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Question: To what degree do our candidates:

(a) reflect on their backgrounds,
(b) convey beliefs of students achievement,
(c) understand the actions that they will take in teaching because of their knowledge of diversity in the classroom,
(d) work with diverse students and their families.
Data Collection Tools/Methods:
CI 514 Multicultural and Urban Education Scoring Guide

Guide used "no-evidence", "some-evidence" and "substantial evidence" and "no-response" and 5 distinctive indicators for evaluation.
Data:
The data shows compelling evidence that our students actively:
- reflect on their backgrounds,
- convey beliefs of students achievement,
- understand the actions that they will take in teaching because of their knowledge of diversity in the classroom,
- and work with diverse students and their families.

The majority of the students demonstrated with effectiveness all of the objectives that were addressed. However, 15 percent (13 out of 85) of the students assessed, scored "some evidence" in (d) work with diverse students and their families.

80% of students show that they use knowledge of teaching and learning theories to depict respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments, while only 60% demonstrate the ability to apply age-appropriate application of teaching and learning theory within a cultural and community context.

Analysis/Conclusions:
A majority of students show proficiency related to our standards for diversity. With a small number of "some evidence" scores in the area of "work with diverse students and their families," we begin to wonder how much our program focuses on families in context of student learning. We recommend an audit of our program’s curriculum (former and revised).

Further and for the most part, students scored highly in using their knowledge of theory to depict respectful, supportive and challenging learning environments. We wonder if we will see this trend continue across years and suggest that we continue to audit this area. Overall, we do feel that our students scores demonstrate a strong cultural responsiveness in their thinking.

Additionally, we discussed the problem of assessing applications of knowledge in a the first quarter of the licensure program, lacking a field placement component at this stage. We also discussed the issue of timing (mid-point) when students are potentially processing rather than assimilating and discussing demonstration.
Action steps:

• The committee recommended a review of the syllabi--Teaching for Social Justice and Foundations of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices (at the secondary and elementary level)-- for more explicitly embedded work around the objective d) work with diverse students and their families. While this objective was only a focus in one course and assignment in the former program, the objective and assessment are now found in multiple courses in the GTEP revision. The committee found that in Teaching for Social Justice this objective is addressed explicitly through the "Bridging the Divide" assignment. Further, in Foundations of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices at the Secondary Level, the Case Study assignment also explicitly addresses this objective. Finally, the Foundations of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Practices at the Elementary Level addresses the objective with the "Reading Response Paper B."

• GTEP faculty are also adopting field-based assignments in first quarter of the program starting summer 2013.

• Additionally, GTEP faculty are remaking the scoring guide to a 4-point rubric to better aligning to the other program key assessment rubrics and more accurately pinpoint data and issues.

Take Action
Follow up from 2011-12 action items:

• In 2011-2012, a pilot of a new work sample process was implemented:
  o A work sample scoring guide was developed by elementary cohort leaders.
  o Supervisors and instructors participated in workshops about how to support work sample development and work sample assessment.
  o More explicit instruction about assessment and data-driven decision making was incorporated into the courses.
  o We gathered positive feedback from teacher candidates and supervisors after completing the work sample.

• A proposal is being considered to adopt the revised work sample process for both Elementary and Secondary cohorts.

• Course work has been more closely aligned to field experience.

• Course instructors have taken a more active role in work sample development and assessment.

• Secondary program has reimagined/reconstructed its methods courses.