reflective group papers on their disability topics and the
	Improvements	n/a
EDUC 503: Parents and Communities as Partners <i>Co-requisite EDUC 231- Child Development</i> (6 hours)	Description	Candidates learn the roles that parent/families and the larger community play attend and participate in school-based community events. They observe and these events and write an essay about their observations. Candidates observe community work together
	Diversity	Make connections to developmental theories with regard to understanding interactions and collaborative learning environments, among others
	Technology	Candidates use technology to summarize their observations.
	Standards	MEC Collaboration Standard: 7.2) Aligned to INTASC 6
	Type of Assessment	Product: Analytic & Reflective Essay
	Improvements	Through TEPAC 's recommendation, this experience has evolved to include Numeracy and Literacy Coaches.
EDUC 504: Technology in the Classroom: <i>Co Requisite: EDUC 350 Computers in Education</i> (6 hours)	Description	Developing the WebQuest immerses students in the recursive cycle of learning learning tool. Candidates use Standard Written English and dominant dialect
	Diversity	Candidates work with small groups of learners and teachers in general and
	Technology	Candidates to apply and integrate technology, including assistive technology, diverse needs requiring different modifications to the web quest to suit their develop a WebQuest.
	Standards	MEC Standard Knowledge: 1.1 MEC Standard Analytical Thinking: 3.3 MEC Standard Effective Communication 6.1 Aligned to INTASC 5-8
	Type of Assessment	Key Assessment Moving from Product to Performance. Candidates will be guided in using classroom practices using performance rubrics to evaluate their performance
Improvements	Through TEPAC's recommendation, this experience evolved to require tight	

Professional	(Methods Courses) At the professional level, the standards used are program specific Special Professional Standards. Candidates at the professional level of field experiences, are required to use their understanding of content based tools of inquiry and structure of the standards as it impacts critical academic learning outcomes for individuals that encourages positive interactions. Additionally, candidates use their understanding of content based tools of inquiry and structure of the standards. Short term goals are set which take into consideration student understanding of pre-requisite knowledge.	
EDUC 505: Working with Individual Learners Co- requisites <i>EDUC 311 – Teaching of Reading Methods I and EDUC 315 – Teaching Elementary Mathematics</i> (20 hours)	Description	Candidates implement an instructional response using one or more instructional strategies to address content for individual learners. 10 hours executing a Reading Assessment and 10 hours executing mathematics interventions based on a school assessment.
	Diversity	Candidates work with individual students and engage in experiences and reflections in inclusive P-6 classroom settings.
	Technology	Candidates participate in a professional development where they use smartboard to analyze student reading and math performance and work with teachers to identify trends.
	Standards	CEC 3,5; NAEYC 4,5; ACEI 2.1,2.3,3.1,3.2 CEC 3,5; NAEYC 4,5; ACEI 2.1,2.3,3.1,3.2 Aligned to INTASC 7,9& 10
	Type of Assessment	Performance but Rubrics are Products
	Improvements	Moving towards Performance Rubrics. The Math Intervention (Modified) and Reading Intervention. Both interventions have always been a performance-based activity, but the candidates are now writing a paper describing their intervention experience and student outcomes. Now candidates are more engaged in math interventions.
EDUC 506: Working with Small Groups <i>Co-requisites EDUC 312 – Teaching of Reading Methods II; EDUC 381 – Reading Methods & Materials for Learners with Special Needs For CSE & CE</i>	Description	Candidates continue to use their understanding of content-based tools of inquiry and structure of the standards in a discipline accessible. Candidates continue to use their understanding of content-based tools of inquiry and structure of the standards in a discipline accessible. Childhood Education and Childhood Education and Childhood Education methods to become familiar with appropriate practices (7 hours). Science methods course's clinical work with the same children in (CE & CSE 7 hours; ECSE 13 hours; CSE & ECSE 7 hours)
	Diversity	Interventions are geared to candidates having a better understanding of diversity.
	Technology	Low end technology is integrated into the Response to Intervention, such as using manipulatives to increase candidates' phonological awareness and processing fluency.
	Standards	CEC 5; NAEYC 4B&4C; ACEI 3.2 CEC 3; NAEYC 4; ACEI 2 CEC 2; NAEYC 1C; ACEI 3.4 Aligned to INTASC 5 & 10

<p><i>EDUC 314 Social Studies Methods OR EDUC 317: Science Methods</i></p> <p>(20 hours)</p>	<p>Type of Assessment</p>	<p>Performance: Guided Reading Implementation Video and Reflection</p> <p>Performance: Tier 2 Response to Intervention (Reading Intervention-Closi</p>
	<p>Improvements</p>	<p>TEPAC recommended that this learning experience evolve to become a m Response to Intervention and Guided Reading</p>
<p>EDUC 507 Curriculum Research & Design</p> <p><i>Co-Requisite</i></p> <p><i>EDUC 457- Curriculum and Instruction in Childhood Education or EDUC 302- Curriculum and Instruction in Early Childhood Education</i></p> <p>(18 hours)</p>	<p>Description</p>	<p>Candidates’ preparation includes researching and developing their own cur on student contextual information (e.g. culture, demographics, development curriculum mapping, gathering state and city curriculum materials and lea units with content-specific representations and distinguish various learning</p>
	<p>Diversity</p>	<p>Gear curriculum to diverse abilities, instructional conditions and cultures</p>
	<p>Technology</p>	<p>Technology must be integrated in the curriculum unit. These curriculum u this task, candidates meet with Grade Level Curriculum Planning Teams in collaborative setting.</p>
	<p>Standards</p>	<p>This results in the development of a program specific curriculum (NAEYC Aligned to INTASC 9 &10</p>
	<p>Type of Assessment</p>	<p>Product: Writing Interdisciplinary Curriculum</p>
	<p>Improvements</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p>EDUC 508/509</p> <p>Assessment in Childhood / Early Childhood Education</p> <p><i>Co-Requisite: EDUC 340 or EDUC 253</i></p> <p>(12 hours)</p>	<p>Description</p>	<p>This field experience provides candidates with an understanding of assessm assessment-related skills. Candidates observe teachers and identify the use assessments used in elementary general and special education settings. Fur for a variety of diagnostic and progress monitoring purposes, ‘particularly candidates with an understanding of assessment practices in specialized an young children (Birth-8) with special needs, familiarizing themselves and delays and young children with disabilities. In the Childhood Special Educa Grade 6 students. Furthermore, they engage in observing to learn about sel them, completing observation checklists and anecdotal notes, conducting i progress monitored.</p>
	<p>Diversity</p>	<p>Candidates learn to assess and interpret findings of children with differing</p>
	<p>Technology</p>	<p>Information is gathered and analyzed using EXCEL</p>
	<p>Standards</p>	<p>(CEC 4; ACEI 4); (NAEYC 3; CEC ECSE: S4.9; S4.11)</p>

		Aligned to INTASC 1-10
	Type of Assessment	Candidates are evaluated based on a performance-based assessments, but t written to describe, analyze and summarize the assessment activities that v
	Improvements	Moving from product based to performance-based rubrics
EDUC 5- Course Number (5-310) Course <i>Based Field Experience in EDUC 310</i> <i>ECSE & CSE candidates only</i> (10 hours)	Diversity	<i>Each candidate must complete AT LEAST ten hours of field experience wo two specific strategies aimed at changing a student’s challenging behavior work where they are already placed. But, because it is not a separate plac placement. Childhood Special Education and Early childhood Special Ed</i>
	Technology	Information is gathered and illustrative charts created using technology.
	Standards	CEC 1, 2,5,&7 NAEYC 1 &3 INTASC 1,2,3,4,5& 10
	Type of Assessment	<i>The field experience is a performance assessment; the rubric has evolved t</i>
	Improvements	Product moving towards Performance Rubrics
Clinical Practice		
Early Childhood Special Education	Diversity	Settings have different instructional conditions, ethnicities, and socio-econ
	Technology	Use technology to gather information and integrate technology as a resour
	Standards	All NAEYC 1-6, CEC 1-7 & INTASC 1-10
	Type of Assessment	Performance Rubric assessing Planning, Learning Experience Plan, Imple
	Improvements	Rubrics will explicitly include content areas although it is an integrated lite
Childhood Special Education	Diversity	Settings have different instructional conditions, different ethnicities, socio-
	Technology	Use technology to gather information and integrate technology as a resour
	Standards	All CEC 1-7 & INTASC 1-10
	Type of Assessment	Performance Rubric assessing Planning, Learning Experience Plan, Imple
	Improvements	n/a
Childhood Education	Diversity	Settings have different ethnicities, socio-economic status
	Technology	Use technology to gather information and integrate technology as a resour
	Standards	All ACEI 1-5 & INTASC 1-10

	Type of Assessment	Performance Rubric assessing Planning, Learning Experience Plan, Imple
	Improvements	n/a

Table 2.1b List of School Partners :Demographic and Alumni Identification

PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS AND TYPE OF FIELD EXPERIENCE	% OF STUDENTS AT PROFICIENT LEVEL IN MATH AND READING		DEMOGRAPHICS (2017)										
	Math	Reading	Gender		Race					Socio-economic	Demographic Trends	ELL	SP
Note 1)- Indicates MEC Alumni			M	F	AA	LA	AS	WH	MU	% Rec. Red School Lunch			
Note 2) PARTNER SINCE 2005													
PS 5 Dr. Ronald McNair School Principal L. Gates 820 Hancock St. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11233 (718) 574-2333	39.6	25.4	50	50	79	15	0	3	1	90	Largest homeless population in district Lab School	4	32
Field: EDUC 503: Parents & Community Partners													
Clinical Practice													
PS 6 Norma Adams Clemons Academy Principal S. Porter 43 Snyder Ave Brooklyn, NY 11226 (718) 856-6560	20.7	17.4	49	51	72	22	1	3	0	72	-----	20	23
Field: EDUC 502: Observing Students in Clinical and Inclusive Settings													

Clinical Practice													
PS 26 Jesse Owens School Principal Dr. C. Celestine 1014 Lafayette Ave Brooklyn, NY 11221 (718) 919-5707	46	43.3	56	44	66	29	2	2	0	77	Gifted Program & Autistim Program	10	31
Field: EDUC 502: EDUC 502: Observing Students in Clinical and Inclusive Settings Clinical Practice													
PS 44 Marcus Garvey School Principal R. James 432 Monroe St. Brooklyn, NY 11221 (718) 834-6939 PARTNER SINCE 2005	24.3	24.3	49	51	80	13	3	2	1	97	Increase in students from Southeast Asia & Middle East	8	24
Field: EDUC 506 (Assessment 381 ECSE, CSE& CE;) Clinical Practice													
PS 46 Edward C. Blum School Principal K. Nicholson	22.7	20.9	49	51	54	41	1	2	1	92	Increase in students from Middle East	15	32

100 Clermont Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11205 (718) 834-7694														
Field: EDUC 501 Clinical Practice														
PS 81 Thaddeus Stevens School Principal C. Ault-Baker 990 Dekalb Avenue Brooklyn, N.Y. 11221 (718) 574-2365 PARTNER SINCE 2005	10	17.9	45	55	56	36	3	0	1	94	_____	21	34	
EDUC 504 Clinical Practice														
PS 92 Adrian Hegeman School Principal Dr. Samerson 601 Parkside Ave Brooklyn, New York 11226 (718)462-2088	17.9	19.8	52	48	73	16	9	1	0	87	_____	22	18	
TOC EDUC Field Experience Clinical Practice														
PS 108 Sal Abbracciamento	44.7	47.8	50	50	12	79	6	1	0	71	-----	14	27	

School Principal C Hahn Assistant Principal Espinal 200 Linwood St. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11208 (718) 277-7010														
Clinical Practice														
PS 161 Crown School Principal Mr. M. Johnson 330 Crown Street Brooklyn, New York 11225 (718) 756-3100	28.2	34.3	56	44	81	11	4	2	1	95	_____	3	19	
EDUC 501														
PS 181 John Steptoe School Principal Mr. V. Esannason 1023 New York Ave Brooklyn, N.Y. 11203 (718) 462-5298 PARTNER SINCE 2005	53	47	51	49	83	11	1	2	17	62	_____	13	19	
TOC Field Experience														
PS 249	71	60.4	51	49	42	48	6	4	0	68	_____	24	20	

The Caton School Principal E. Brown 18 Marlborough Rd. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11226 (718)282-8828 PARTNER SINCE 2005														
EDUC 501 & 502														
PS 256 Benjamin Banneker School Principal Ms. S. Hemphill 114 Kosciuszko St Brooklyn, N.Y. 11216 (718) 857-9820	37.1	35.2	54	46	71	24	2	2	0	96		9	24	
Clinical Practice														
PS 282 Park Slope School Principal Mr. R Hoke Asst. Principals Sidbury & St Just 180 Sixth Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11217 (718) 622-1626	30	47.1	51	49	58	27	4	10	1	59	Autism Program	5	19	
EDUC 505 (311 & Assessment 315) Clinical Practice														

PS 321 William Penn School Principal L Phillips 180 Seventh Avenue Brooklyn, NY 11215 (718) 499-2412	86.7	84	50	50	4	7	6	77	5	7			3	15
Clinical Practice														
PS 375 Jackie Robinson School Principal 46 McKeever Pl Brooklyn, N.Y. 11225 (718) 693-6655	20.3	21.7	54	46	61	30	3	4	0	90		Increasing Multi-lingual Population from Africa	29	28
EDUC 501 EDUC 503														
PS 397 Foster Laurie Principal Ms. M Monteau 490 Fenimore St. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11203 (718) 774-5200	32.3	41	50	50	80	6	3	10	1	84			16	21
TOC Field Experience														
DISTRICT 75 Principal Ms. E. Russell	---	----	83	17	44	22	14	20	0	58			24	10

PS 77 62 Park Pl. Brooklyn, N. Y.11217 (718) 789-1191																				
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Clinical Practice

Day Care Centers

Inner Force Ms. Sween (Birth -2) Ms. Jones (3-5) 1181 E. New York Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11212 (718) 221-1246

Clinical Practice

Community Parents Head Start Ms. John 1809 -90 Chauncey Street Brooklyn, New York 11233 (718) 771-4002 _____

Clinical Practice

Ella Baker Dir. Janet Mcintosh 1150 Carroll St. Brooklyn, N.Y. 11225 (718) 270-6018	Lab School		
---	------------	--	--

Clinical Practice

KEY

M=male; F=Female; AA=African American; LA=Latin American; WH= White; MU= Multi-racial

Rec Red Scl Lnch%=Receiving Reduced School Lunch

2.1 Reference Table : Standard 5: Table 5.1e Grant Projects

2.2

Table 2.2a: Faculty Qualifications

College Clinical Faculty

NAME	GENDER	RACE/ETHNICITY				RANK or TITLE	STATUS F/T or P/T	DEGREE	AREA(S)
		African-American	Latin X	Asian	Caucasian				
Siolen Ho	F			Asian American		Lecturer	PT	M.Ed.	Elementary Education
Joyce Barrett-Walker	F	African-American (Southern & Caribbean Heritage)				Lecturer.	PT	M.S	Administrative Supervision
Kenneth Hoyte	M	African American				Assoc. Prof	FT	PhD BA	Neuroscience Behavioral Science
Margaret Lafontant	F	Haitian--American				Assistant. Prof	FT	PhD MSE BS	Developmental Psychology Bi-lingual Ed Psychology
Donna Wright	F	African American				Assoc. Professor	FT	PhD M.Phil	Educational Psychology

NAME	GENDER	RACE/ETHNICITY				RANK or TITLE	STATUS F/T or P/T	DEGREE	AREA(S)
		African- American	Latin X	Asian	Caucasian				
		(Caribbean Heritage)						M.Ed MA BA	Learning Instru Literacy Acquisit Remedia Basic Ac Literacy Interven grades
Salika Lawrence	F	Guyanese- American				Assoc. Prof	FT	PhD MA MA BA	Sociolog Social S Educatio
Rupam Saran	F			South East Indian- American		Assoc. Prof.	FT	PhD MA BA BSc	Math, Sc Technol Childho Ed Element and Soci

NAME	GENDER	RACE/ETHNICITY				RANK or TITLE	STATUS F/T or P/T	DEGREE	AREA(S)
		African- American	Latin X	Asian	Caucasian				
									Political & Socio
Taboara Johnson	F	Jamaican- American				Assistant Prof.	FT	Ed.D.	Educational Leadership
Alicia Collins	F	African- American				HEO	FT	Ed.D.	Educational
Rosalina Diaz	F		Puerto Rican- American			Assoc Prof.	FT	Ph.D	Urban E

Table 2.2b: Action Research Publications List

Publications
Lawrence S., Johnson T., Baptiste M., Caleb A., Sieunarine C., and Similien, C. (2017). "Pre-Service Teachers' Use of Multicultural Literature," <i>Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education</i> , 9 (1), Article 3.
Lawrence S., Johnson T., Baptiste M., Caleb A., Sieunarine C., and Similien, C. (2017). "Pre-Service Teachers' Use of Multicultural Literature," <i>Journal of Inquiry and Action in Education</i> , 9 (1), Article 3.
Johnson, T., & Crafton, J. (2016). "Putting...celery stalks in the red water": Inquires & insights from a pre-service action project. <i>International Journal of Humanities Social Sciences and Education</i> . 3 (1), 95-102.
Presentations
Johnson, T., Andrews, A. (April, 2018). Power within: Examining a pre-service teacher's use of mindfulness activities in an urban classroom. Presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association (AERA), New York, NY.
Lawrence, S. A. & Johnson, T. (November, 2016). Pre-service teachers' culturally relevant literacy instruction for linguistically diverse students. Paper to be presented at National Council of Teachers of English Annual Conference, Atlanta, GA.
Lawrence, S. A., Johnson, T., Baptiste, M. (November, 2016). Using Culturally Relevant Texts in Elementary Classrooms. Paper presented at the 2016 Annual Conference, New York State Reading Association, Saratoga Springs, NY

Table 2.2c: Cooperating Teachers, Site and College Supervisor Evaluations

(with observations)

2017

The tables below summarize teacher candidates’ evaluation of: (a) Clinical Practice Sites (b) Cooperating Teacher, and (c) College Supervisor. Rating sheets were collected from a total of 32 binders. Not all binders contained rating forms for all three categories for evaluation. A sample of 8 complete set of rating sheets were used. Confusion in the use of forms have persisted. Forms should be used via an electronic system that will reduce human error. The information recorded reflects the number of teacher candidates who assigned ratings against the standards indicated. All candidates affirm that placements are with diverse students in organized orderly classroom settings where best teaching practices are observed. However, two of the sites did not incorporate candidates into its professional development and one did not provide access to resources. One candidate claimed that cooperating teachers’ orientation to clinical practice needed to improve and that collaboration with the EPP was not apparently valued. Two Cooperating Teachers were emerging in their incorporation of technology and interdisciplinary/integrated curricula practices and encouragement in students’ use of academic language was lacking. Two candidates stated that the College Supervisor had emerging ability in discussing New York learning standards. Following the table is a detailed analysis of issues with the forms used to evaluate Clinical Practice Sites, Cooperating Teacher and College Supervisor.

Cooperating Teacher (N=8)					
<i>Standard 1 – The college supervisor/cooperating teacher’s knowledge and skills are utilized to develop MEC teacher candidate’s professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.</i>					
		Exemplary	Competent	Emerging	Unacceptable
1	Is credentialed in the subject areas in which she/he is teaching	9	0	0	0
2	Discusses instruction in compliance with New York State Learning Standards	8	1	0	0
3	Models and/or identifies use of “best practices’ and techniques in instruction and assessment	6	3	0	0
4	Assists teacher candidate in the use of best practices	8	1	0	0
5	Discusses the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners	6	2	1	0

6	Discusses the use of effective behavioral modification techniques	5	2	2	0
7	Discusses creative, appropriate resources, materials and technology in instruction	5	2	2	0
8	Discuss interdisciplinary/integrated curricular practices	5	2	1	0
9	Discusses the importance of academics language	5	2	1	0
10	Discusses the importance of engaging students	5	4	0	0
Standard 2 – <i>The cooperating teacher’s dispositions are conducive to a positive and rewarding learning experience to the MEC teacher candidate</i>					
1	Demonstrates commitment to host and mentor a MEC teacher candidate	8	1	0	0
2	Provides frequent opportunities for MEC teacher candidate to instruct and manage individual, group and whole classes	4	3	2	0
3	Provides teacher candidate with frequent feedback about his/her practice	5	1	3	0
*4	Provides timely feedback to college supervisor on teacher candidate’s performance, attendance, punctuality and professional demeanor	5	4	0	0
5	Demonstrates a positive, respectful attitude toward the teacher candidate	8	0	2	0
6	Demonstrates a positive, respectful attitude toward the students	7	2	1	0
7	Creates a classroom environment in which issues of equity and justice are valued, practiced and promoted	7	3	0	0
8	Creates a nonthreatening classroom environment that supports receptivity and reciprocity between teacher and students	7	3	0	0

**Clinical Practice Site
(N=8)**

Standard 1 – School/Agency provides an exemplary model (environment) for teaching and learning for MEC Teacher Education Program candidates

		Exemplary	Competent	Emerging	Unacceptable
4	Classrooms are composed of diverse student populations	7	1	0	0
6	Classrooms are orderly, organized, with students actively involved in learning	8	0	0	0
7	Evidence of best practices in teaching and learning are visible in classrooms	7	1	0	0

Standard 2 – School/Agency provides MEC Teacher Education Program candidates with opportunities to develop professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.

1	Teacher candidates are placed with cooperating teachers who meet or exceed MEC expectations	7	1	0	0
2	Teacher candidates are placed in classrooms that have diverse student populations	5	3	0	0
3	Teacher candidates are encouraged to participate in school professional development activities, e.g. workshops, faculty/grade meetings	3	2	1	2
4	Teacher candidates are provided with access to support in the use of school/agency resources, including technology and libraries	6	1	0	1

Standard 3 – School/Agency creates a caring learning community and professional culture for teacher candidates (through collaboration and communication).

2	MEC School of Education personnel provide an orientation for cooperating teachers	5	3	0	1
3	Collaboration with MEC School of Education is perceived as an opportunity to contribute to the teaching profession	6	1	1	1
4	Timely feedback to the college supervisor concerning teacher	6	3	0	0

	candidate's attendance, punctuality and professional demeanor is provided				
5	Communication with the MEC School of Education coordinator of early field and clinical experience and supervision faculty is timely and on-going	7	2	0	0

College Supervisor (N=8)

Standard 1 – The college supervisor/cooperating teacher's knowledge and skills are utilized to develop MEC teacher candidate's professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.

1	Is credentialed in the subject areas in which she/he is teaching	Exemplary	Competent	Emerging	Unacceptable
		7	1	0	0
2	Discusses instruction in compliance with New York State Learning Standards	5	1	2	0
3	Models and/or identifies use of "best practices" and techniques in instruction and assessment	7	1	0	0
4	Assists teacher candidate in the use of best practices	7	1	0	0
5	Discusses the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners	8	0	0	0
6	Discusses the use of effective behavioral modification techniques	5	3	0	0
7	Discusses creative, appropriate resources, materials and technology in instruction	7	1	0	0
8	Discuss interdisciplinary/integrated curricular practices	8	0	0	0
9	Discusses the importance of academic language	8	0	0	0
10	Discusses the importance of engaging students	8	0	0	0

11	Discusses the importance of unique practices for early, special or childhood education	5	2	0	0
Standard 2 –The cooperating teacher’s dispositions are conducive to a positive and rewarding learning experience to the MEC teacher candidate					
1	Demonstrates commitment to host and mentor a MEC teacher candidate	7	1	0	0
2	Provides frequent opportunities for MEC teacher candidate to instruct and manage individual, group and whole classes	7	1	0	0
3	Provides teacher candidate with frequent feedback about his/her practice	7	1	0	0
4	Provides timely feedback to college supervisor on teacher candidate’s performance, attendance, punctuality and professional demeanor	7	1	0	0
5	Demonstrates a positive, respectful attitude toward the teacher candidate	8	0	0	0
6	Demonstrates a positive, respectful attitude toward the students	8	0	0	0
7	Creates a classroom environment in which issues of equity and justice are valued, practiced and promoted	8	0	0	0
8	Creates a nonthreatening classroom environment that supports receptivity and reciprocity between teacher and students	8	0	0	0
Observations					
<p><i>Completion of Forms</i></p> <p>Thirty-two (32) forms were retrieved from students’ binders. Issues with the forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all forms were completed with basic demographic information (names omitted, no supervisor’s name); • Forms for both Fall and Spring Semester were not available for all students. 					

- Totals were not tabulated for all sections. Items for one entire standard was missing.

There were two forms for College Supervisor/Cooperating Teacher. The form seemed to have been revised, but both forms were still being used.

One form had 12 questions, and the other had 10. It appeared that the form with 12 questions was for College Supervisors, but some students used the form to evaluate both College Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher. *Reliability would be affected because of the difference in the total of 33 instead of 36.* Other observed discrepancies were:

Different phrasing on questions under Standard 1 of College Supervisor/Cooperating Teachers

- (1) Item 1 - *Plans and implements instruction in compliance with New York State Learning Standards;* and

Discusses instruction in compliance with New York State Learning Standards.

- (2) Item 3 – *Models use of best practices and techniques in instruction and assessment;* and
Models and/or identifies use of best practices in techniques in instruction and assessment

- (3) Item 5 - *Models the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners;* and

Discusses the use of differentiated instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners

- (4) Item 6 - *Assists teacher candidates in the use of differentiated instruction;* and

Item 6 - Discusses the use of behavioural modification techniques

- (5) Item 7- *Models the use of positive behavioural modification techniques*

- (6) Items 7&8 are repeated – *Discusses the use of creative, appropriate resources, materials and technology in instruction. (Interestingly, most students assigned different scores, although it was the same item).*

- (7) Item 9 on one form - *Models the use of creative, appropriate resources, materials and technology in instruction;* and

Item 10 - Assists teacher candidates in the use of creative, appropriate resource, materials and technology

(8) Item 11- *Discusses the importance of academic language*

(9) Item 12 - *Discusses the importance of unique practices for early, special or childhood education*

In general, (a) students seemed not to have taken care in filling out the forms; (b) full names were missing, (c) signatures were missing, and (d) the title of the person being reviewed was not selected by all students.

Instead of a shared form for College Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher, separate forms should be used.

2.2 Reference Tables: Standard 1

Table 1.1q: Clinical Practice Implementation Data -ECSE

Table 1.qi : Clinical Practice Implementation Data-CSE

Table 1.qii : Clinical Prctice Implementation Data -CE

2.3 References Tables : Standard 1

Table 1.5X : Diversity Table

Table 1.5X : Technology Table

2.3 Reference Tables : Standard 1

Tables 1.5 & 1.5a : Technology Clinical Practice Rubric Items

Table 2.3a Mathematics Modification Summary Data

Modified Lesson Plan & Instruction

Developing and Teaching a Modified Mathematics Lesson

Candidate Performance Data Tables: 2015-2017

Year	N	Unsatisfactory Grades D to F	Emerging Grades C to C+	Competent Grades B- to B+	Exemplary Grades A- to A+
2015	22	0 (0%)	7 (32%)	6 (27%)	9 (41%)
2016	19	0 (0%)	2 (11%)	9 (47%)	8 (42%)
2017	18	2 (11%)	2 (11%)	5 (28%)	9 (50%)

Table 2.3b Statistical Analyses on Clinical Practice

Assessment Question: Do evaluations represent a true score?

Summary of Data for Two Cycles 2016-2017

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

PLANNING

Basic Level for Instruction to Develop Knowledge of Pedagogical Constraints and Considerations: Influences in the Learning Environment in Applying content Knowledge

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 2	10%	57.5%	32.5%	84
NAEYC 4	11%	58.7%	30%	84
NAEYC 6	9.4%	60%	30.6%	87
CEC 2	10%	60%	30%	87
CEC6	19%	51%	30%	80
CEC 7	9.6%	56%	34%	86

Intermediate Planning for Instruction: Understanding Content Knowledge and its Intersection with Child Development

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 1	12.5%	55%	32.5%	84
NAEYC 5	11%	55%	34%	86
NAEYC 6	10%	63%	27%	85
CEC 1	10%	50%	40%	88
CEC 3	9%	66%	25%	80
CEC 5	10%	60%	30%	86
CEC 7	11%	59%	30%	82

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

Advanced Independent Planning of Instruction: Children’s Abilities Assets and Challenges Inform Teaching Accommodating Learning Differences

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 4	10%	51%	39%	89
CEC 1	10%	50%	40%	89
CEC 3	9%	66%	25%	83
CEC 4	25%	47.5%	27.5%	84
CEC 5	10%	51%	39%	

Advanced Planning of Instruction for Content Knowledge Relating Children’s Prior Knowledge to Language and Literacy Development to Support an Understanding of the Central Focus

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 3	22%	48%	30%	80
NAEYC 4	3%	50%	47%	80
CEC 4	3%	59%	38%	87
CEC 5	3%	50%	47%	88

Supporting Children’s Development and Learning to Apply Content Knowledge Using Appropriate Instructional Strategies

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 1	7.5%	65%	27.5%	86
NAEYC 2	3%	61%	36%	86
NAEYC 4	3%	62.5%	34.5%	86
CEC 1	3%	59%	38%	84
CEC 2	7.5%	65%	27.5%	88

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

CEC 5	3%	62.5%	34.5%	86
-------	----	-------	-------	----

CEC 6	10%	65%	25%	84
-------	-----	-----	-----	----

Advanced Planning of Instruction of Content Knowledge: Supporting Children’s Language Development

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

NAEYC 4	7.5%	65%	27.5%	85
---------	------	-----	-------	----

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

NAEYC 5	7.5%	65%	27.5%	85
---------	------	-----	-------	----

CEC 5	7.5%	65%	27.5%	85
-------	------	-----	-------	----

Overall Planning for Appropriate Inclusion: More Attention to Learning Differences

CEC 2	0%	50%	50%	89
-------	----	-----	-----	----

CEC 3	0%	50%	50%	89
-------	----	-----	-----	----

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of Learning Experience through Instructional Strategies: Promoting a Positive Learning Environment

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

NAEYC 1	19%	52%	29%	84
---------	-----	-----	-----	----

NAEYC 2	23%	40%	37%	84
---------	-----	-----	-----	----

NAEYC 4	20%	52.5%	27.5%	84
---------	-----	-------	-------	----

CEC 5	20%	47.5%	32.5%	84
-------	-----	-------	-------	----

CEC 6	23%	40%	37%	84
-------	-----	-----	-----	----

Implementation of Learning Experience: Engaging Children in Differential Learning Using Developmentally Appropriate Practices

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 1	20%	57.5%	22.5%	86
NAEYC 2	18%	50%	32%	86
NAEYC 4	20%	55%	25%	84
CEC 1	38%	43%	19%	82
CEC 3	22.5%	55%	22.5%	84
CEC 4	25%	52.5%	22.5%	84
CEC 5	19%	53%	28%	84

Implementation of Learning Experience through Instructional Strategies: Imparting Content Knowledge

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 5	19%	55%	26%	83
CEC 3	20%	52.5%	27.5%	84
CEC 5	20%	55%	20%	84

Implementation of Learning Experience: Pedagogical Content Knowledge (applying content knowledge)

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
CEC 3	20%	47.5%	32.5%	84
CEC 5	20%	47.5%	32.5%	84

Self-Reflection: Analyzing Teaching

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

NAEYC 1	22.5%	52.5%	25%	83
NAEYC 5	20%	57.5%	22.5%	83
CEC 1	21%	59%	20%	86
CEC2	20%	65%	15%	87
CEC 4	22.5%	52.5%	25%	83

OUTCOMES

Analyzing Children's Learning

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 3	23%	46%	31%	80
NAEYC 4	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80
CEC 1	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80
CEC 4	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80
CEC 6	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80

Outcomes of Student Assessment: Feedback to Guide Further Learning

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 4	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80
CEC 6	32.5%	37.5%	30%	80

Outcomes of Assessment : Evidence of Language Understanding and Use

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
NAEYC 4	12.5%	57.5%	30%	83

N=15 EARLY CHILDHOOD SPECIAL EDUCATION RUBRIC: PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING INSTRUCTION

Planning Interrater Reliability-.517 lower range .369 upper range .624

Implementation Interrater Reliability- .383 lower range -.080 upper-range .626

CEC 6 12.5% 57.5% 30% 83

Outcomes of Assessment: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

NAEYC 6	32.5%	47.5%	25%	81
---------	-------	-------	-----	----

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

CEC 6	32.5%	47.5%	25%	81
-------	-------	-------	-----	----

Overall Evaluation of Teacher Candidate Assessment of Children’s Learning

Standards	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Mean
-----------	----------	-----------	-----------	------

NAEYC 1	32.5%	32.5%	35%	80
---------	-------	-------	-----	----

NAEYC 3	13%	55%	32%	84
---------	-----	-----	-----	----

NAEYC 4	12.5%	52.5%	35%	86
---------	-------	-------	-----	----

CEC 2	32.5%	32.5%	35%	80
-------	-------	-------	-----	----

CEC 4	12.5%	55%	32.5%	84
-------	-------	-----	-------	----

Assessment Question: Is candidate performance specific to particular content areas?

Childhood Education: A Look at Content Area Performance

Indices	Year	Emerging	Competent--Exemplary
Across all Dimensions	2015-2017	15-20%	80% -85%

Selected Content Area Dimensions									
Reading	2015			2016			2017		
	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary	Emerging	Competent	Exemplary
	5%	45%	50%	5%	55%	40%	5%	75%	20%
Math	5%	45%	50%	5%	55%	40%	5%	55%	40%

Assessment Question: Does candidate instructional delivery result in student learning?

Childhood Special Education Candidates' Influence on Student Learning: A Look at Positive Outcomes Across Reading and Math

YEAR	Across Reading and Math			
	Exemplary SCORE 3 Grade Range: A-/A (90-100)	Competent SCORE 2 Grade Range: B-/B/B+ (80-89)	Emerging SCORE 1 Grade Range: C/C+ (70-79)	Unsatisfactory Score 0 Grade Range: D/F (0-69)
2015	7	5	2	0
2016	2	2	1	0
2017	1	2	2	0

Table 2.3c Standard 2 Action Plan

Areas for Development/Review	Goal	Task 1	Task 2	Task 3
Rubric Development	Move from Product to Performance Assessments	Workshop on Rubric Development	Rewrite/Improve Own Rubrics	Upload Approved Rubrics to Sharepoint
EDUC 504		Qualitative vs. Quantitative		Share with TEPAC
EDUC 505		Words to Avoid		Add to Assessment Handbooks
EDUC 506 (Review Performance Rubrics)		Process Analysis		
EDUC 508/509 EDUC 5-310				
Time Line		October 2018	November 2018	December 2018
Early Childhood Special Education Clinical Practice Rubrics	Additions and Clarifications	Specify Content Areas and choose the essential content based competencies for skills and knowledge	Add in rubric	Monitor its utility with candidates, college supervisors and cooperating teachers
		Provide examples of rubric related practices, skills application of knowledge on the rubric criterion	Add in examples on Data Summary Sheets on clinical practice rubrics	Monitor its utility with candidates, college supervisors and cooperating teachers
Time Line		October 2018	October 2018	November-December 2018
Candidate Career Readiness	Writing Small Technology Grants	Collaborating with cooperating teacher to identify technology needs	Identifying small grants as an inclusion in Clinical Practice Seminar	Grant Writing Practice for Enriching Curriculum with Technology

Time Line		October 2018	November 2018	December 2018
Review Clinical Experience Initiatives	EDUC 501: Shadowing Professionals	Shadowing all professional and not just teachers	Interview PS 46 to determine its benefit	Suggest Modifications
	EDUC 503: Community as Partners	Assess benefit of interviewing Parent Coordinators, School Psychologists and Guidance Counselors	Interview PS 5,92 to determine its benefit	Suggest Modifications
Time Line		October 2018	November 2018	December 2018
Ella Baker Charles Romain Day Care Center	Moving towards becoming a lab school	Conduct a facility walk through	Order Furniture	Contact Dept. of Health
Time Line		September 2018	September 2018	December 2018
	Monitor Utility of New Learning Experience Plan for Children Under 4 years	Provide Professional Development on Multiculturalism	Review of Teacher Journal entries	Observing the Implementation of the new learning experience plan
Time Line		July 2018-done	October 2018	November 2018