2024

# Educator Preparation Assessment: An Alignment of the GaPSC Standards and InTASC Standards

Jessica VanValkenburgh

Aaron R. Gierhart

Thomas Dailey

Jennifer VanSlander

# Educator Preparation Assessment: An alignment of the GaPSC Standards and InTASC Standards

Jessica VanValkenburgh, Ed.D.
Columbus State University


Aaron R. Gierhart, Ed.D.
Columbus State University


Thomas Dailey, Ph.D
Columbus State University


Jennifer VanSlander, Ph.D.
Columbus State University

*Jessica VanValkenburgh*, Ed.D., is an Assistant Professor and Program Coordinator of Middle Grades Education in the College of Education and Health Professions at Columbus State University. She served as a middle school science teacher for 10 years in South Carolina.  Her teaching includes undergraduate and graduate middle grades and curriculum and instruction courses.  Her research interests include middle grades education, science education, and family/community involvement in schools.

*Aaron R. Gierhart*, Ed.D., is an Assistant Professor in the College of Education and Health Professions at Columbus State University, teaching elementary science methods, STEM education, and contemporary elementary education issues. He currently serves as the STEM Teaching P-12 Graduate Endorsement Program Coordinator and an Honors College Faculty Fellow at Columbus State and hosts the seasonal *Journeys of Teaching* podcast. He served as an elementary classroom teacher in Illinois for 11 years. His research interests include (critical) digital pedagogy, narratives of pedagogy, and teacher education.

*Thomas Dailey, Ph.*D., is Director of Data Management in the College of Education and Health Professions at Columbus State University. He previously served as a lecturer in sociology and taught courses in social theory, sociology of education, homelessness and poverty, and quantitative methods. His research interests include discourse, discursive practices, and ideology.

*Jennifer L. VanSlander*, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership in Teacher Education, Leadership, and Counseling at Columbus State University. Following 20 years of service in public education as a teacher, instructional coach, and school administrator, she now supports teacher candidates and graduate students in the area of literacy instruction. Her research interests include writing instruction, teacher and administrator self-efficacy, writer identities, instructional leadership, and adult learning.

**Educator Preparation Assessment: An alignment of the GaPSC Standards and InTASC Standards**

**Abstract (150 word max):** To create the crosswalk between the InTASC and Georgia performance standards, each faculty member used a spreadsheet with rows containing 174 InTASC indicators and columns containing all 75 CAPS indicators. Faculty members worked independently without consulting each other to consider the 15,640 points of alignment between both sets of standards and their indicators. After a complete review, the group met as a whole to discuss the alignment, eventually agreeing on 674 points of alignment between the two sets of standards and their indicator. Additionally, the team found 10,455 points of alignment with the MAP assessment and 3,145 points of alignment with the Dispositions assessment. Findings indicate that more work should be done to align the GaPSC standards with the InTASC standards to ensure a smoother transition from educator preparation to the workforce. In the future, we suggest other institutions use our crosswalk to assess their assessment instruments.

Educator preparation programs (EPPs) in the United States assess teaching candidates in a variety of ways. Typically, a state exam is required along with performance-based measures so that a wide range of evidence is drawn upon to determine whether candidates are fit for licensure (Short, 2021). These measures satisfy federal recommendations from the U.S. Department of Education, and EPPs report performance measures and outcomes related to candidates' teaching effectiveness (*Teacher preparation issues*, 2014). In addition, individual EPPs are also required to submit annual program reviews as part of national accreditation to fulfill standards from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC).

Including performance-based assessments allows teacher educators to draw upon a myriad of evidence (e.g., observations, artifacts, work samples, candidates' input, etc.) to more holistically evaluate the effectiveness of teaching candidates as they seek certification and induction into the teaching profession (Huss, 2020). Performance-oriented evaluation approaches may require more time and deeper reflection by candidates (Hildebrandt & Swanson, 2019); however, EPPs can scaffold this process by intentionally designing and implementing low-stakes practice tasks in early coursework experiences to prepare candidates in advance (Polly et al., 2020).

**Introduction**

Columbus State University (Columbus, GA), the authors' home institution, offers several EPPs for students seeking teacher certification in the State of Georgia, including Elementary, Middle Grades, Secondary, and Special Education. The College of Education and Health Professions also works across the University with other Colleges to provide certification of candidates to teach in specific content areas, such as Theatre, Fine Arts, and Music Education.

Candidates in the EPPs must successfully complete versions of the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE). Five versions of GACE exist that are required of candidates and current Georgia teachers, depending on the certification type (i.e., content, certification upgrade, educational leadership, Georgia ethics, and paraprofessional) they are seeking (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2022). Candidates can benefit from engaging in reflection on their short- and long-term professional needs and areas of improvement, including the identification of professional learning practices for increasing their content knowledge (Lupinski et al., 2012; Mohamad Rozlan & Raja Harun, 2022).

As an EPP, we align programs and courses to the Council of Chief State School Officers' (CCSSO, 2013) Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards. InTASC consists of ten standards organized across four categories: The Learner and Learning, Content, Instructional Practice, and Professional Responsibility; there are 174 indicators across the four categories of InTASC.

InTASC is widely used by EPPs throughout the United States as "initial licensing standards" (Clark & Paulsen, 2016, p. 2). Despite the ubiquity of InTASC in U.S. teacher education, Laughter et al. (2022) caution that additional measures "of an effective teacher's essential knowledge, performances, and critical dispositions" (p. 283) are needed in order to effectively foster their growth and ensure program effectiveness.

Educators in Georgia are formally evaluated with the Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES), which includes a performance-based assessment–the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS). TAPS includes a rubric to evaluate an educator's teaching practices across each of the ten performance standards. An additional assessment, the Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS; also known as Intern Keys), was also developed

to evaluate teacher candidates on the same ten performance standards. The standards in the CAPS instrument are similar to TAPS, replacing *teacher* with *teacher candidate* and include 75 performance indicators across ten performance standards on the summative rubric. This instrument was found to have high interrater reliability, though validity studies have mainly been limited to single institutions and focused primarily on the content of the instrument (Elder et al., 2015, 2016). Wider statewide studies have not been conducted as of this writing.

Given the quantity and variety of assessments used by our EPP and reporting requirements both to state and national organizations, it is necessary to align the various instruments and multiple sets of standards we utilize so that reports can be written efficiently without duplicating efforts. However, no systematically-created crosswalk between InTASC and CAPS had been located during a search for the documents, nor had the current versions of the EPP-created assessments been aligned to both sets of standards. Therefore, a project was initiated to develop a crosswalk and alignment, both to increase the efficiency of current reporting and to facilitate the alignment of future rubrics.

**Context**

Clearly defined and aligned standards of effectiveness as well as means of evaluating and reinforcing them throughout coursework and clinical experiences are hallmarks of effective EPPs (Darling-Hammond, 2014). The authors conducted an alignment project during the 2021-2022 academic year to create a crosswalk between the InTASC standards and the performance standards from CAPS and TAPS. The project began on November 19, 2021, and was completed on March 4, 2022.

The project focused on two main goals: a) create a crosswalk between both sets of standards, and b) align the University's EPP unit assessments to both sets of standards.

Evaluating candidates' dispositions and critical perspectives have been less emphasized in research and EPPs' practices, due in part to a lack of emphases in contemporary standards (i.e., InTASC) and unclear definitions of dispositions as "attitudes, dispositions, and professional competencies" (Laughter et al., 2022, p. 273).

Columbus State University (CSU) uses the Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) Version 3.2020 (Appendix A) and the Dispositions Evaluation Version 3.2021 (Appendix B) to evaluate candidates in their field placements and during student teaching. These instruments were created to be used, reevaluated, and redesigned as institutional, state, or national standards changed. Although these instruments are not used beyond CSU, many institutions have similar assessment tools. Individual programs and institutions cannot control how the CAPS standards and InTASC standards align with each other, but they can control how they create and revise instruments to meet candidates' needs. Additionally, information gathered from similar alignment projects at other institutions could be used to revise courses, field experiences, and EPPs.

The MAP is loosely based on the Danielson (1996) Framework and rates candidates on 18 components, using four levels of proficiency across three domains: Planning and Preparation, Classroom Environment, and Instruction. Clinical faculty use the MAP to evaluate teaching candidates in the field during observation, rate their proficiency in all components, and provide written feedback to support the candidates' growth toward designing and implementing instruction (Jones et al., 2022). It is vital that EPPs evaluate how candidates transfer their coursework learning into field-based practice to effectively support students' learning, and evaluation tools, such as the MAP, can serve as a means of providing feedback to these novice educators (Flushman et al., 2019).

The Dispositions Evaluation consists of eight dispositional domains and four levels of performance. Evaluating and providing feedback on teaching candidates' dispositions is critical for supporting their professional development. Although school districts and EPPs tend to agree on the professional knowledge and skills candidates need to be successful as teachers, the dispositions they value can vary (Truscott & Stenhouse, 2022). Dispositions can be viewed as fixed traits or attributes or as malleable areas in which practitioners can achieve growth (Diez, 2007). Promoting or fostering dispositions requires EPPs to intentionally teach candidates ways they can engage in professional reflection about their practices, work with students, instructional design, and professional interactions with students and stakeholders (Zhang et al., 2022).

In addition to focusing on standards, an alignment for the crosswalk and each unit assessment were completed for individual indicators for both sets of standards. Individual propositions within the criteria of the unit assessments and any listed indicators were also aligned to standards at the indicator level. Such alignment review efforts are important to ensure that EPPs are providing a complete and holistic picture of program effectiveness, evaluating candidates in ways that align as closely as possible with national and state standards (Russell & Davidson Devall, 2016).

**Procedure**

The project used a modified version of the Delphi Method to develop the alignment between sets of standards. The Delphi method uses a panel of experts who work to reach a consensus on a topic through several rounds consisting of individual responses to inquiry and group discussion (Hsu & Sanford, 2007). It is particularly useful when investigating issues or topics for which there is little or no literature available and is considered to be especially effective when the aim of the research is the "achievement of consensus in a given area of

uncertainty or lack of empirical evidence" (Powell, 2003, p. 377). The Delphi method is well

suited for exploring issues related to assessment and curriculum alignment in higher education,

as faculty and other academic experts are readily available to be recruited to form a Delphi panel

(Al Dera, 2021; Smith & Simpson, 1995).

Three faculty members were recruited to join the Delphi panel. All faculty recruited had

multiple areas of expertise, giving the group a representative but varied perspective when

considering matters of alignment. All three faculty members were familiar with InTASC

standards and had used the CAPS, MAP, and Dispositions Evaluations to assess candidates in the

field. The following faculty members were part of the project group:

- Dr. Aaron Gierhart, Assistant Professor of Elementary Education, who had additional

  expertise in digital pedagogy, STEM, and Elementary Education

- Dr. Jennifer VanSlander, previous Assistant Professor of Literacy Education, who had

  additional expertise in TESOL and Educational Leadership

- Dr. Jessica VanValkenburgh, Assistant Professor of Middle Grades Education, who had

  additional expertise in Math Education, Science Education, and Curriculum and

  Instruction

The project was coordinated by Dr. Thomas Dailey, the Director of Data Management for

the College of Education and Health Professions at Columbus State University. Dr. Dailey was

responsible for coordinating members of the Delphi panel as they worked individually and also

facilitated meetings, designed crosswalk documents, and organized the collaborative worksheets

and formulas used to efficiently determine alignment.

To create the crosswalk between the InTASC and Georgia performance standards, each

faculty member used a spreadsheet with rows containing all 10 InTASC standards (and 174

indicators) and columns containing all 10 performance standards (and 75 CAPS indicators). During the first round of the project, faculty members worked independently without consulting each other to consider the 15,640 points of alignment between both sets of standards and their indicators.

After a complete review, each member noted alignment on their spreadsheets before convening to discuss the results and reconcile any differences. The project was completed in two phases consisting of a total of 16 hours of collaborative meetings (in addition to time spent assessing the standards independently outside of formal meetings).

*Phase 1*

The goal of Phase 1 was to develop a crosswalk between the InTASC standards and GaPSC performance standards for teacher candidates used on the Intern Keys rubric. To give a complete picture of how these standards were associated, the standards were aligned at the individual indicator level.

**Phase 1a.**

During Phase 1a, members of the panel considered alignment between the standards using a Google Sheet that listed all the InTASC standards and the full text of each indicator in the far left column and the GaPSC performance standards in the top row. Each panel member had an individual copy of the spreadsheet and permissions were set so members of the panel could only view and edit their individual sheet.

Team members were instructed to enter an 'x' in the cell when they believed the indicators aligned. The group was given access to the spreadsheets on November 19, 2021, and tasked to complete the review by December 10, 2021. The project coordinator created a copy of the alignment sheet to be used to total the results of the individual work. The reconciliation sheet

pulled in the data from each sheet and used a formula to display the total number of x's for each cell among the panel members.

**Phase 1b.**

Once all panel members completed individual alignment in the first phase of the project, they met via Zoom, on December 15, 2021, to review and discuss the alignment results from all three members. The goal of the meeting was to discuss any disagreement or other discrepancies between how the project members aligned indicators. Zoom and Google Docs allowed project members to view all spreadsheets and documents needed to discuss the project.

As previously mentioned, the reconciliation spreadsheet was formulated to calculate and highlight areas of agreement and disagreement based on how each individual completed each sheet. It counted the number of x's in individual sheets, displayed the number, and highlighted the cell depending on the level of agreement: *green* for all three project members in agreement, *yellow* for two project members in agreement, and *red* for only one participant in agreement.

During the Zoom meeting, the panel reviewed each red or yellow cell which indicated a possible point of misalignment. Panel members then engaged in a collaborative conversation and shared thinking related to the intent, language, and personal interpretation of the standards or indicators. Although during Phase 1b 100% agreement was not required, panel members were allowed to change their answers based on the collaborative discussion. Once the panel had worked through all the yellow and red cells and made the best possible attempt to reconcile all disagreements, the project transitioned to Phase 2a.

*Phase 2*

The second task was to align the individual criteria on the MAP and Dispositions rubrics to the indicators of the InTASC standards and GaPSC performance standards. The team also

denoted criteria that relate to the themes of diversity and technology (as CAEP cross-cutting themes), so that these could also be highlighted on the rubrics. The rubrics were separated to complete the MAP alignment and reconciliation before moving on to the Dispositions alignment and reconciliation.

**Phase 2a.**

During this phase of the alignment project, the team evaluated the MAP and Dispositions rubrics individually, as well as their alignment to the InTASC and GaPSC indicators. The spreadsheets for these phases were set up similarly to those used in Phase 1; however, in contrast to Phase 1, this phase also included columns for project members to note if the criteria related to themes of diversity and technology, so those areas could be highlighted on the rubrics. Also during this phase, project members were asked to pay attention to the clarity, applicability, and usefulness of each performance description. The comments and notes will be used to make future revisions to these assessment rubrics.

The MAP worksheet listed all performance descriptions in the far left column. When a criterion included multiple performance descriptors, each descriptor was isolated to allow members to consider individual alignment. The indicators listed for each criterion on the MAP were also listed in their unique rows for the same reason. Panelists were asked to complete their alignment spreadsheets by January 7, 2022.

The Dispositions evaluation was broken up as well but had no separate set of indicators. Project members completed their alignment spreadsheets by February 18, 2022.

**Phase 2b.**

Similar to Phase 1b, the team met to reconcile differences between project members in terms of alignment on both the MAP and Dispositions rubrics. Members met via Zoom on

January 13, 2022, after individually completing the spreadsheet, to examine the MAP alignment

and discuss points of disagreement or other discrepancies. The team met again on February 25,

2022, and repeated the process with the Dispositions.

Similar to Phase 1b, project members noted alignment by placing an 'x' in the respective

spreadsheet cell. Another spreadsheet was created to show alignment with the colors green (3/3

aligned), yellow (2/3 aligned), and red (1/3 aligned).

### *Final Reconciliation*

When the project concluded, the panelists were given a final opportunity to review

decisions on the InTASC and GaPSC standards crosswalk to determine if any views on points of

alignment had shifted during Phase 2. The panel convened for the last time to discuss any

remaining points of disagreement to determine if project members still maintained their stances

after engaging in all of the previous rounds in the study.

For purposes of finalizing the project, "alignment" was determined when at least two out

of three project members agreed the indicators were aligned. The majority of disagreements were

resolved, but after evidence and rationales were discussed to defend alignment or lack thereof, 64

of 274 indicators remained an alignment score of two, meaning only two of three panel members

agreed standards were aligned. Positions against alignment typically arose due to ambiguity of

the language of the standards, missing essential terms or ideas, or a lack of clarity regarding the

intent of the standard. Additionally, the lack of consistency in language across documents made

alignment cumbersome. For instance, InTASC uses the term *discipline*, whereas GaPSC applies

*subject* to refer to the same concept. The InTASC standards were perceived as more detailed and

specific, whereas the GaPSC standards were brief and the intent was, at times, unclear.

Moreover, the team agreed that it was difficult to assess whether a candidate *knows* or *understands* a concept and that knowing or understanding does not always lead to doing.

The following examples illustrate cases of a score of 2 for alignment, indicating one team member of the panel of three did not agree the standards were similar enough to constitute alignment:

Example 1:

- InTASC 1(g) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013): The teacher understands the role of language and culture in learning and knows how to modify instruction to make language comprehensible and instruction relevant, accessible, and challenging (p. 16).

- GaPSC 1.7 (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, n.d.): Displays an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group (p. 1).

Example 2:

- InTASC 2(b) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013): The teacher makes appropriate and timely provisions (e.g., pacing for individual rates of growth, task demands, communication, assessment, and response modes) for individual students with particular learning differences or needs (p. 17).

- GaPSC 4.5 (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, n.d.): Develops critical and creative thinking by providing activities at the appropriate level of challenge for students (p. 4).

In the majority of instances, alignment between the standards was straightforward for the team to determine. A total of 210 of 274 indicators scored a level 3, indicating all three panel

members agreed the language and perceived intent of the standards were closely aligned. The indicators below demonstrate an example of a score of 3 on the alignment document:

- GaPSC 2.3 (Georgia Professional Standards Commission, n.d.): Plans instruction effectively for content mastery, pacing, and transitions (p. 2).

- InTasc 2(b) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013): The teacher makes appropriate and timely provisions (e.g., pacing for individual rates of growth, task demands, communication, assessment, and response modes) for individual students with particular learning differences or needs (p. 17).

There were no instances of a score of 1 for alignment. The collaborative discussions conducted after individual ratings led to a deeper knowledge of the standards and resolved any uncertainty to a degree to which at least two of the three panel members agreed to alignment.

**Findings**

During this project, 174 InTASC indicators and 75 CAPS indicators were assessed for alignment. Additionally, the MAP and Dispositions rubrics were assessed to determine alignment with the indicators. The strength of the relationship and alignment between standards was calculated using the agreement between the three faculty members while examining individual indicators.

Alignment was not determined only quantitatively. The text of each standard was examined along with the calculated points of alignment to determine whether or not each paired standard from the two sets fell into one of the following categories: Strong to Moderate Alignment, Related or Supportive Alignment, and Weak to No Alignment. The Strong to Moderate group was purposely constructed to include an alignment between all ten standards in both the InTASC standards and the Georgia Performance Standards.

*Phase 1*

After aligning the InTASC standards and Georgia Performance Standards, 16 standard pairs were found to have Strong or Strong to Moderate Alignment. The aligned standards are shown in Table 1 along with the calculated points of alignment for each pair. Standards were found to have strong alignment if they had between 22 and 64 points of agreement and strong to moderate alignment if they had between 15 and 21 points of alignment. Using only the 16 strong and strong to moderate aligned standard pairs, all ten standards from both standard sets were represented in the alignment.

**Table 1**

*Strong and Strong to Moderately Aligned Standard Pairs and Points of Alignment for*

| InTASC Standard | Performance Standard (CAPS or TAPS) | Points |
|---|---|---|
| Standard #1: Learner Development. | Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge. | 21 |
| | Performance Standard 10: Communication. | 18 |
| Standard #2: Learning Differences. | Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning. | 18 |
| | Performance Standard 4: Differentiated Instruction. | 20 |
| Standard #3: Learning Environments. | Performance Standard 7: Positive Learning Environment. | 59 |
| | Performance Standard 8: Academically Challenging Environment. | 18 |
| | Performance Standard 10: Communication. | 30 |
| Standard #4: Content Knowledge. | Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge. | 29 |
| Standard #5: Application of Content. | Performance Standard 1: Professional Knowledge. | 18 |
| Standard #6: Assessment. | Performance Standard 5: Assessment Strategies. | 38 |
| | Performance Standard 6: Assessment Uses. | 64 |
| Standard #7: Planning for Instruction. | Performance Standard 2: Instructional Planning. | 35 |
| Standard #8: Instructional Strategies. | Performance Standard 3: Instructional Strategies. | 20 |
| Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice. | Performance Standard 9: Professionalism. | 55 |
| Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration. | Performance Standard 9: Professionalism. | 21 |
| | Performance Standard 10: Communication. | 50 |

In addition to the quantitative scores totaled for each standards pair, the standards and associated indicators were also examined qualitatively to ensure that alignments were logical. The alignment of eight standard pairs was obvious using the title of the standard alone (e.g. Learning Differences aligns to Differentiated Instruction, Instructional Strategies aligns to Instructional Strategies, and Planning for Instruction aligns to Instructional Planning). Other standard pairs were examined using associated indicators to determine where and how the standards were aligned, considering both the language in the standard as well as the indicators. For example, Leadership and Collaboration (InTASC #10) and Communication (Performance Standard 10) were found to have a strong alignment (with 50 points of agreement), as both standards shared indicators that emphasized collaboration.

### *Phase 2*

The second phase of the process was to align the individual criteria on the Columbus State University MAP and Dispositions rubrics to the indicators of the InTASC standards and GaPSC performance standards. The authors also denoted criteria that related to the themes of diversity and technology, so that these could also be highlighted on the MAP and Dispositions rubrics as well.

All MAP standards align to at least one InTasc and one GaPSC indicator, with the exception of 1D 'Selects appropriate learning outcomes', which does not at all align to the InTasc Standards. There are 25 individual indicators that do not align to the GaPSC standards and 15 that do not align with the InTasc standards.

**Table 2**

*MAP Indicators that did not show full alignment*

| Indicator | Alignment to InTasc | Alignment to GaPSC |
|---|---|---|
| 1B.b Plans show evidence of anticipation student misconceptions | Yes | No |
| 1C.b Knowledge of student interest and needs for use in planning | Yes | No |
| 1C.f Instructional materials, displays, and examples represent varied student interests and cultural backgrounds | No | Yes |
| 1D.a Statements of student learning, not student activity | No | Yes |
| 1D.b Learning outcomes permitting assessment of student attainment (measureable) | No | No |
| 1D.c Includes learning outcomes that require higher order thinking among students | No | Yes |
| 1E.a Materials by the district | Yes | No |
| 1E.b Guest Speakers | Yes | No |
| 1E.c Materials provided by professional organizations | Yes | No |
| 1E.e University resources | Yes | No |
| 1E.f A range of texts | Yes | No |
| 1F.d Opportunities for student choice | No | No |
| 1G.b Assessment types suitable to the style of the outcome | Yes | No |
| 1G.c Expectations clearly written and descriptors for each level of performance | Yes | No |
| 2A.c Fairness | No | Yes |
| 2B.a Belief in value of what is being | No | Yes |

| Indicator | Alignment to InTasc | Alignment to GaPSC |
|---|---|---|
| learned | | |
| 2B.d Expectation and recognition of effort and persistence on the part of students | No | No |
| 2D. B Absence of hostility between candidate and students concerning behavior | No | Yes |
| 2D.d Preventive action when needed by the candidate (i.e., including subtle signals) | No | Yes |
| 2D.e Reinforcement of positive behavior | No | No |
| 2E.b Safe environment | Yes | No |
| 2E.c Accessibility for all student | Yes | No |
| 3A.a Clarity of lesson purpose | No | Yes |
| 3A.b Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities | No | Yes |
| 3B.b Effective use of the students' responses and ideas | Yes | No |
| 3B.c High levels of student participation in discussion | Yes | No |
| 3B.d Students take an active role in discussion (e.g., lead) | Yes | No |
| 3D.a Candidate pays attention to evidence of student understanding | Yes | No |
| 3E.c Candidate seizing on a teachable moment | No | No |
| 3E.e Incorporates school events or upcoming events in the school (e.g., championship game, school play, or scholar bowl) | Yes | No |
| 3F.c Connects wishes (things to change) and positives (things that went well) | No | Yes |

In terms of the Dispositions rubric, five indicators were not aligned to the InTasc standards (2.1, 3.4, 4.3, 6.3, and 7.3) and four (3.4, 5.2, 6.3, and 8.4) were not aligned to the GaPSC standards (see Appendix B for full indicator text). The only indicator that was not aligned to either set of standards was 3.4 'Asks proactive questions'.

When looking at the MAP rubric there were many components of the GaPSC and InTasc standards that aligned, but we did determine some missing components. Both the GaPSC standards and the MAP rubrics reference learning outcomes/objectives, though the InTasc standards did not. On the other hand, the InTasc standards mention academic language/language development and the GaPSC standards and CSU's MAP rubric do not. The InTasc standards also mention culture, while the GaPSC standards do not. CSU's MAP rubric minimally mentions culture compared to the InTasc standards. Lastly, both the InTasc Standards and MAP rubric mention technology multiple times, though the GaPSC standards only mention technology once.

## Discussion

This alignment project was performed over approximately four months and consisted of approximately 16 hours of meetings. Meetings were spent discussing the project and alignments as well as reconciling disagreements. In addition to this time, each participating member spent another 30-40 hours individually determining their perspectives of alignment between the CAPS and InTASC standards, as well as the alignment with the MAP and Dispositions assessments. Of the ten InTASC Standards, with 174 indicators, and ten GaPSC CAPS standards, with 75 indicators, the team found a total of 674 points of alignment. A total of 16 alignment pairs were found to have strong to moderate alignment.

The in-depth investigation into alignment revealed opportunities for further clarification and revision of GaPSC standards and institutional evaluation instruments to ensure preservice

teachers are being prepared for evaluations during their first year of teaching. Georgia ranks 7th in the United States for the number of emergent bilinguals and that number continues to rise (National Center for Education Statistics, n.d). But, the current version of GaPSC standards does not address the unique instructional methods or supports needed to ensure the academic success and language development of this expanding group of learners. For example, InTASC Standard 2(e) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013) states as follows: "The teacher incorporates tools of language development into planning and instruction, including strategies for making content accessible to English language learners and for evaluating and supporting their development of English proficiency" (p. 17). No GaPSC standards demonstrated even partial alignment.

Similarly, the InTASC standards identify teacher expectations for meeting the cultural needs of students and families, a component that is absent from the GaPSC standards. For example, InTasc Standard 1(g) (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2013) reads as follows: "The teacher understands the role of language and culture in learning and knows how to modify instruction to make language comprehensible and instruction relevant, accessible, and challenging" (p. 16). Two of three panel members decided alignment with GaPSC indicator 1.7: "Displays an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group" (p. 1.) However, one panel member believed the absence of language and cultural considerations in the GaPSC standard did not warrant alignment. Overall, these findings have created opportunities to revisit institutional documents to fill these gaps and effectively ensure teacher candidates are prepared to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

The entire crosswalk is available from the authors on request, which includes alignment between all standards and indicators, along with the calculated points of alignment. All 674

points of alignment are also included in a single, sortable spreadsheet that can be used to align assessments to both sets of standards. In addition, strength calculations are also listed for all standard pairs (including moderate to weak and weak to none) on a table, along with notes about the alignment for each pair.

**Implications and Future Research**

As teacher educators, one of our primary goals is to have valid and reliable methods of assessment. The validity and reliability of assessments must be regularly evaluated, as our standards, programs, and students are constantly changing. Creating an alignment document, such as the one described in this writing, allows programs like ours to determine with which standards their assessments align (and which they do not). Additionally, if standards change, a similar document can be utilized and this process can be replicated. Those who evaluate pre-service and novice in-service teachers can use this alignment to better understand the possible needs of the teacher and identify areas of strength and opportunities for improvement.. Additionally, this alignment may give insight to building and district level administrators in terms of professional development needs for the school(s) and induction programs.

In addition, GaPSC has recently revised Georgia's EPP approval rules (effective June 15th, 2023) to remove any references to InTASC standards, using only CAPS/TAPS in the GaPSC Educator Preparation Rules. Though the project was undertaken before these revisions were known, having the crosswalk and alignment charts will be invaluable as all Georgia EPPs work to convert alignment in reports, courses, and syllabi to comply with the new rules. This is particularly true for Georgia EPPs seeking national accreditation with Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), as they will need to align all of their assessments,

rubrics, and other instruments to both InTASC and CAPS and report on both sets of standards simultaneously.

Moving forward, EPPs in Georgia can use this document to determine the alignment of institutional assessments. Additionally, institutions can use the methodology used in this project to perform similar alignments within and outside of teacher education. Furthermore, institutions outside of Georgia could use a similar process to assess the alignment of their EPP standards. We also encourage more work to be done to align these two sets of standards to refine the transition from teacher preparation to in-service teaching.

**References**

Al Dera, H. (2021). Curriculum Mapping and Alignment of the Neuroscience Block in an

    Undergraduate Medical Education Program: A Delphi Study. *Advances in medical*

    *education and practice*, 12, 567–575. https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S263915

Clark, T. K., & Paulsen, T. H. (2016). Student teacher dialogue in an electronic community of

    practice: Cognition level related to the InTASC standards. *Journal of Agriculture*

    *Education, 57*(3), 1-17.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (2013). *Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support*

    *Consortium InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and learning progressions for*

    *teachers 1.0: A resource for ongoing teacher development*. https://ccsso.org/sites/

    default/files/2017-12/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher

    education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 89*(4), 547-561.

    https://www.jstor.org/stable/43909794

Danielson, C. (1996). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching.* Association

    for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Diez, M. E. (2007). Looking back and moving forward: Three tensions in the teacher

    dispositions discourse. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*(5), 388-396.

Elder, T., Wang, J., & Cramer, S. E. (2015). *An evaluation of the validity and reliability of the*

    *Intern Keys Assessment*. University of Georgia: College of Education.

    https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/TransformingEdPrep/Documents/InternKey

    s/InternKeys%20Final%20Report_1020.pdf

Elder, T., Wang, J., & Cramer, S. E. (2016). *An evaluation of the validity and reliability of the*

*Intern Keys Assessment: Phase II*. University of Georgia: College of Education.

https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/DataResources/Documents/InternKeys/Inter

nKeys%20Phase%20II%20Final%20Report_September%202016.pdf

Flushman, T., Guise, M., & Hegg, S. (2019). Improving supervisor written feedback: Exploring

the "what" and "why" of feedback provided to pre-service teachers. *Issues in Teacher

Education, 28*(2), 46-66.

Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (2022). *About the GACE assessments*.

https://www.gace.ets.org/about

Georgia Professional Standards Commission. (n.d.). Georgia Intern Keys: Candidate Assessment

on Performance Standards (CAPS). https://www.gapsc.com/EducatorPreparation/

DataResources/Documents/InternKeys/Intern-Keys- Summative%20Observation%

20Document.pdf

Hildebrandt, S. A., & Swanson, P. (2019). Re-examining teacher candidate performance on

world language edTPA as a consequential assessment. *NECTFL Review,* 84, 15-33.

Hsu, C. C., & Sandford, B. A. (2007). The Delphi technique: Making sense of consensus.

*Practical assessment, research, and evaluation*, *12*(1), 10.

Huss, R. (2020). edTPA relevance: Voices from teacher education program graduates. *SRATE

Journal, 29*(2).

Jones, E., Wind, S. A., Burcham, J., Hartm A., & XXXXX, T. (2022). A case study of a multi-

faceted approach to evaluating teacher candidate ratings. *The Teacher Educator*.

doi:10.1080/08878730.2022.2104983

Laughter, J. C., Brown, A. A., & Neu, L. W. (2022). ProCAD: Looking at a fuller picture of the

    teacher candidate. *Journal of Teacher Education, 73*(3), 271-285.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487120972635

Lupinski, K., Jenkins, P., Beard, A., & Jones, L. (2012). Reflective practice in teacher education

    programs at an HBCU. *Educational Foundations, 26*, 81-92.

Mohamad Rozlan, M. Q., & Raja Harun, R. N. S. (2022). The depthness of student teachers'

    reflective entries. *AJELP: The Asian Journal of English Language & Pedagogy, 10*(1),

    29-42. https://doi.org/10.37134/ajelp.vol10.1.3.2022

National Center for Educational Statistics. (n.d.). *Digest of education statistics.*

    https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d21/tables/dt21_204.20.asp

Polly, D., Byker, E. J., & Putman, S. M. (2020). Examining elementary education teacher

    candidates' experiences completing edTPA. *The Teacher Educator, 55*(4), 392-410.

Powell, C. (2003). The Delphi technique: Myths and realities. *Journal of advanced nursing*,

    *41*(4), 376-382.

Russell, V., & Davidson Devall, K. F., (2016). An examination of the edTPA portfolio

    assessment and other measures of teacher preparation and readiness. *Foreign Language

    Annals, 49*(3), 479-501. doi:10.Un/flan.12209

Short, D. (2021). The limitations of performance-based assessment: Disparities in teacher

    diversity. *SRATE Journal, 30*(1), 1-9.

Smith, K. S., & Simpson, R. D. (1995). Validating teaching competencies for faculty members in

    higher education: A national study using the Delphi method. *Innovative higher education,

    19*(3), 223-234.

Teacher preparation issues: A proposed rule by the Education Department, 79 FR 71819, Federal

Register. (2014). https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2014/12/03/2014-

28218/teacher-preparation-issues

Truscott, D., & Stenhouse, V. L. (2022). A mixed-methods study of teacher dispositions and

culturally relevant teaching. *Urban Education, 57*(6), 943-974.

Zhang, Q., Hayes, J., TeHau-Grant, R., Skeoch, R., France, L., Jiang, K., & Barnes, R. (2022).

Positioning dispositions in initial teacher education: An action research approach.

*Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(4), 39-54.

**Appendix A**

Model of Appropriate Practice (MAP) Version 3.2020

| Domain 1: Planning and Preparation | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **1A. Demonstrates Knowledge of Content** | | | |
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| In planning, the candidate does not address appropriate curriculum standards and makes content errors.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate displays little knowledge of prerequisite relationships important to student learning of the content. | The candidate displays knowledge of the curriculum standards and important concepts central to the discipline but displays a lack of awareness of how these concepts relate to one another (Integration).<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate displays knowledge of prerequisite learning, although such knowledge may be inaccurate or incomplete. | The candidate displays knowledge of the curriculum standards and important concepts central to the discipline and how these relate to one another (Integration).<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate displays accurate knowledge of prerequisite relationships among concepts. | The candidate displays knowledge (Command of the subject matter) of the appropriate curriculum standards and important concepts central to the discipline and how these relate both to one another and to other disciplines (Integration).<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate displays accurate knowledge of prerequisite relationships among concepts and develops strategies that ensure students make the connections in the discipline. |

1A. Indicators:
- ❏ Plans identify appropriate curriculum standards aligned with learning targets, instructional activities, and assessments
- ❏ Lesson and unit plans reflect important concepts central to the discipline and accurately communicate concepts, processes, and knowledge
- ❏ Lesson and unit plans identify and accommodate prerequisite relationships among concepts and skills, linking new concepts to familiar concepts
- ❏ Lesson and unit plans reflect command of subject matter taught through use of multiple representations or explanations that capture key ideas in the subject

| 1B. Demonstrates Knowledge of Pedagogy | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate's plans reflect little or no knowledge of the range of pedagogical approaches suitable to student learning of the content.<br>-- OR --<br>Plans for instructional groups are not suitable to the activities and offer no variety. | The candidate's plans reflect a limited knowledge and use of a range of pedagogical approaches to the discipline or to the students.<br>-- OR --<br>Plans for instructional groups partially support the activities, with some variety. | The candidate's plans reflect knowledge and use of a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline. The candidate uses technology, when appropriate, to enhance student learning.<br>-- AND --<br>Instructional groups are varied and support the activities. | The candidate's plans reflect knowledge and use of a wide range of effective pedagogical approaches in the discipline and best practices based on current research, and the ability to anticipate student misconceptions. The candidate provides opportunities for students to use interactive technologies, when appropriate, to enhance student learning.<br>-- AND --<br>Instructional groups are varied appropriately, with some opportunity for student choice. |

1B. Indicators:

- ❏ Plans and practice reflect effective teaching approaches/practices in the discipline
- ❏ Plans show evidence of anticipating student misconceptions
- ❏ Plans indicate use of varied instructional groups (e.g., groups varying in size, membership, purpose)
- ❏ Plans include opportunities for students to control group dynamics and help set the agenda for the group to follow

| 1C. Demonstrates Knowledge of Students | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate's plans display minimal knowledge of how students learn—and little knowledge of their varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages—and does not indicate that such knowledge is valuable<br><br>-- OR --<br>The candidate fails to apply differentiated learning tasks/activities for groups of students. | The candidate plans display generally accurate knowledge of how students learn and of their varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages, yet may apply this knowledge not to individual students but to the class as a whole.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate applies some differentiation for different groups of students | The candidate plans for the active nature of student learning and applies information about levels of development for groups of students. The candidate also purposefully acquires knowledge from more than one source about groups of students' varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, interests or cultural heritages.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate applies adequate differentiation for groups of students. | The candidate plans for the active nature of student learning and applies information about levels of development for individual students. The candidate also systematically acquires knowledge from more than one source about individual students' varied approaches to learning, knowledge and skills, special needs, and interests and cultural heritages.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate appropriately applies and differentiates activities to meet the learning needs and interests of individual learners. |

1C. Indicators:
- ❏ Formal and informal information about students gathered by candidate for use in planning instruction
- ❏ Knowledge of student interest and needs for use in planning
- ❏ Knowledge and participation in community cultural events
- ❏ Knowledge of special needs, circumstances of student to differentiate lessons
- ❏ Uses prior assessment data in making instructional decisions to meet learners' needs in each area of development (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical)
- ❏ Instructional materials, displays, and examples represent varied student interests and cultural backgrounds.

| 1D. Selects Appropriate Learning Outcomes | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate states learning outcomes that reflect low expectations for students and lack of rigor, and not all of these outcomes reflect important learning in the lesson. | The candidate states learning outcomes that reflect moderate expectations and rigor. Some reflect important learning in the lesson and consist of a combination of outcomes and activities. | The candidate states learning outcomes that reflect high expectations for all students, represent rigorous and important learning in the lesson and are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and suggest viable methods of assessment. | The candidate states learning outcomes that reflect high expectations for all students and build, in a developmentally appropriate way, toward high-order thinking skills in the lesson. They are clear, are written in the form of student learning, and permit viable methods of assessment. |

1D. Indicators:
- ❏ Statements of student learning, not student activity
- ❏ Learning outcomes permitting assessment of student attainment (measureable)
- ❏ Includes learning outcomes that require higher order thinking among students

| 1E. Demonstrates Knowledge of Resources | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not include resources to assist student learning beyond materials provided by the school or district, nor does the candidate include resources for expanding one's own professional skill. | The candidate includes some resources beyond those provided by the school or district for classroom use and for extending one's professional skill but does not seek to expand this knowledge of available resources. | The candidate uses resources, including technology, beyond those provided by the school or district, including resources for classroom use and for extending one's professional skill, and seeks out such resources. | The candidate effectively incorporates a variety of resources, including technology, for classroom use and for extending one's professional skill, including real world resources available through the school or district, in the community, through professional organizations and universities. The selected resources have potential to promote student accountability and engagement and ensure accessibility and relevance for all learners. |

1E. Indicators:
- ❏ Materials by the district
- ❏ Guest speakers
- ❏ Materials provided by professional organizations
- ❏ Community resources
- ❏ University resources
- ❏ A range of texts
- ❏ Internet resources and other technologies

| 1F. Designs Coherent Instruction | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate plans learning activities that are poorly aligned with the instructional outcomes, do not follow an organized progression, are not designed to engage students in active intellectual activity, and have unrealistic time allocations. | The candidate plans learning activities and materials that are aligned with the instructional outcomes and represent moderate cognitive challenge. The lesson or unit has a recognizable structure; but the progression of activities is uneven, with only some reasonable time allocations. | The candidate plans learning activities that are aligned with the instructional outcomes and follow an organized progression suitable to groups of students. The learning activities have reasonable time allocations; they represent a significant cognitive challenge. | The candidate sequences the learning activities in a way that is clear, logical, sequential, and integrated across the curriculum, is aligned to instructional outcomes, and is designed to engage all students in high-level cognitive activity. |

1F. Indicators
- ❏ Lessons support learning outcomes and reflect important concepts
- ❏ Proper sequencing of instruction and structured lesson plans
- ❏ Activities that represent high-level thinking
- ❏ Opportunities for student choice
- ❏ Use of varied resources
- ❏ Thoughtfully planned learning groups

| 1G. Assesses Student Learning for Planning | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate plans assessment procedures that are not congruent with instructional outcomes and lack criteria concerning how student performance will be assessed.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate has no plan to incorporate formative assessment in the lesson or unit. | The candidate plans assessment procedures that are partially congruent with instructional outcomes.<br>-- OR --<br>The assessment criteria are developed, but not clear.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's approach to using formative assessment is uneven and lacks specificity that would be useful for future planning. | The candidate plans assessment procedures congruent with instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies have been adapted for groups of students.<br>-- AND --<br>The assessment criteria are well developed and clear.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's approach to using formative assessment focuses on group response that limits differentiation and has limited impact on future planning. | The candidate plans assessment procedures congruent with instructional outcomes; assessment methodologies have been adapted for individual students as needed.<br>-- AND --<br>The assessment criteria are well-designed with clear criteria for assessing individual student work<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's approach to using formative assessment focuses on differentiated instruction based on student responses that inform future planning. |

1G. Indicators:

- ❏ Lesson plans indicate connections between assessment and learning outcomes
- ❏ Assessment types suitable to the style of the outcome
- ❏ Expectations clearly written and descriptors for each level of performance
- ❏ Variety of performance opportunities for students
- ❏ Formative assessments designed to inform minute-to-minute decision making during instruction (i.e., checking for understanding, assessment questions, recognition checks, concept maps)
- ❏ Assessments will provide data that may be used to modify instruction in each developmental area (cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical).

| Domain 2: The Classroom Environment | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2A. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport** | | | |
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate's patterns of classroom interactions, with the students, and others, are predominantly negative, inappropriate, or insensitive to students' ages, cultural backgrounds, and developmental levels. Interactions are characterized by sarcasm, put-downs, or conflict. | The candidate's patterns of classroom interactions, with the students and others, are generally appropriate but may reflect occasional inconsistencies, favoritism, and disregard for students' ages, cultures, and/or developmental levels. | The candidate's interactions with students and others are friendly and demonstrate general caring and respect. | The candidate works with students and others to establish a climate of trust and teamwork reflecting genuine warmth and caring and sensitivity to students' diversity to include race, color, religion, sex, national origin or disability. |
| 2A. Indicators:<br>❏ Respectful talk, active listening, and turn-taking<br>❏ Politeness and encouragement<br>❏ Fairness<br>❏ Students feel valued, safe, and comfortable taking intellectual risks<br>❏ Positive body language | | | |

| 2B. Establishing a Culture for Learning | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The classroom culture is characterized by a lack of commitment by the candidate or students to the value of what is being learned.<br> -- OR --<br>The candidate exhibits minimal expectation for student engagement. | The classroom culture is characterized by little commitment by the candidate or students to the value of what is being learned.<br> -- OR --<br>The candidate exhibits expectations that focus on getting finished regardless of student engagement. | The classroom culture is characterized by a commitment by the candidate to the value of what is being learned.<br> -- AND --<br>The candidate exhibits expectations for quality learning for the group. | The classroom culture is a cognitively vibrant place, characterized by a shared belief (candidate/students) in the value of what is being learned.<br> -- AND --<br>The candidate exhibits expectations for learning by all students who are engaged in improving the quality of their work. |

2B. Indicators:

- ❏ Belief in value of what is being learned
- ❏ High expectations, supported through verbal and nonverbal behavior, for both learning and participation
- ❏ Expectation of high-quality work on the part of students
- ❏ Expectation and recognition of effort and persistence on the part of students
- ❏ High expectations for expression and work product

| 2C. Managing Classroom Procedures | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate's instructional time is lost through inefficient classroom routines and procedures; little evidence that students know or follow established routines for transitions, or instructional groups. | The candidate's instructional time is minimized due to inconsistent classroom routines and procedures when dealing with instructional groups or transitions. | The candidate challenges student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible. -- AND -- The candidate's pacing of the learning tasks provides students the time needed to become actively engaged in the lesson. | The candidate's management of instructional time is maximized due to smooth routines and procedures when dealing with instructional groups and routines; students may initiate routines. |

2C. Indicators:

- ❏ Smooth functioning routines (e.g., handling of materials and supplies).
- ❏ Little or no loss of instructional time
- ❏ Students playing an important role in carrying out the routines
- ❏ Students knowing what to do, where to move

| 2D. Managing Student Behavior | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate fails to establish rules of student behavior. -- OR -- The candidate's response to students' misbehavior is disrespectful/ or inappropriate. | The candidate attempts to establish rules of student behavior, but implementation is inconsistent. -- OR -- The candidate's response to student misbehavior is inconsistent in terms of respect or appropriateness, sometimes harsh, other times lenient. | The candidate establishes rules for student behavior that are consistently enforced. -- AND -- The candidate's response to student misbehavior is consistent, respectful and effective. | The candidate establishes rules for student behavior and encourages students to take an active role in monitoring their own behavior. -- AND -- The candidate's response to student misbehavior is sensitive to individual student needs and respects students' dignity. |

2D. Indicators:

- ❏ Clear standards of conduct, possibly posted and referred to during lesson as appropriate
- ❏ Absence of hostility between candidate and students concerning behavior
- ❏ Candidate awareness of student conduct; if needed, corrects behavior using positive feedback in a way the student still feels respected
- ❏ Preventive action when needed by the candidate (i.e., including subtle signals)
- ❏ Reinforcement of positive behavior

| 2E. Organizing Physical Space | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The classroom environment is unsafe.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate fails to use physical resources or technology when appropriate. | The classroom is safe, and essential learning is accessible to most students.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's use of physical resources, including technology when appropriate, is moderately effective. | The classroom is safe, and learning is accessible to all students; the candidate ensures that the physical arrangement is appropriate to the learning activities.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate makes effective use of physical resources, including technology when appropriate. | The classroom is safe and learning accessible to individual students' diversity to include race, color, religion, sex, national origin or disability.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate and students make effective use of physical resources, including technology when appropriate and adjusts the physical environment to accommodate the needs of all students. |

2E. Indicators:

- ❏ Pleasant inviting atmosphere
- ❏ Safe environment
- ❏ Accessibility for all students
- ❏ Furniture/equipment suitable for the learning activities
- ❏ Effective use of physical resources, to include technology, by both candidate and students

| Domain 3: Instruction | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **3A. Communicating With Students** | | | |
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not communicate the purpose of the lesson clearly; and the directions and procedures are confusing.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's explanation of the content contains major errors<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's communications include errors of vocabulary or incorrect use of academic language. | The candidate's attempt to explain the instructional purpose has only limited success, and/or directions and procedures must be clarified after initial student confusion.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's explanation of the content may contain minor errors; some portions are clear, others difficult to follow<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's communications use academic vocabulary correctly but it is too advanced or too juvenile for the students. | The candidate clearly links the instructional purpose of the lesson to students, including how it relates to prior learning; directions and procedures are explained clearly and modeled.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's explanation of content is scaffolded, clear, and accurate and connects with students' knowledge, experience, and cultural backgrounds.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's communication uses correct academic vocabulary and is suited for the lesson. | The candidate links the instructional purpose of the lesson to the larger curriculum; the directions and procedures are clear and anticipate possible student misunderstanding.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's explanation of content is thorough and clear, deepening students' understanding through scaffolding and connecting with students' interests and cultural backgrounds.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's communication uses correct academic language and encourages students to use the language in conversation. |

3A. Indicators:
- ❏ Clarity of lesson purpose
- ❏ Clear directions and procedures specific to the lesson activities
- ❏ Absence of content errors and clear explanations of concepts and strategies
- ❏ Correct and imaginative use of language

| 3B. Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate's questions are of low cognitive challenge, with yes/no or single correct responses, and are asked in rapid succession.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate accepts all contributions without asking students to explain their reasoning. | The candidate's questions lead students through a single path of inquiry, with answers seemingly determined in advance.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate attempts to ask some questions designed to engage students in thinking, but only a few students are involved. | While the candidate may use some low-level questions, he/she poses questions designed to promote student thinking and understanding.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate creates a genuine discussion among students, providing adequate time for students to respond and stepping aside when doing so is appropriate to ensure that most students are heard. | The candidate uses a variety or series of questions or prompts to challenge students cognitively, advance high-level thinking and discourse, and promote metacognition.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate creates a learning environment in which students formulate many questions, initiate topics, challenge one another's thinking, and make unsolicited contributions. |

3B. Indicators:
- ❏ Questions of high cognitive challenge by both candidates and students
- ❏ Effective use of the students' responses and ideas
- ❏ High levels of student participation in discussion
- ❏ Students take an active role in discussion (e.g., lead)
- ❏ Asks questions at a variety of levels to engage learners

| 3C. Engaging Students in Learning | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not invite or provide opportunities for students to share their thinking.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's pacing of the learning tasks has no clearly defined structure, or the pace of the learning tasks are too slow or rushed for students to become engaged. | The candidate allows little opportunity for students to explain their thinking, allowing most students to be passive or merely compliant.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate's pacing of the learning tasks are uneven- suitable in parts but rushed or dragging in others. | The candidate challenges student thinking, inviting students to make their thinking visible.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's pacing of the learning tasks provides students the time needed to become actively engaged in the lesson. | The candidate provides suitable scaffolding and challenges students to explain their higher –order thinking.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate's pacing of the learning task is even, allowing time for active student engagement to meet lesson outcomes. |

3C. Indicators:

- ❏ Student enthusiasm, interest, thinking, problem solving, etc.
- ❏ Learning tasks that require high-level student thinking and invite students to explain their thinking
- ❏ Appropriate and meaningful technology is used to enrich students' learning
- ❏ Students actively "working," rather than watching while the candidate "works"
- ❏ Suitable pacing of the lesson: neither dragged out nor rushed, with time for closure and student reflection

| 3D. Using Assessment in Instruction | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not make students aware of the assessment criteria (rubrics, checklists, performance criteria, etc.). -- OR -- The candidate does not use informal and/or formal assessments to monitor student learning and inform instructional decisions. -- OR -- The candidate does not provide feedback or the feedback is of poor quality. | The candidate makes students partially aware of the assessment criteria (rubrics, checklists, performance criteria, etc.). -- OR -- The candidate inconsistently uses informal and/or formal assessments to monitor student learning and inform instructional decisions. -- OR -- The candidate's feedback to students is general. | The candidate does make students aware of the assessment criteria (rubrics, checklists, performance criteria, etc.). -- AND -- The candidate uses informal and formal assessments to monitor student learning, measure student progress and inform instructional decisions. -- AND -- The candidate's feedback to groups of students is accurate and specific. | The candidate makes students aware of the assessment criteria (rubrics, checklists, performance criteria, etc.). -- AND -- The candidate fully integrates assessment throughout instruction to measure student progress and to inform instructional decisions. -- AND -- The candidate provides a variety of forms of feedback, to both individuals and groups of students, is accurate and specific and advances learning. |

3D. Indicators:

- ❏ Candidate pays attention to evidence of student understanding
- ❏ Candidate posing specifically created questions to elicit evidence of student understanding
- ❏ Candidate circulating to monitor student learning and to offer feedback
- ❏ Students assessing their own work against established criteria
- ❏ Differentiated criteria based on students' needs and strengths

| 3E. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not challenge, support, and/or accommodate students' questions, needs, interests, and cultural backgrounds. -- OR -- The candidate makes no attempt to adjust the lesson even when students don't understand the content. | The candidate inconsistently challenges, supports, and/or accommodates students' questions, needs, interests, and cultural backgrounds when appropriate. -- OR -- The candidate's adjustment of the lesson in response to student misunderstandings is minimal or ineffective. | The candidate successfully challenges, supports, and accommodates students' questions, needs, interests, and cultural backgrounds when appropriate. -- AND -- The candidate makes smooth minor adjustments to the lesson in response to student misunderstandings. | The candidate seizes an opportunity to enhance learning and challenge individual students, building on a spontaneous event, students' needs, interests, and cultural backgrounds when appropriate. -- AND -- The candidate successfully adjusts and differentiates instruction to address individual student misunderstandings. |

3E. Indicators:
- ❏ Incorporation of students' interest and daily events into a lesson
- ❏ Candidate adjusting instruction in response to evidence of student understanding (or lack of it)
- ❏ Candidate seizing on a teachable moment
- ❏ Possible phrases: "That's not working, let's try it another way"; "Stop here's another way to try it";
- ❏ Incorporates school events or upcoming events in the school (e.g., championship game, school play, or scholar bowl)

| 3F. Reflecting on Teaching | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Ineffective Level 1** | **Needs Development Level 2** | **Proficient Level 3** | **Novice Level 4** |
| The candidate does not know whether the lesson was effective or achieved its instructional outcomes.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate profoundly misjudges the success of a lesson.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate has no suggestions for how a lesson could be improved. | The candidate has a generally accurate impression of the lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which instructional outcomes were met.<br>-- OR --<br>The candidate makes general suggestions about how a lesson could be improved, which may or may not be related to students' learning. | The candidate makes an accurate reflective assessment of the lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes and can cite general references to support the judgment.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate makes a few specific suggestions of what could be tried another time the lesson is taught based on assessment of students' learning. | The candidate makes a thoughtful and accurate assessment of the lesson's effectiveness and the extent to which it achieved its instructional outcomes, citing many specific examples from the lesson.<br>-- AND --<br>The candidate offers specific alternative actions based on assessment of individual student's and small groups of students' learning to inform and develop future instructional decisions. |

3F. Indicators:
- ❏ Accurate assessment of the lesson and provides specific examples
- ❏ Indicates ways to make adjustments in the future
- ❏ Connects wishes (things to change) and positives (things that went well)
- ❏ Uses feedback from instructors, cooperating candidates, peers, and students to improve practice.

**Appendix B**

XXXXX University: Teacher Candidate Dispositions Assessment
The following seven dispositional domains will be assessed by faculty, staff, and cooperating teachers at various points during the program. Numbers in parentheses refer to the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles addressed. Example behaviors operationalize each dispositional domain. This list is meant to illustrate the domain, but it is not intended to be comprehensive. Example behaviors may or may not be weighted equally in the determination of the dispositional domain rating.

| Disposition | Unacceptable | Needs Improvement | Proficient<br>Proficient is the expected level of performance. | Exemplary<br>In addition to meeting the requirements for Proficient… |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Legal & Ethical Conduct (9)** | Does not demonstrate a clear understanding of legal and moral obligations of the profession which includes integrity and honesty;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not exhibit ethical conduct by meeting established standards;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not maintain confidentiality of student records, parent communications, or private professional communications | Inconsistently demonstrates a clear understanding of legal and moral obligations of the profession which includes integrity and honesty;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently exhibits ethical conduct by meeting established standards;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently maintains confidentiality of student records, parent communications, or private professional communications | Adequately demonstrates a clear understanding of legal and moral obligations of the profession which includes integrity and honesty;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately exhibits ethical conduct by meeting established standards;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately maintains confidentiality of student records, parent communications, and private professional communications | Consistently demonstrates a clear understanding of legal and moral obligations of the profession which includes integrity and honesty;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently exhibits ethical conduct by meeting established standards;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently maintains confidentiality of student records, parent communications, and private professional communications |

| Interactions with Others (3, 5, 10) | Does not interact or establish an effective rapport with others appropriately, respectfully, or professionally using appropriate language, voice, and tone;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not acknowledge perspectives and/or seeks opportunities to collaboratively work/interact with all individuals with respect and consideration to achieve common goals | Inconsistently interacts and establishes an effective rapport with others appropriately, respectfully, or professionally using appropriate language, voice, and tone;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently acknowledges perspectives or inconsistently seeks opportunities to collaboratively work/interact with all individuals with respect and consideration to achieve common goals | Adequately interacts and establishes an effective rapport with others appropriately, respectfully, and professionally using appropriate language, voice, and tone;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately acknowledges perspectives and regularly seeks opportunities to collaboratively work/interact with all individuals with respect and consideration to achieve common goals | Consistently interacts and establishes an effective rapport with others appropriately, respectfully, and professionally using appropriate language, voice, and tone;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently acknowledges perspectives and continuously seeks opportunities to collaboratively work/interact with all individuals with respect and consideration to achieve common goals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reliability (9)** | Does not meet or is not punctual for deadlines, professional activities, or requests;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not make prior arrangements with instructor/supervisor when absence is necessary;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not maintain active or focused participation;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not ask proactive questions | Inconsistently meets or is punctual for deadlines, professional activities, or requests;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently makes prior arrangements with instructor/superviso r when absence is necessary;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently maintains active or focused participation;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently asks proactive questions | Adequately meets and is punctual for deadlines, professional activities, and requests;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately makes prior arrangements with instructor/supervisor when absence is necessary;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately maintains active and focused participation;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately asks proactive questions | Consistently meets and is punctual for deadlines, professional activities, and requests;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently makes prior arrangements with instructor/supervis or when absence is necessary;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently maintains active and focused participation;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently asks proactive questions |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Professional Appearance & Demeanor (9)** | Does not exhibit appropriate attire and hygiene;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not act in a mature, professional manner or maintains emotional control;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not display confidence, composure, positive attitude or initiative | Inconsistently exhibits appropriate attire and hygiene;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently acts in a mature, professional manner or maintains emotional control;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently displays confidence, composure, positive attitude or initiative | Adequately exhibits appropriate attire and hygiene;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately acts in a mature, professional manner and maintains emotional control;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately displays confidence, composure, positive attitude and initiative | Consistently exhibits appropriate attire and hygiene;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently acts in a mature, professional manner and maintains emotional control;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently displays confidence, composure, positive attitude and initiative |
| **Commitment to Student Learning (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10)** | Does not demonstrate and advocate the belief that all students can learn and does not adapt the instruction to meet various needs and abilities;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not demonstrate accountability for student learning and development | Inconsistently demonstrates and advocates the belief that all students can learn while adapting the instruction to meet various needs and abilities;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently demonstrates accountability for student learning and development | Adequately demonstrates and advocates the belief that all students can learn while adapting the instruction to meet various needs and abilities;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately demonstrates accountability for student learning and development | Consistently demonstrates and advocates the belief that all students can learn while adapting the instruction to meet various needs and abilities;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently demonstrates accountability for student learning and development |

| **Commitment to Improvement (6, 9)** | Does not listen to or use feedback from instructors, cooperating teachers, peers, or students to improve practice; AND/OR makes excuses, defenses, or justifications for deficiencies | Inconsistently listens to or uses feedback from instructors, cooperating teachers, peers, or students to improve practice; AND/OR at times makes excuses, defenses, or justifications for deficiencies | Adequately listens to and uses feedback from instructors, cooperating teachers, peers, and students to improve practice | Consistently listens to and uses feedback from instructors, cooperating teachers, peers, and students to improve practice |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |

| Commitment to the Profession (9) | Does not follow appropriate protocols when seeking solutions to problems;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not value opportunities for networking with others in the field;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not use appropriate language conventions in communications both oral and written;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not demonstrate flexibility and responsiveness;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>does not engage in appropriate use of personal electronic devices and social media;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>undermines colleagues | Inconsistently follows appropriate protocols when seeking solutions to problems;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently values opportunities for networking with others in the field;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently uses appropriate language conventions in communications both oral and written;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>inconsistently engages in appropriate use of personal electronic devices and social media;<br><br>AND/OR<br><br>at times undermines colleagues | Adequately follows appropriate protocols when seeking solutions to problems;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately values opportunities for networking with others in the field;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately uses appropriate language conventions in communications both oral and written;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness;<br><br>AND<br><br>adequately engages in appropriate use of personal electronic devices and social media | Consistently follows appropriate protocols when seeking solutions to problems;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently values opportunities for networking with others in the field;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently uses appropriate language conventions in communications both oral and written;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently demonstrates flexibility and responsiveness;<br><br>AND<br><br>consistently engages in appropriate use of personal electronic devices and social media |
|---|---|---|---|---|

**Comments:**

 

**Faculty Signature:** _____     **Date:** _____

**Cooperating Teacher Signature:** _____     **Date:** _____

**Student Signature:** _____     **Date:** _____