1.1: Candidates Demonstrate Progressive Knowledge of 10 InTASC Standards

The EPP uses several measures to demonstrate candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions, and to show how these proficiencies achieve the goals of the EPP's Candidate Performance Standards, which are closely aligned with the 10 InTASC Standards *(Table 1.1).* Candidate learning and practical experiences begin with gaining knowledge and demonstrating understanding of diverse learners and learning by completing an education core curriculum of 5 courses *(Tables 1.1a – 1.1c).* The field experiences are progressive in nature, and begin with observation, followed by immersion into supervised practice, then whole class teaching in Clinical Practice.

Evidence to Support the Learner and Learning

1. Early Field Experiences

To demonstrate contextualization of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments, the EPP's four early field experiences provide evidence that candidates have a deeper understanding of these factors and how they influence and impact teaching and learning in diverse settings *(Table 1.1k)*. These early experiences are required by all candidates in all programs and reflect alignments to INTASC Standards.

2. The Educating All Students Test (EAS)

All candidates are required to take the EAS licensure exam. The external assessment measures candidates' knowledge, skills, and dispositions including their capacity to teach diverse learners (see outcomes on Table 1.1l – 1.1lii.

Analysis: Candidate performance on EAS show the EPP achieved a pass rate above 80% among all test takers across all programs. With slight fluctuations in test taking rates (83% in 2015, 78% in 2016, 94% in 2017) overall pass rates remain above 80%. Disaggregated data by program (*Figure 1.1b: Test Takers by program EAS*), show that more than 50% of candidates across programs pass the EAS between 2015 and 2017. Although CSE candidates had lower percentages of program completers taking the test (2015=92%, 2016=72%, 2017=60%), they had better performance rates than ECSE candidates. The number of CE candidates is too small to make a comparison across 3 years. ECSE candidates demonstrated greater strengths in Competencies 4-Teacher Responsibilities, and 5-School Home Relationship. The majority of ECSE candidates (81%) scored at Level 3 or 4 on Competency 4, and 87.5% on Competency 5.

Interpretation: Candidates taking the EAS demonstrated knowledge of learners and learning, how to apply knowledge in practice, and professional responsibilities to support the development of learners. Despite the fluctuations in the number of candidates passing the exam, across programs and licensure areas, on average more than half of program completers take and pass the EAS exam. Although the small number of CE candidates limits comparisons across programs, of the candidates who took the EAS

between 2015 and 2017, CSE candidates appear to perform better than ECSE candidates. The pass rates on this assessment show that candidates know how to support diverse learners including ELLs (Component 2) and students with disabilities (Component 3).

3. Content Knowledge - GPA in Concentration

Candidate performances in required subject–specific courses assess their levels of proficiency compared to non-candidate performance in the courses at two transition points: 1) Professional Program Entry and 2) Subject–Area Concentrations (*Table 1.1m.)*

Analysis: Candidates had higher means than non-EPP students in English at the entry level. In mathematics, EPP candidates were at or above the means of non-EPP students in 2015 and 2017, but lower in 2016 at the entry level. In science, EPP candidates had higher means in 2015 and 2016, but lower than non-EPP science students in 2017. Comparisons between concentration courses (EPP) and the majors show lower means for EPP candidates in English (2016), mathematics (2017) and science (2015 and 2017). EPP candidates were at or above the means in Psychology and Social Studies than their counterparts in the majors. Across programs, the means for CE candidates were at or above the means for non-EPP students on all, except mathematics in 2016. ECSE candidates were at or above the means of non-EPP students in all five subject areas in 2015; but lower in English in 2016 and mathematics and science in 2017. CSE candidates were at or higher than non-EPP in both English and Social Studies across the three years, but lower in Mathematics in 2017 and Science in 2015.

Interpretation: EPP candidates perform at or better than non-EPP candidates in content knowledge across most subject areas, both at the entry level and in their concentrations. CE and CSE candidates had better results in mathematics, English and science than ECSE candidates. However, ECSE candidates were strong in psychology and social studies. EPP candidates typically outperform peers in English, psychology, and social studies, demonstrating significant strengths in these academic content areas. The most challenging area for EPP candidates is mathematics. Even in the cases where the EPP mean was below the non-EPP mean, candidates were able to achieve an overall GPA of 3.0 in mathematics and science in their concentration coursework. **The weakness in mathematics and science has implications for the EPP's preparation of STEM teachers in relation to the larger population of students served at the College. This prompted the EPP to institute several measures to improve mathematical abilities earlier to better prepare its prospective teachers (see Action Plan).**

Evidence to Support Application of Content Knowledge

1. The Reading Intervention Project is designed to assess candidates' skills in evaluating reading abilities and providing the necessary intervention for students at risk for reading failure. It is one of the EPP's assessment points and a major program assessment for all candidates. *Table 1.1n:* and *Table 1.1n* provide evidence of candidate performances and their impact on student learning outcomes.

Analysis: In 2015 almost all candidates (93%) completed this assessment at the highest level of performance (Exemplary), with only one candidate (7%) performing at Competent. Over 70% of them demonstrated significant strengths across all of the domains assessed. While all candidates in 2016 and 2017 passed the assessment, the majority were rated as Competent (75%; 81% respectively). Analyses across the measures show that 2015 candidates demonstrated significant strengths on *Knowledge* and use of theories and research (CEC 1.0, NAEYC 1; ACEI 1.0), their ability to plan and implement instruction to help diverse learners - *Analytical Ability* (CEC 4.1; NAEYC 3; ACEI 3.2), and *Creativity* in meeting individualized goals (CEC 4.2; 4.4; NAEYC 3; ACEI 3.1), with 80% - 90% earning Exemplary on the Standards. The 2016 cohort had lower achievement ratings on this assessment. The majority (75%) performed at Competent across seven of the eight measures assessed. Notable challenge for candidates was on the EPP measure of *Analytical Ability*, where 50% were Emerging in their ability to implement modified general and specialized curriculum (CEC 3.3). Results in 2017 reflected better performances than in 2016, in that over 80% of candidates were Competent across all EPP and SPA measures, with the strongest performances (94%) on CEC 6.0; ACEI 5.1.

Impact on Student Learning

The importance of value added assessment prompted the EPP to expand this project in 2016 to include data reporting and sharing on learning outcomes from the interventions, with careful consideration of the ethical principles of the profession. Referred to as *Closing the Gap*, results from two years of implementation shows the impact of candidate interventions in improving the performances of readers identified by partner schools as at risk. Between 2016 and 2017, only 50% of the 2016 cohort were Competent, while most candidates (100% in 2017; 50% in 2016) were rated as Emerging in masterfully executing the tasks involved in this performance assessment. Results of the post-tests showed improvements beyond the 35% benchmark (50%-90% in 2016: Gr 2-3; 37%-76% in 2017: K-2).

Interpretation: Data show that 100% of candidates met the criteria for passing this assessment and therefore met the EPP and SPA standards assessed. Among the 38 candidates completing this assessment, the program realized that a majority (87%) of its candidates achieved more than adequate knowledge and skills to effectively impact student learning to read, having met the criteria at the Competent to Exemplary levels of assessment. While only 34% performed at the Exemplary level, the vast majority competently demonstrate understanding of disabilities and differences, and their impact on reading performance. Candidates demonstrated use of developmental theories and research to design learning opportunities that impacted students' reading performance (ACEI 1.0; NAEYC 1). They showed adequate knowledge of the differences in learning styles (ACEI 1.0, NAEYC 1, CEC ECSE S1.1), and differentiated for individualized learning goals (ACEI 3.1) by adapting curriculum materials and creating positive learning experiences for at risk readers (ACEI 3.2; NAEYC 4a). They demonstrated their skills in

using assessment instruments and using the information from these assessments (CEC 4; ACEI 4.0; NAEYC 3) to select, modify and use effective approaches, strategies and tools to provide reading interventions and instruction for students (CEC 3.3; ACEI 3.1; ACEI 3.2). They demonstrated adequate engagement in the professional field through their learning communities, and reflected on their experience in implementing the interventions aligned to curriculum standards and learning goals (CEC 6: ACEI 5.1). The results on improvements in reading among the K-3 students who participated in the project clearly validate the importance and success of this assessment.

Evidence to Support Instructional Practice

1. **Knowledge of Assessment**

   a) Test Development Project

This assignment requires CSE and CE candidates to assess understanding and use of formal and informal assessments in education. Candidates conduct informal interviews with parents and teachers to gather background information on the students' skills, areas of strengths, and areas of needs. They administer the Peabody Individual Achievement Test, and the Woodcock Johnson Math Reasoning Battery or the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test in the diagnosis of a Learning Disability. Using the analysis of the results of these formal assessments and the background anecdotal information gathered from parents and teachers, candidates develop an appropriate Standardized Test, as well as an Assessment Plan for the student. They modify, adapt, and use this Plan over a period of time to monitor the progress of the student in the elementary classroom *(Table 1.1o).*

Analysis: Ten (10) candidates completed this assignment in 2015, 36 candidates in 2016, and 21 candidates in 2017. Between 43%-50% of candidates completed this assessment with Exemplary performances, and 33% - 52% received a Competent rating. Across the individualized dimensions of the CEC Standard 4 (Assessment), most candidates (90%) were proficient at the higher levels: Competent to Exemplary across all areas assessed, with one candidate at the emerging levels in 2015 and 2017, and between 6 to 8 candidates at Emerging levels on the six dimensions in 2016.

Interpretation: The majority of candidates were successful in demonstrating their ability to use formal and informal assessments, developing, adapting, modifying and using exceptionality-specific assessments with students with disabilities and demonstrated sound knowledge of formal and informal assessments to ensure continuous intellectual, social and physical development of learners. Candidates met the Standards and demonstrated the skills and professional dispositions to develop, adapt, and use testing instruments for students with exceptional learning needs (CEC 4).

b) Authentic Assessment of 3 - 6 year olds - ECSE

This project spans across many weeks and with several key components that afford candidates opportunity to apply knowledge of early childhood assessment. ECSE candidates conduct formal

interviews with parents and/or teachers collect information from the parent/teacher to complete a simple and common screening tool called the Center for Disease Control (CDC) Developmental Checklist, appropriate for the child's age. Candidates assess the children, using the Work Sampling System (WSS) to assess indicators in the areas of: a) "Follows Classroom Rules"; b) "Represents Stories," and c) "Addition and Subtraction". Examining children's work samples allows candidates to formulate ideas on best ways to instruct whole groups, as well as methods /approaches to differentiate instruction to meet individual needs (Table 1.1p & 1.1pi).

Analysis: Overall performance decreased from 2016 to 2017 and this was most apparent for the NAEYC 3 / CEC 4, directly related to assessment. None of the candidates scored Exemplary for NAEYC 4 / CEC 5 criteria, which addresses the use of assessment results to make decisions about instructions. On the other hand, there was quite a notable increase in the percentage of candidates who scored on the Exemplary Level for the CEC 1 / NAEYC 1 (83%), as well as the NAEYC 3 / CEC 4 (52 %) standards.

Interpretation: Overall performance fluctuated on this assessment. This was most notable in the CEC 4 / NAEYC 3 and CEC 5 / NAEYC 4 standard, related to analyzing assessment results and using these results to make decisions about instruction, respectively. Upon further analysis of the work samples, the main reason why certain candidates achieved only Emerging for the CEC 4 / NAEYC 3 standards is because they either did not complete the data table for that section of the report correctly or they left it out altogether. **An area of concern and a noticeable trend is in candidates' math abilities that have implications on their performances in assessment-related tasks. Supporting candidates' mathematics skills is an area for improvement, detailed in the Action Plan.** All candidates were able to compare and contrast the children they tested in terms of overall strengths and weaknesses on specific testing criteria. They were also able to effectively utilize course materials and resources to identify learning objectives and activities that were developmentally appropriate for the groups of children that they tested. However, they fell short on providing sufficient or an abundance of differentiated learning activities to score Competent and Exemplary, respectively.

2. Application of Knowledge of Learners and Learning in Instructional Situations
In Clinical Practice (CP), candidates' demonstrate ability to apply their knowledge in practice situations - measured using the Implementation portions of the extensive three-part CP Assessment instruments. Each candidate is observed teaching at least four lessons each semester, one in each subject area – ELA, mathematics, science and social studies or integrated ELA/Social Studies and Math/Science (Tables 1.1q -1.1qii).

Analysis: All candidates (2015-2017) successfully completed this part of the assessment, with 83% (2015), 86% (2016), and 80% (2017) performing between the Competent or Exemplary levels, indicating

mastery of teaching skills and proficiencies on CEC Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. In analyzing candidate performances on teaching academic content areas, 80% - 85% of CE/CSE candidates and 75% - 81% ECSE candidates had Competent to Exemplary performances across all dimensions measured during their four observed lessons each semester. However, more CE/CSE (58%) candidates performed at Exemplary when compared to ECSE candidates (28%). The data show that 95-100% of candidates met the **standards** and the sub-standards that were aligned to the EPP measures for assessment of content area pedagogical and professional skills.

Interpretation: CE/CSE/ECSE candidates demonstrate that they had strong skills in instructional delivery for diverse learners that are supported by the unique blend of academic subject area proficiency and special education preparation. They were able to use their foundational knowledge of diversity and exceptionalities (CEC 1; ACEI 1; NAEYC 1) to select, adapt and use instructional strategies, materials and technology, including assistive technology to meet the individual characteristics and needs of their learners (CEC 2, 4; NAEYC 3; ACEI 3.1, 3.2) as they effectively taught and challenged their students to learn and master critical academic subjects in the general curriculum (CEC 3; ACEI 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4). These results also informs the EPP and confirms that with additional practice, mentoring and reflection, candidates do grow and improve.

3. Ability to Plan Instruction

Each candidate is required to plan at least four lessons each semester, one in each subject area – ELA, mathematics, science and social studies or integrated ELA/Social Studies and Math/Science. In preparing lessons for observations, candidates engaged in a process that starts with conceptualization and ends with reflection, a model developed and used by the EPP since 2003. This model ensures that assessments of and for instruction are central to candidate practice. Tables 1.1r – 1.1ri show candidate performance in lesson planning, which is assessed as Part I of the CP rubric.

Analysis: All candidates' demonstrate ability to plan instruction for diverse learners; thereby meeting the Standards assessed. Of the 32 CE/CSE candidates 84.3% (27) scored at the Competent or Exemplary level, while 15.6% (5) of them met the Standards at the Emerging level. Candidates showed strengths on Standard 5.1 - Professional growth, reflection, and evaluation; and Standard 5.2 – Collaboration as they received Exemplary ratings on these Standards. More than half of them were also strong on Standard 4– Assessment. Only one candidate in each cohort performed consistently at Emerging. In the planning dimensions, more than 80% of the 15 ECSE candidates performed at Competent or Exemplary on the combined CEC/NAEYC standards (CEC 1, 3, 4, 5, 7/NAEYC 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7). A recurring trend **(math abilities)** was NAEYC 3: Observing, documenting and assessing, in that 22% displayed Emerging competency.

Interpretations:

Candidates across programs continue to demonstrate proficiencies in planning instruction for teaching students with and without exceptional learning needs. With the exception of one or two candidates each year with consistently Emerging performances, all EPP candidates had the requisite competencies to plan appropriate instruction for diverse learners.

4. Instructional Strategies

Observation and assessment of candidates during CP Experience provide substantial evidence that our candidates *understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways (INTASC 8).* While teaching academic subjects, candidates creatively integrate subject matter to deepen students' acquisition and mastery of critical academic content reflected in the assessment of their integrated lessons in ELA/Social Studies and Mathematics/Science during their CP observations. Candidate performances are referenced in *Tables 1.1q – 1.1qii.*

Analysis: All candidates successfully completed this part of the assessment, with 83% of CE/CSE candidates (2015), 86% (2016), and 80% (2017), performing at Competent or Exemplary. Similarly, most ECSE candidates (>90%) performed at Competent or Exemplary. These results indicate mastery of teaching skills and proficiencies. Among the strongest performances was on the EPP dimension of *Using Effective Strategies to Promote Active Engagement in Learning (CE/CSE: 92% 92%, 100%, and 80%)* in 2015-2017 respectively. On the same measure for ECSE, candidates were similarly strong on NAEYC 5 (81%); CEC 3 (80%) and CEC 5 (75%) as reflected in the Competent or Exemplary ratings of all candidates.

Interpretation: Overall, the majority of candidates know and use a wide repertoire of strategies to engage and motivate learners. While the CSE candidates performed better than the ECSE candidates on this dimension, the majority of ECSE (>90%) candidates met the standards measured in the implementation of instruction to their learners. ECSE candidates demonstrated their ability to engage children in differential learning of content using developmentally appropriate practices.

Implications: Results of candidates' knowledge of instructional practice described above is juxtaposed with evidence from the validated external edTPA assessment, specifically, Task 2 (Instructing and Engaging Students). Comparisons across programs show that ECSE had means ranging from 2.8 – 3.6; CSE was 3.0-3.4 and CE was 3.3 - 3.5 on the Planning Competency on the edTPA *(see* TASK 2 on *Table 1.1wi: Disaggregated edTPA Performances by Programs: ECSE; Table 1.1wii: Disaggregated edTPA Performances by Programs: CSE; and Table 1.1wiii: Disaggregated edTPA Performances by Programs: CE)*. These results suggest candidates perform above average in their abilities to plan instruction.

5. Evidence to Support Professional Responsibility

Candidate performances on EAS Competency 4 – Teacher Responsibilities are used as evidence to demonstrate candidates' *professional learning and ethical practice (INTASC 9)* *(Tables 1.1l-1.1lii).*

Analysis

Among the EPP's 43 candidates (2015-2017) who took and passed the EAS, disaggregated results on *Competency 4 – Teacher Responsibilities* show that 67% scored above or well above average on this dimension. Only 7% (3) candidates scored well below average on this dimension. Candidate performance on the EAS fluctuated *(Figure 1.1b).* From 2015 to 2016, candidates' performance on Competency 4 improved, with 47% of candidates in 2016 performing at level 4, showing strong command of relevant knowledge and skills, and 32% at level 3, demonstrating satisfactory command of knowledge and skills. By 2017, 62.5% of candidates scored at level 4, and 25% at level 3. Among ECSE candidates (n=16), 44% were at Level 4, while 38% were at Level 3. In 2016 and 2017 ECSE test takers performed better than the 2015 cohort, with 86% and 80% respectively scoring at levels 3 and 4. Performance of CSE candidates (n=24) shows 33% at level 4, while 29% were at level 3. Similarly, CSE candidates in 2016 and 2017 did better than those in 2015. In 2016, 73% scored at levels 3 and 4; with 63% of them scoring at level 4. In 2017, 100% of CSE test takers passed this competency at level 3 and 4, with 67% of them at level 4. In the CE program the one candidate taking the EAS in 2016 passed, and met this competency at level 3. Of the 41 candidates overall who took and passed the EAS test, 32% of them scored at the highest level – level 4, while 44% were at level 3. Overall, candidates performing at level 3 or 4 on Competency 4 of EAS increased from 2015-2017: 2015 (71%); 2016 (72%); and 2017 (100%). From 2015-2017, candidates scoring 3 or 4 increased by 29%. Among the ECSE candidates overall, 87.5% [14] performed at level 3 and 4, with the highest percentage (60%) in 2017. CSE candidates showed a 57% increase in number of program completers earning level 3 or 4 from 2015-2017.

Interpretation: Candidates demonstrate satisfactory to strong command of teacher responsibility. This finding suggests that candidates have a good understanding of *the rights and responsibilities in situations involving interactions between teachers and students (INTASC 9).*

1.2 Candidates Use Research and Evidence

During Transition Point 3, candidates complete an **Action Research Study** during Clinical Practice *Table 1.2a* and *Table 1.2ai.*

Analysis: In 2015, most candidates (47%) earned Emerging for ACEI 1.0, NAEYC 1, while 47% of the candidates earned Competent (33%) or Exemplary (13%). For ACEI 5.1, 5.2; NAEYC 6; and CEC 6 46.6% of the candidates earned Emerging and 40% earned Competent or Exemplary. Although, none of the candidates earned Exemplary on ACEI 2.1, CEC 3; NAEYC 5 most (53%) achieved Competent. A slight improvement in candidates' performance on the assignment in 2016 show that 50% received Exemplary while between 25% and 31% earned Competent across standards. The amount of candidates

performing at the Competent or Exemplary declined significantly in 2017. Only 20% of the candidates achieved Exemplary across standards on the assignment and 40% earned Competent on ACEI 1.0. Although none of the candidates received Unsatisfactory in the assignment, most were at the Emerging level (80%) for ACEI 2.1, 5.1, and 5.2. **(See Action Plan)**

Interpretation: Candidates were Competent in their ability to know, use and understand the use of major concepts, principles, theories and research related development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities for students. In terms of professionalism, only 40% of candidates illustrated an ability to reflect deeply on their practice and collaborate with families. Results of some of these studies have been published in peer-reviewed journals and shared at national conferences **(See Appendix C).**

1.3 Candidates Apply Content and Pedagogical Knowledge in Response to SPAs

1. State Licensure Exams

a) The New York State licensure exams measure specific content knowledge for educators and is used by the State to measure EPP's program effectiveness. This EPP exceeded the 80% pass rate among its 2015-2017 test takers (Range 83% - 93%). Candidate performances on these certification examinations are discussed in several sections of the Self Study, with reference to Standard 4. Refer to data *Table 4.2a* for evidence of test takers and pass rates among test takers on the EAS, CST-SwD, CST-Multisubject and edTPA tests**.**

b) Specialized Professional Association (SPA) reports for NAEYC, CEC, and ACEI (see Appendix 1.3A; 1.3B), are appended as evidence. Submissions of the ACEI (CE) and CEC (CSE) reports were made in a timely manner, and are currently under review. **However, the ECSE's response to previous conditions was Not Nationally Recognized. Reasons for this decision and actions to be taken are outlined in the Action Plan).**

1.4 Commitment to P-12 Students Access to Rigorous College- and Career-Ready Standards

The *edTPA evaluates authentic teaching and evaluates the candidate's ability to effectively teach his/her subject matter to all students.* Robust data on candidates' performance on edTPA is an external measure that candidates can teach diverse students in a variety of settings. *Table 1.4a – 1.4aii* shows overall candidate performances on the edTPA across programs.

Analysis: For ECSE and CSE, means on Competency 15 is used, while CE means on Competency 18 was used to show skills to guide P-6 students toward college/career readiness. ECSE ranged from 2.8-3.0; CSE 3.0-3.2; CE 2.8-3.5 showing average to above average ability.

Interpretation: EPP candidates across all programs demonstrate they can prepare students to be college and career-ready.

1.5   Candidates Model and Apply Technology

1. Use of Technology in CP

Candidates use technology throughout their preparation in courses and in Clinical Practice (CP) to help P-6 students access and assess quality digital content. *Table 1.5a- 1.5b* show candidates' performance on the CP assessment rubrics domain related to technology, while Table 1.5c show candidates' use of technology across courses. All candidates infuse technology in their lessons, including CSE and ECSE candidates' use of assistive technologies – practices that culminate in CP. The CP Experience Assessment measures candidates' ability to develop and facilitate technology-enhanced lessons in their classrooms. (Table 1.5d).

Analysis: From 2015-2017, 80% of candidates scored at the competent or higher on required technology related standards. In 2015, of the 21 candidates in CP, 81% scored Competent on technology domains of the CP Implementation rubrics. In 2016, 69% of our candidates scored Competent or above. In 2017, there was increase in candidate's performance, with 92% of the candidates scoring Competent. Most candidates consistently performed at Competent when using technology in the field. CP results show that 80% of candidates understand communication theory and know how to use a variety of media communication tools. In 2015, most candidates performed at Emerging, while in 2017 most candidates earned Competent in their use of technology. Candidates integrated Smartboard engagement activity in lessons. Close analysis of data on WebQuest shows that in 2015-2017 out of 148 candidates, 80 % achieved a Competent rating, only 9 % candidates were Emerging, and 11% candidates did not meet the standards.

Interpretation: Candidates have technology content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge of web-based teaching strategies, are responsive to diversity, can use technology as a teaching tool, and can develop technology-based curriculum, including use of assistive technology. Most candidates have the knowledge to select and use appropriate problem-solving tools, computers, electronic information resources, and visual materials to support the learning of different subject areas. Candidates understand and use appropriate technology to help students become capable technology users through communication; through access, management, analysis, and problem-solving with information, and through collaborative and self-directed learning. During CP, candidates show that they understand how to engage children by catering to children's interests and by integrating strategies that encourage them to use digital tools to ignite P-6 students' interests and support students' use of technology.