# Eastern Connecticut State University

**Rejoinder to NCATE Board of Examiners Report for Continuous Improvement Pathway**

**Onsite Visit November 13-15, 2016**

Eastern Connecticut State University (Eastern)’s Unit acknowledges receipt of the NCATE Board of Examiners’ (BOE) Report about the NCATE Full Onsite Visit November 13-15, 2016. We submit this rejoinder report addressing concerns and areas for improvement recommended in the BOE report.

Eastern’s Unit would like to thank and appreciate the collegial and professional leadership and support shown by the visiting team members, in particular by Dr. Jerry Bailey, the team chair. All members of our Unit felt that the team members were uniformly professional, thorough, organized and fully committed to the task. The Unit also appreciates the comprehensive and detailed BOE report submitted by the visiting team. It clearly identifies our strengths, highlights the improvements to our programs that have been accomplished and implemented, acknowledges our ongoing work for continuous improvements, and denotes a few areas for further improvement.

To facilitate the review of all of our accreditation documents, Eastern Unit has uploaded these in our website at <http://www.easternct.edu/graduate/accreditation/>. This website holds the Institutional Report (IR) with the narratives for all the standards and related exhibits, the response to the Offsite Report and related appendices, and the evidence shared with the visiting team Onsite. While the IR and Offsite report and all related exhibits and appendices have been loaded in AIMS also, the Unit believes that our website is clearly organized and may be more conducive for easy navigation between the narrative and the evidence with hyperlinked access to the data.

Table 1 (below) captures the essentials of the BOE report with all standards MET for both Initial and Advanced programs, AFIs removed (n=22), previous AFIs continued (n=0), new AFIs recommended (n=2), and a concise response to the recommended AFIs. In the narrative following, we address the statements of concerns raised in the narratives for Standards 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 (all recommended as MET). We also address the new AFIs recommended for Standard 3.

The BOE report clearly captures our historical background and the legacy Eastern carries forward in Connecticut. It also identifies and establishes the transitions that the Eastern Unit has been undergoing during the last few years with new leadership within the School of Education and Professional Studies. The Unit appreciates the visiting team for understanding the effect of this transition on continuous improvement (I.1) and that several positive changes in place for the Initial programs in 2014 had not yet come to mature (I.4). Too, the visiting team acknowledged the (continuing) low enrollment in our Advanced programs with therefore little data for reporting in 2014 and the current transition toward the discontinuance of individual programs for a single, interdisciplinary advanced master’s program in Educational Studies with concentrations (I.4).

**Table 1: Chart outlining BOE Recommendations, AFIs removed, continued, recommended and Eastern’s response**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Standard** | **BOE** | **Programs** | **AFIs removed from last visit** | **AFIs continued from last visit** | **New AFIs recommended** | **Eastern’s Response** |
| **1** | Met | Initial  Advanced | All (n=1) previous AFIs removed | None | None | Agreed |
| **2** | Met | Initial  Advanced | All (n=3) previous AFIs removed | None | None | Agreed |
| **3** | Met | Initial Advanced | All (n=2) previous AFIs removed | None | 1. The unit does not ensure clarity of expectations and timelines for the new Core sequence in the initial programs and for the field experiences in the advanced programs among all constituencies. (ITP, ADV) | a. Initial: We believe that the lack of clarity may stem from varied references to “Core” in different contexts and by different constituents. We clarify the distinction between the various references below.  b. Advanced: Clinical expectations for the current and newly developed advanced master’s program remain the same and is embedded within EDU 518: Methods of Teaching English Language Learners. We provide clarification below in the narrative. |
| 2. There is no formal structure in place to ensure that the unit’s school partners and other members of the professional community are systematically and regularly involved in the design delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. (ITP, ADV) | Eastern maintains a long established formal and informal partnership with P-12 partners with both groups meeting informally frequently and meeting formally occasionally. Both these opportunities have provided regular and systematic feedback from the P-12 partners and afforded adequate channels for involvement to the P-12 community. More detail and our current plans to further this relationship (also shared with the visiting team) are outlined below. |
| **4** | Met | Initial Advanced | All (n=3) previous AFIs removed | None | None | Agreed |
| **5** | Met | Initial Advanced | No previous AFI | None | None | Agreed |
| **6** | Met | Initial Advanced | All (n=2) previous AFIs removed | None | None | Agreed |

## Standard 1

## The BOE report recommends that this standard is MET, with all previous AFIs removed, citing that the evidence presented attests distinctly to our initial and advanced candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions. As stated in the section I.1, all but the Elementary and Secondary Math programs have been recognized by their respective SPAs. Since the November 2016 visit, our Elementary Undergraduate program has been recognized. As stated in our Institutional Report and affirmed by the BOE report, we continue to collect and analyze data for the programs currently not recognized and will be submitting them for SPA review and approval once we have gathered three cycles of data (page 5). Additionally, the BOE report clearly acknowledges that the concerns raised by the Offsite Report were nullified by evidence presented during the onsite visit, particularly in terms of presenting disaggregated data for both the bachelors and the master’s programs. The data clearly delineated our candidates’ performance in assessments related to their content knowledge, skills and dispositions. These reports and the data are available on AIMS, as well as on our website.

**Standard 2**

## The BOE report recommends that this standard is MET, with all previous AFIs removed. In particular, the BOE report affirms that our electronic data management system (TK20) is in full operation, supporting assessment data collection and analysis for all programs. Assisted by a TK20 coordinator and a dedicated faculty member for assessment, the Unit has been able to regularly and systematically capture and analyze assessment data to make decisions about program improvements. We also regularly share data among our faculty and with university (e.g., Arts and Sciences faculty) and outside partners. Data are periodically analyzed and program improvements planned and implemented during these meetings (page 9). A program improvement that stemmed from these data discussions was the new Core assessments. The BOE report refers to our existing Clinical assessments and commends us for implementing additional Core assessments (page 9). We explain and clarify the distinction between Core semesters, Core assessments, and Clinical Practices in Core curriculum within Standard 3 below.

**Standard 3**

The BOE report recommends that this standard is MET, with all previous AFIs removed, and 2 new AFIs added. Table 2 below addresses the new AFIs briefly with detailed responses provided in narrative.

The report acknowledges and commends our close and excellent relationships with P-12 teachers and administrators. Feedback from school partners has been elicited via a multitude of ways, including informal meetings, regularly scheduled monthly meetings with supervisors, annually scheduled meeting with P-12 cooperating teachers and administrators and occasional meetings with the Teacher Education Advisory Council. These have served to provide validating feedback on our core curricula, clinical experiences and assessment instruments. In addition, recognizing the need to further systematize our community partnerships, to capitalize on our close relationship and to develop this association into a more mutually beneficial collaboration, the unit has re-designed the Teacher Education Advisory Council into a Professional Learning Council. This latter venture, while in its nascent stages as noted in the BOE report (page 15), has been thoughtfully planned to include select partners and will come to fruition concomitant to our own transition towards CAEP accreditation.

While it is true (as the BOE report indicates, page 15) that we have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with one school district (Coventry) and plans for more formal agreements with others, it is undeniably true that our clinical collaborations with several of the 36 districts are long-standing and well established, even without an MOU. Members of the visiting team visited two of these non-MOU districts: Norwich (a high school) and Windham (a preschool) and were struck by the deep connections between our university and the schools in terms of district partner’s understanding of our curriculum and other expectations and their complete support of our teacher candidates. In both these schools, Eastern teacher candidates are visibly present in classrooms, Eastern alumni are serving as cooperating teachers or school administrators (pages 16 and 23). Teachers from both these schools were also part of the interviewees who met with the visiting team for formal interviews on campus (see, onsite visit schedule). It is the unit’s firm belief that even while we continue to maintain strong relationships that provide ongoing and systematic opportunities for P-12 school partners to be involved in the design, delivery, and evaluation of our field and clinical experiences, we want to distinguish the growing school districts with whom we have MOUs. Since the November visit, we have established an MOU with another district, Windham (see Windham MOU in Appendix B). These partnerships provide an even greater service by offering internships to our graduate level teacher candidates.

As stated in the BOE report (third full paragraph, page 15), our field and clinical experiences require all our initial candidates (both undergraduate and graduate) to complete 45 clock hours of planned experiences in their Core I and Core II terms, followed by 135 hours in their Core III and a full semester of student teaching. The description of these experiences with expected competencies is outlined in the Clinical Experience and Student Teaching handbook. These experiences and their evaluations have always been present in our programs and candidates are routinely evaluated by university supervisors. Data from these evaluations were shared with the team onsite and are present as part of our reports on our website and in AIMS.

In addition to these field and clinical experiences, we have also initiated a new set of assessments called the Core I, II, III portfolios. Reading the BOE report (final paragraph on page 15), we realize (and apologize) that we may have been unclear and inadvertently used similar words to describe related but distinct experiences and assessments. We want to clarify the distinction between several references to the Cores that the visiting team may have heard or read about, which may have led to the mistaken assumption that we have not ‘clearly articulated [the expectations for these experiences] with candidates, faculty members and P-12 colleagues’ (page 16, third line). It is our belief that our candidates, faculty and P-12 partners are fully aware of the expectations and timelines for these various Cores, as affirmed by the generation of data.

Core I, II, III, IV: Cores refer to the select cluster of program courses that candidates complete sequentially after admission to the program. Thus, each program has four Cores. Each of these Cores has its own distinct clinical experience with supervision. Candidates are evaluated by way of an observation assessment, the Clinical evaluation rubric (see Core I, II, III, IV clinical evaluations below). Each of these Cores is also where we have begun to embed our new set of assessments called Core I, II, III portfolios (see below), to be completed by candidates separate from and in addition to their Core clinical evaluations.

Core I, II, III, IV clinical evaluations: These are evaluations of the candidates in their Core I, II, III and IV clinical experiences, completed by their university supervisor, using the Clinical Evaluation rubric. These are based largely on classroom observation and conferences with candidates and other clinical faculty (i.e., the cooperating teacher). Core III evaluation is the candidates’ practicum or pre-student teaching evaluation; Core IV evaluation is the candidates’ student teaching evaluation. Disaggregated data for all four clinical evaluations were shared with the visiting team and available at AIMS and in our website.

Core I, II, III portfolio: New unit-wide assessments, being developed, validated and implemented. Core I portfolio was piloted in Spring 2016 with a Looking Backwards Looking Forward assignment (see exhibit 2.3c Assessment report on Looking Back, Looking forward report submitted with the Institutional Report and posted at our website). Core I portfolio was fully implemented in Fall 2016; Core II portfolio is being implemented in Spring 2017. Core III portfolio is being developed and validated in Spring 2017 and will be implemented in Fall 2018. A roadmap outlining our timeline for development and implementation was shared onsite and is posted on our website. Please note that the Core IV portfolio will consist of edTPA. During and since our onsite visit, select programs (i.e., elementary Education, Secondary English, Early Childhood Education, and Physical education) have been piloting edTPA with national scoring. See Appendix A for edTPA internal report of national scoring of candidates in Spring 2016. The unit continues to phase in edTPA during Core IV, with full EPP implementation and national scoring by 2019.

Please refer to Table 3 below for more clarification.

Our advanced programs have always had a formal field experience often completed in the candidates’ current school setting. This is embedded within EDU 518: Methods of Teaching English Language Learners. Guidelines about the assessment and data were shared in AIMS and with the visiting team. As acknowledged by the visiting team, our advanced programs have long suffered low enrollment, which has partly affected our abilities to collect data on our programs and has led to our current plans to develop a single advanced program with concentrations in 5 initial areas. The BOE report refers to two field experiences being planned in the new program (first full paragraph, page 16) and states that we did not provide information about their requirements. We would like to clarify that our plan is to retain the single formal field experience currently in place in EDU 518. Since that information was already provided with our report, we did not resubmit it. The assessment schema for the new advanced master’s program with concentrations has been completed since the site visit and will be provided during the next accreditation cycle, contingent upon state approval.

The BOE report outlines the rigorous and careful process maintained by our OECE (Office of Educational and Clinical Experiences) to place our candidates such that they have both a diversity of experiences and a rich support system to further their professional development (page 18). Our Child and Family Development Resource Center, located on our campus, is one example of collaborative partnerships supporting the design, implementation and evaluation of our field experiences. In keeping with our state regulations, all cooperating teachers have completed the state’s TEAM (Teacher Education and Mentoring Program) and school districts further support by verifying the qualifications of the selected cooperating teachers. Evaluations of university supervisors are elicited via the end of program survey, which has been modified (shared with the team and available on our website) to include feedback on our cooperating teachers too. We continue to evaluate this survey to include formal and pertinent information relevant to our improvement of candidates’ clinical experiences.

One point of correction: Our candidates in Core I and II are formally evaluated by their university supervisor. In the third paragraph of page 17, the report indicates otherwise. This is the Clinical I and II evaluations, for which data were shared in AIMS and with the team.

The BOE report indicates that it was not clear in the Institutional Report why the number of credits for student teaching varies from six to nine credits (second paragraph on page 18). Some programs (elementary and secondary education) offer a variable credit option for student teaching (6-9) to accommodate candidates who may require additional experience to meet the established learning outcomes. The variable credits are recommended by faculty on a case-by-case basis. All candidates meet and or exceed the minimum, state requirement of ten weeks for student teaching. As stated in the BOE report, each additional credit lengthens a candidate’s hours in the classroom as appropriate.

**Table 2: Eastern’s Responses to new AFIs for Standard 3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **New AFIs recommended** | **AFI Rationale** | **Eastern’s Response** |
| 1. The unit does not ensure clarity of expectations and timelines for the new Core sequence in the initial programs and for the field experiences in the advanced programs among all constituencies. (ITP, ADV) | a. Based on information obtained from interviews and from documentation provided, it appears that the unit has not clearly articulated with candidates, faculty members, and P-12 colleagues the differences between the old and the new field and clinical experience models, and the date(s) for implementation. According to a meeting with the unit head and the NCATE coordinator, the new Core I is being implemented in fall 2016, and by fall 2018, each of the four new Cores will be in place for all initial undergraduates and initial graduate candidates. However, according to meetings with the director of OECE, university supervisors, and candidates, and information contained in the Clinical Experience and Student Teaching Handbook, it appears that all of the new Cores are being implemented now.  b. Candidates in the advanced programs complete a field experience in EDU 518: Methods of Teaching English Language Learners. The unit has developed one new masters of education program that includes field experiences; however, the requirements for the field experiences were not provided. | a. Initial: It is true that each of the four new Core assessments (Core I, II, III portfolio and edTPA) will be in place for all candidates by Fall 2018.  We believe that the confusion in implementation or lack of clarity may stem from varied references to “Core” in different contexts and by different constituents. We clarify the distinction between the various references in the narrative above and in Table 3.  b. Advanced: Clinical expectations for the current and newly developed advanced master’s program remain the same and is embedded within EDU 518: Methods of Teaching English Language Learners. Data from this clinical experience (including guidelines and rubric) were shared with the Institutional report and with the visiting team. The assessment schema for the new advanced master’s program with concentrations has been completed since the site visit and will be provided during the next accreditation cycle, contingent upon state approval. |
| 2. There is no formal structure in place to ensure that the unit’s school partners and other members of the professional community are systematically and regularly involved in the design delivery, and evaluation of field and clinical experiences. (ITP, ADV) | Isolated examples were provided of how P-12 partners have provided formal or informal feedback to the unit. The director of OECE maintains very close and excellent relationships with teachers and administrators in the local school districts and as a result, informal feedback occurs. The unit is planning to establish a Professional Learning Council for the purpose of involving P-12 partners and others; however, it was not in place at the time of the visit. | ECSU has long established formal and informal partnerships with the P-12 community. Formal partnerships are typically outlined by MOUs. As in the case with the graduate internship program (see exhibit for 3.1a in Institutional Report on Memorandum of Understanding with Coventry School District) the initiative is mutually designed and managed in terms of goals, day-to-day operations, and evaluation. Regular collaborations consist of the Dean’s annual meeting with school superintendents to discuss and plan according to the ongoing needs within the community (see exhibit for 2.2 in Institutional Report on Meeting with Superintendents and Superintendents Meeting Minutes Fall 2016 in Onsite evidence for Standard 3). More detail and our current plans towards strengthening this relationship were shared with the visiting team including details about the Professional Learning Council (onsite evidence under Standard 3). |

**Table 3: Clarification between various references to Core**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CORE** | **Candidates** | **Curricula**  (often referred as Core # by faculty and candidates) | **Clinical Experience**  (often referred as Core # within the context of clinical experiences by faculty, candidates and university supervisors) | **New Core Assessments**  (often referred as new Core # portfolio by faculty, candidates, university supervisors) |
| Core I | All graduate and undergraduate initial teacher candidates in their first semester or term, after admission to program | Set of 3 to 4 core courses, as determined by program faculty | Clinical I: 45 clock hours, evaluated by the university supervisor with the Clinical I Evaluation rubric. Rubric and Data were shared at AIMS, onsite and on our website. | Core I portfolio, developed and piloted in Spring 2016, implemented in Fall 2016. Guidelines for this assessment, including rubrics, and storage in TK20 shared with the visiting team and in AIMS. |
| Core II | All graduate and undergraduate initial teacher candidates in their second semester or term, after admission to program | Set of 3 to 4 core courses, as determined by program faculty | Clinical II: 45 clock hours, evaluated by the university supervisor with the Clinical II Evaluation rubric. Rubric and Data were shared at AIMS, onsite and on our website. | Core II portfolio, developed in Fall 2016, and being implemented currently, in Spring 2017. The Fall 2016 plans for developing this assessment were shared with the visiting team and posted on AIMS. Guidelines and rubric have been included in our TK20 and available for review. |
| Core III | All graduate and undergraduate initial teacher candidates in their third semester or term, after admission to program | Set of 2 to 3 core courses, as determined by program faculty | Clinical III (Practicum or Pre-Student Teaching): 135 clock hours, evaluated by the university supervisor with the Practicum or Pre-Student Teaching evaluation rubric. Rubric and Data were shared at AIMS, onsite and on our website. | Core III portfolio, is being developed in Spring 2017, and will be implemented in Fall 2017. Plans for developing this assessment were shared with the visiting team and posted on AIMS. |
| Core IV | All graduate and undergraduate initial teacher candidates in their final semester of their program | 1 course either designed as a student teaching seminar (elementary, secondary and physical education) or as an assessment course with focus on differentiation (early childhood education) | Clinical IV (Student Teaching): One full semester (minimum 10 weeks), evaluated by the university supervisor with the Student Teaching evaluation rubric. Rubric and Data were shared at AIMS, onsite and on our website. | Core IV portfolio will include edTPA, in pilot since Spring 2016, with national scoring.  Student teaching portfolio or impact on student learning assessments will continue to be conducted until edTPA becomes fully implemented across programs by 2019. Data from these ongoing assessments were shared at AIMS, onsite and on our website. |

**Standard 4**

## The BOE report recommends that this standard is MET, with all previous AFIs removed. The report outlines our varied and successful efforts to deepen curriculum, including the embedded course projects that broaden our candidates’ experience with diverse peers and students. We have infused evaluation of our candidates’ professional dispositions related to diversity within our key assessments, such as the student teaching instrument. Data from these evaluations are analyzed during the annual retreats to assess and to plan for continuous program improvements. These efforts are ongoing and the unit has continued to work on these goals post-accreditation visit.

**Standard 5**

## The BOE report recommends that this standard remains MET. The report outlines the extensive professional experience of our faculty and staff, within all areas of teaching, clinical supervision, research and service to the field. Part-time faculty are equally qualified and hold certifications within the areas of their courses and supervision. Professional development for all faculty is ongoing and supported by university resources to maintain currency in the field. Our faculty are immersed in their field and have produced an impressive number of publications and presentations, making a name for Eastern at the international arena.

**Standard 6**

## The BOE report recommends that this standard is MET, with all previous AFIs removed. As stated in the report, the Dean of the School of Education and Professional Studies is the head of the unit, including the two departments of Education and Kinesiology and Physical Education. Since his arrival on campus, the unit has deepened its clinical experiences and unit-wide assessments and maintained ongoing and continuous progress in developing clinical partnerships and collaborations, including a new partnership with a nationally recognized institution among Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) that continues in development since the site visit (see Letter of Intent and Cultural Competence and Leadership exhibits outlining the Initiative with Spelman College in Onsite evidence under Standard 4).

**Appendix A**

**edTPA Pilot Study (Spring 2016)**

Descriptive statistics were conducted for each of the 15 Rubrics of the edTPA Pilot Study. Candidates from Elementary, Secondary, and Physical Education participated. There were 50 candidates who participated in the study. Only 39 of those candidates were able to register and only 18 of those registered were able to submit their portfolio and have it scored (36%). The mean of each item was provided in the table below. Though the aim of the pilot was to examine the assessment from an implementation vantage point, the data revealed that candidate are proficient in three areas: (1) Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs, (2) Learning Environment, and (3) Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning. Candidates were approaching proficiency in many areas, but struggled within a cluster of elements related to assessment, with a mean of 2.5 or lower. Namely, these are: (4) Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness, (5) Student Understanding and Use of Feedback, (6) Student Understanding and Use of Feedback, (6) Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Literacy Learning, and (7) Using Assessment to Inform Instruction. As a pilot, these results are advisory.

All competencies are scored on a five-point scale, ranging from “Emerging Performance” to “Advanced Performance.”

EMERGING PERFORMANCE (1 or 2): PROFICIENT PERFORMANCE (3): ADVANCED PERFORMANCE (4 or 5)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | N | Mean |
| Planning Rubrics – Rubric 1: Planning for Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Context for Learning Information; Planning Commentary Prompt 1; strategic review of Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials | 18 | 2.89 |
| Planning Rubrics - Rubric 2: Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations); Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 3; strategic review of Lesson Plans and Instructional Materials to clarify planned supports | 18 | 3 |
| Planning Rubrics - Rubric 3: Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Planning Commentary Prompts 2 and 3 | 18 | 2.75 |
| Planning Rubrics - Rubric 4: Identifying and Supporting Language Demands  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Planning Commentary Prompt 4a-d; strategic review of Lesson Plan as noted in commentary prompt 4b | 18 | 2.83 |
| Planning Rubrics - Rubric 5: Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Context for Learning Information (required supports, modifications, or accommodations for assessments); Planning Commentary Prompt 5; assessment materials; strategic review of Lesson Plans | 18 | 2.81 |
| Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 6: Learning Environment  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Video Clip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 2 | 18 | 3.06 |
| Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 7: Engaging Students in Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Video Clip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 3 | 18 | 2.78 |
| Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 8: Deepening Student Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Video Cclip(s) 1 and/or 2; Instruction Commentary Prompt 4a | 18 | 2.83 |
| Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 9: Subject-Specific Pedagogy  PRIMARY SOURCES FO EVIDENCE: Video Clip 1 (engagement of students while candidate models the essential literacy strategy); Video Clip 2 (supporting students to practice and apply the essential literacy strategy); Instruction Commentary Prompt 4b | 18 | 2.61 |
| Instruction Rubrics - Rubric 10: Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Video Clips 1 and 2 (for evidence of student learning); Instruction Commentary Prompt 5 | 18 | 2.5 |
| Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 11: Analysis of Student Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 1; student work samples; evaluation criteria | 18 | 2.72 |
| Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 12: Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 2a-b; evidence of written, audio, or video feedback | 18 | 3.06 |
| Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 13: Student Understanding and Use of Feedback  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 2c | 18 | 2.36 |
| Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 14: Analyzing Students’ Language Use and Literacy Learning  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 3; evidence of student language use (student work samples and/or video evidence from Instruction Video clips or separate Language Use clip in Assessment) | 18 | 2.53 |
| Assessment Rubrics - Rubric 15: Using Assessment to Inform Instruction  PRIMARY SOURCES OF EVIDENCE: Assessment Commentary Prompt 4 | 18 | 2.56 |