

CAEP Annual Report: Student Teaching Evaluation: Aspiring Teacher Rubric (Instrument used by all teacher preparation programs except BSED Secondary Education, Sciences and Mathematics and MAT-S Teaching Science with Certification.)

(CAEP Standard Components R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R2.1, R3.3, R5.1, R5.2, and R5.3)

1. Case for Meeting Standard Component

- The Aspiring Teacher Rubric (ATR) is a proprietary instrument developed by the National Institute for Excellence in Education. The ATR was intentionally designed to be developmentally appropriate for student teachers. NAU Professional Education Programs (PEP) selected the ATR as the student teaching evaluation instrument due to the explicit alignment to the InTASC Standards (**CAEP Standards R1**). It is a validated instrument that requires training and annual certification to support the consistent implementation and reliability of the data collected (R5.2). The ATR is used by University Supervisors to evaluate a student teacher’s design and delivery of a lesson through a formal Midterm and Final observation thus providing evidence for **CAEP Standard Component R3.3**, Competency at Completion. NAU PEP transitioned to the ATR from the NIET TAP Rubric in Fall 2020.

NIET Aspiring Teacher Rubric Comparison Summary

This table below provides a summary of how the NIET Aspiring Teacher Rubric indicators relate to the NIET Teaching Standards indicators and InTASC Standards.

NIET Aspiring Teacher Rubric Indicators	NIET TAP Rubric Teaching Standards Indicators	InTASC Standards
Instructional Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructional Plans • Lesson Structure and Pacing • Student Work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #7: Planning for Instruction
Assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #6: Assessment
Standards and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standards and Objectives • Assessment • Student Work • Expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #1: Learner Development • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Presenting Instructional Content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Presenting Instructional Content • Teacher Content Knowledge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #5: Application of Content • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Activities and Materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activities and Materials • Grouping Students • Motivating Students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Questioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questioning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content
Academic Feedback	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Feedback 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content

Teacher Knowledge of Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teacher Knowledge of Students Grouping Students Lesson Structure and Pacing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #1: Learner Development Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #6: Assessment
Thinking and Problem-Solving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thinking Problem-Solving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #5: Application of Content Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment Expectations Respectful Culture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #3: Learning Environments
Engaging Students and Managing Student Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Managing Student Behavior Lesson Structure and Pacing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #3: Learning Environments
Professionalism and Ethical Behavior	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Professionalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice Standard #10 Leadership and Collaboration

Data from the ATR are extracted and archived in the university’s quality assurance system (**CAEP Standard Component R5.1**). The university’s information technology service extracts data from the enterprise learning management system (LMS), loads it into the data warehouse, and makes it available in the reporting infrastructure, or Business Objects. Data from this system are downloaded into useable and formatted Excel spreadsheets, which can be inserted into both program level reports (i.e., Assessment 5) as well as at the unit level as documented in this file.

- The AY 2020-2021 data results were shared internally with the Initial Teacher Preparation Coordinating Council (ITP CC) in Fall 2021 and with Cooperating Teachers (key stakeholders) through new feedback items that were added to the instrument cooperating teachers complete. These additional items were piloted in Fall 2021 and fully implemented in Spring 2022. The raw data results and data analysis from these additional items as well as open ended comments provided by Cooperating Teachers were provided to ITP Coordinating Council members and program coordinators at the March 2022 ITP CC meeting to review further and determine if any instructional or program improvements are needed. PEP leadership and staff followed-up with programs at the April 2022 ITP CC meeting and in Fall 2022 to request documentation of any curricular changes based on the data results. The AY 2021-2022 data results were shared internally with the ITP CC in Fall 2022 and with Cooperating Teachers through the evaluation items on the instrument completed by cooperating teachers. In addition, at the conclusion of each fall and spring semester, program level assessment files (i.e., Assessment 4) are updated as appropriate with ATA results. Use of data results are noted in the interpretation section of this assessment file (i.e., item d.). These examples illustrate use of data in Section 4 “Findings, Implications, & Use of Data.”
- In Spring 2023, a six-member team of lead faculty and PEP staff attended the NIET Conference in Indianapolis on the invitation of the NIET group. The team included faculty from Special Education and Elementary Education, the Director of PEP, the Associate Dean of PEP, a student teaching coordinator, and senior data analyst. At the conference, [“2023 NIET National Conference: Elevating Educators,”](#) the team discovered opportunities to develop partnerships with districts, such that the ATR evaluation system for student teachers can work seamlessly

with districts using the TAP rubric to evaluate practicing teachers. In addition, the faculty attendees attended sessions on embedding ATR activities within classrooms and ways to use the ATR rubric to evaluate a student teacher's ability to work with diverse populations. The faculty reported out on the conference to their respective departments, and PEP reported on the conference to the ITP CC group. PEP will meet with the Senior Specialist-West Team of NIET (Ruhi Khan, EdD) to begin talks on a grant opportunity to build a co-constructed ATR-to-TAP student teaching placement approach within rural and regional districts using the TAP rubric.

2. **Data Sources & Methods**

- **Data Source:** As noted above, NAU transitioned to the ATR in Fall 2020. Prior to Fall 2020, the NIET TAP Rubric was used for evaluating student teachers. This evidence file contains ATR data results from Fall 2020 to Spring 2023 (i.e., three-plus cycles of data). Data results are updated in this evidence file at the conclusion of each academic year. The decision to move from TAP, which is an evaluation measure most appropriate for practicing teachings, to ATR, which is established specifically for "Aspiring" teachers, is in alignment with RA5.4 Continuous Improvement.

Methods:

Instrument Training for Evaluators: The pilot implementation of the ATR occurred in Fall 2020. University Supervisors attended a virtual training in summer 2020. Following this training, University Supervisors completed an online certification module. Each year new University Supervisors complete the virtual training. NAU adheres to NIET's 2-year certification training option for university supervisors to support consistency in implementation of the instrument. University Supervisor certification is tracked by PEP staff through the US Database for each term. As of Spring 2022, the ATR Certification expiration date for the majority of University Supervisors is summer or fall of 2023. ATR re-certification training is scheduled for Summer 2023.

Implementation: The ATR is used for two formal evaluations during student teaching in all undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs except for the Secondary Education Mathematics and Science programs. These programs chose a separate instrument based on the programs' affiliation with the UTeach program at the University of Texas at Austin (see Evidence File UTeach Observation Protocol R1). The primary purpose of the ATR is to provide targeted feedback to a candidate regarding their performance related to best practices and InTASC Standards. The ATR is provided through the online student teaching course materials provided to candidates through the university's learning management system. The scoring rubric was created in the learning management system to collect evaluation data.

At an initial meeting, the University Supervisor introduces the ATR and scoring guidelines to the Cooperating Teacher and Student Teacher. The Student Teacher also completes a self-assessment using the ATR, which is discussed at the initial meeting. A copy of the ATR, instructions, and scoring guidelines are included as Appendix A at the end of this evidence file. As recommended by NIET, a passing score is considered an overall average of 2.5 or higher on the Final Evaluation and no "1s" on any of the rubric indicators.

The Professional Education Programs (PEP) Director serves as the primary instructor for all student teaching courses and sections. Prior to the posting of individual grades, PEP staff verify

that all student teaching requirements have been successfully completed by each candidate, including a passing score on the ATR.

- **Data Reporting:** At the conclusion of each semester, the ATR evaluation data are extracted from the learning management system and archived in Business Objects, a university supported reporting tool. The data are disaggregated by program and results are added to each program's Assessment 4 report file. For analysis at PEP level, the instrument items are disaggregated by the 12 ATR indicators which align to InTASC Standards (see alignment noted in Section 5 Data Tables) and mean scores are computed. Program- and EPP-level data reports are stored on a university SharePoint website that faculty and EPP leaders have access to for review and analysis for the purpose of program evaluation and continuous.
- The transition to the ATR, including a copy of the instrument and reasons for why NAU chose to move to this instrument, was discussed with stakeholders in NAU's Teacher Preparation Advisory Council. As noted above, initial ATR results were also shared with Cooperating Teachers through the additional survey items that were added to the student teaching evaluation instrument completed by mentor teachers regarding their candidate. Cooperating Teachers were asked to rate if they observed similar strengths and areas for improvement as identified through the aggregated ATR results. The feedback from the Cooperating Teachers is found presented below in the links to the Cooperating Teacher Additional Items.

Links to the Cooperating Teacher Additional Items data results from Fall 2021, Spring 2022, and Fall 2022 are provided below. These links are publicly available on the [EPP Program Evaluation](#) page, CAEP Accountability Measures (under the accordion file for "Stakeholder involvement-Measure 2; Initial R5.3/Advanced RA5.3).

- The results of the Cooperating Teacher additional survey items offer compelling evidence that, when triangulated with the ATR and the Candidate Work Sample, our candidates struggle to create, apply, and effectively use assessment in the classroom. For example, in Fall 2022, 10% to 14% of responding Cooperating Teachers who mentored early childhood, elementary, and special education candidates marked Not Observed/Applicable on questions relating to candidate's abilities to develop "assessments aligned to lesson objectives" (InTASC Standards 6 & 7), and use "assessment results to inform instructional decisions" (InTASC Standards 6 & 7). The need for additional improvements in assessment was also apparent in the Cooperating Teacher Data Results for the Secondary Education programs, though to a lesser degree.

2.a. Evidence of Data Credibility

- NIET requires ATR training and the successful completion of a re-certification process every two years to address validity and reliability in relation to use of the instrument. A listing of NAU's University Supervisors and their status in relation to certification is maintained in the University Database created for each semester and managed by PEP staff. NAU worked in partnership with NIET and provided data results for purposes of conducting a reliability study regarding the instrument.

2.b. Participants

- The number of graduates by program are listed in the table. In Fall 2020, there were 193 total program graduates, and in Spring 2021 there were 308 program graduates. In Fall 2021, there were 191 total program graduates, and in Spring 2022, there were 372 program graduates. In Fall 2022, there were 173 total program graduates, and in Spring 2023, there were 292. All teacher preparation programs, except for the science and math fields, utilize the ATR and are represented in the data tables below. The BSED and MAT Mathematics and Science programs utilize the UTeach Observation Protocol, and the data for these programs is provided in a separate evidence file. The response rate for the ATR is high, given that candidates are required to earn a passing score to successfully complete student teaching.

Note: According to the public-facing webpage hosted by NAU's Office of Strategic Planning, Institutional Research, & Analytics, "[because] degree posting occurs over several months following a semester and degrees are occasionally posted retroactively to an older semester, totals for the latest fiscal year will show considerable change until the majority of summer degrees are posted. For these reasons, counts of graduates may change over time."

Program Graduates by Initial Teacher Preparation Program Fall 2020 to Spring 2022							
College of Education							
Teacher Preparation Programs	Number of Program Graduates						
	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Total
Early Child Education & Early Childhood Special Education (BSEd)	5	5	3	16	1	16	46
Elementary Education - Certification (MEd)	6	10	14	23	13	12	78
Elementary Education (BSEd)	91	167	77	205	62	180	782
Elementary & Special Education (BSEd)	46	47	38	56	51	35	273
Special Education – Early Childhood Special Education w/ Cert (MEd)	4	-	2	2	6	2	16
Special Education – Mild/Moderate Disabilities Certified (MEd)	2	19	1	16	2	5	45
College of Education Totals	154	248	135	318	135	250	1240
Secondary Education							
Teacher Preparation Programs	Number of Program Graduates						
	Fall 2020	Spring 2021	Fall 2021	Spring 2022	Fall 2022	Spring 2023	Total
Art Education (BSEd)	3	11	7	8	3	6	38
Music Secondary Education (BMEd)	14	4	25	1	13	2	59
Secondary Education - English (BSEd)	10	25	10	17	13	14	89
Secondary Education - Spanish (BSEd)	2	2	3	2	-	1	10

Secondary Education - History & Social Studies (BSEd)	10	14	11	21	8	18	82
Health Sciences - Physical Education (BSEd)	-	4	-	5	1	1	11
Secondary Education Totals	39	60	56	54	38	42	289
Totals for All Programs	193	308	191	372	173	292	1529

3. Data Analysis

- The ATR data includes pilot implementation data collected in Fall 2020. The number of candidates for each program and response rates are provided in the left column of the tables in Section 5 Data below.

The overall passing score as recommended by NIET for the ATR Rubric is 2.5 on the Final evaluation. NAU’s goal is to focus continuous improvement efforts in relation to program preparation for indicators where the overall average at the Midterm evaluation falls below an average score of 3.0.

- Analysis of the aggregate data from the ATR student-teaching mid-term evaluation results indicated overall strengths as well as areas for improvement. To be categorized as a strength, we looked for items with a pattern of average scores around 3.1 or higher at mid-term. Areas for improvement were based on overall results across the two semesters of data and across COE and Secondary Education degree programs. For areas of improvement, we looked for items in which average scores showed a pattern of being below 3.0 at mid-term. PEP focuses analysis efforts on mid-term evaluation results since these results better portray candidates’ strengths and areas for improvement after completion of teacher preparation courses. Analysis of final evaluation results are provided below and focus on candidate competencies at completion of the program.

Fall 2022 and Spring 2023: Analysis of Mid-Term Evaluation Results

Strengths

- ATR Indicators 5, Activities and Materials, 10, Environment, and 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors were identified as strengths based on the data results.
 - Indicator 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors was the highest rated with overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 being 3.41 and 3.44, respectively. Indicator 12 is aligned to InTASC Standards 9 and 10, Professional Learning and Ethical Practice and Leadership and Collaboration.
 - Indicator 10, Environment received the second highest ratings for the overall average mid-term scores. Indicator 10, Environment is defined as environment, expectations, and respectful culture. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were 3.35 and 3.30, respectively. Indicator 10 is aligned to InTASC Standards 2 and 3, Learning Differences and Learning Environments.

- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials was noted as having the third highest ratings. Indicator 5, Activities and Materials is defined as activities and materials, grouping, and motivating students. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were 3.10 and 3.22, respectively. Indicator 5 is aligned to InTASC Standards 5 and 8, Application of Content and Instructional Strategies, respectively.

Areas for Improvement

- Overall average scores at mid-term were lowest for Indicator 2, Assessment (aligned to InTASC Standard 4, Content Knowledge and Standard 6, Assessment), Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives (aligned to InTASC Standard 1, Learner Development, Standard 4, Content Knowledge, and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies), Indicator 6, Questioning (aligned to InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content), and Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving (aligned to InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies). The overall average mid-term scores for Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 were:
 - Indicator 2, Assessment—2.95 and 2.84, respectively
 - Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives—3.11 and 2.97, respectively
 - Indicator 6, Standards and Objectives—2.95 and 2.93, respectively
 - Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving—2.90 and 2.85, respectively

Analysis of Final Evaluation Results

The overall final evaluation results from Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 were similar and indicate that candidates performed well. For these two semesters, the overall final evaluation results indicated average scores above 3.0 for all ATR indicators.

Strengths

The ATR criteria with the highest overall final evaluation scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, respectively, demonstrate where candidates excelled most include:

- Indicator 1, Instructional Plans - 3.58 and 3.6, respectively
- Indicator 4, Presenting Instructional Content - 3.65 and 3.65, respectively
- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials - 3.59 and 3.68, respectively
- Indicator 8, Teacher Knowledge of Students - 3.66 and 3.66, respectively
- Indicator 10, Environment - 3.70 and 3.70, respectively
- Indicator 11, Engaging Students and Managing Behavior - 3.55 and 3.63, respectively
- Indicator 12, Professionalism and Ethical Behavior - 3.76 and 3.82, respectively

Areas for Improvement

The ATR criteria with the lowest overall final evaluation scores demonstrating where candidates struggled the most included:

- Indicator 2, Assessment - 3.25 and 3.34, respectively
- Indicator 6, Questioning - 3.37 and 3.50, respectively
- Indicator 7, Academic Feedback – 3.46 and 3.48
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem-Solving - 3.30 and 3.44, respectively

Fall 2021 and Spring 2022

Analysis of Mid-Term Evaluation Results

Strengths

- ATR Indicators 5, Activities and Materials, 10, Environment, and 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors were identified as strengths based on the data results.
 - Indicator 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors was the highest rated with overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 being 3.26 and 3.42, respectively. Indicator 12 is aligned to InTASC Standards 9 and 10, Professional learning and Ethical Practice and Leadership and Collaboration, respectively.
 - Indicator 10, Environment received the second highest ratings for the overall average mid-term scores. Indicator 10, Environment is defined as environment, expectations, and respectful culture. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were 3.13 and 3.31, respectively. Indicator 10 is aligned to InTASC Standards 2 and 3, Learning Differences and Learning Environments, respectively.
 - Indicator 5, Activities and Materials was noted as having the third highest ratings. Indicator 5, Activities and Materials is defined as activities and materials, grouping, and motivating students. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were 3.04 and 3.18, respectively. Indicator 5 is aligned to InTASC Standards 5 and 8, Application of Content and Instructional Strategies, respectively.

Areas for Improvement

- Overall average scores at mid-term were lowest for Indicator 2, Assessment (aligned to InTASC 4, Content Knowledge and Standard 6, Assessment), Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives (aligned to InTASC 1, Learner Development, Standard 4, Content Knowledge, and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies), Indicator 6, Questioning (aligned to InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content), and Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving (aligned to InTASC 5, Application of Content and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies). The overall average mid-term scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were:
 - Indicator 2, Assessment – 2.74 and 2.87, respectively
 - Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives – 2.91 and 3.04, respectively
 - Indicator 6, Questioning – 2.71 and 2.91, respectively
 - Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving – 2.85 and 2.95, respectively

Analysis of Final Evaluation Results

The overall final evaluation results from Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were similar and indicate that candidates performed well. For these two semesters, the overall final evaluation results indicated average scores above 3.0 for all ATR indicators.

Strengths

The ATR criteria with the highest overall final evaluation scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, respectively, demonstrate where candidates excelled most include:

- Indicator 4, Presenting Instructional Content - 3.50 and 3.61, respectively
- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials - 3.45 and 3.65, respectively
- Indicator 8, Teacher Knowledge of Students - 3.48 and 3.62, respectively
- Indicator 10, Environment - 3.56 and 3.67, respectively
- Indicator 11, Engaging Students and Managing Behavior - 3.44 and 3.58, respectively
- Indicator 12, Professionalism and Ethical Behavior - 3.65 and 3.79, respectively

Areas for Improvement

The ATR criteria with the lowest overall final evaluation scores demonstrating where candidates struggled the most included:

- Indicator 2, Assessment - 3.20 and 3.29, respectively
- Indicator 6, Questioning - 3.24 and 3.38, respectively
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem-Solving - 3.32 and 3.40, respectively

Fall 2020 and Spring 2021

Analysis of Mid-Term Evaluation Results

Strengths

- ATR Indicators 1, Instructional Plans, 10, Environment, and 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors were identified as strengths based on the data results.
 - Indicator 12, Professional and Ethical Behaviors was the highest rated with overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 being 3.43 and 3.52, respectively. Indicator 12 is aligned to InTASC 9 and 10, Professional learning and Ethical Practice and Leadership and Collaboration, respectively.
 - Indicator 10, Environment received the second highest ratings for the overall average mid-term scores. Indicator 10, Environment is defined as environment, expectations, and respectful culture. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 were 3.19 and 3.38, respectively. Indicator 10 is aligned to InTASC 2 and 3, Learning Differences and Learning Environments, respectively.
 - Indicator 1, Instructional Plans was noted as having the third highest ratings. – Indicator 1, Instructional Plans is defined as instructional plans, lesson structure and pacing, and student work. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 were 3.08 and 3.19, respectively. Indicator 1 is aligned to InTASC 4 and 7, Content Knowledge and Planning for Instruction, respectively.

Areas for Improvement

- Overall average scores at mid-term were lowest for Indicator 2, Assessment (aligned to InTASC 4, Content Knowledge and Standard 6, Assessment), Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives (aligned to InTASC 1, Learner Development, InTASC 4, Content Knowledge, and InTASC 8, Instructional Strategies), Indicator 6, Questioning (aligned to InTASC 5, Application of Content), and Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving (aligned to InTASC 5, Application of Content and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies). The overall average for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 mid-term scores were:
 - Indicator 2, Assessment – 2.79 and 2.82, respectively
 - Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives – 2.95 and 2.98, respectively
 - Indicator 6, Questioning – 2.81 and 2.88, respectively
 - Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving – 2.87 and 2.92, respectively.

Analysis of Final Evaluation Results

The overall final evaluation results from Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 were similar and indicate that candidates performed well. For these two semesters, the overall final evaluation results indicated average scores above 3.0 for all ATR indicators.

Strengths

The ATR criteria with the highest overall scores for Fall 2020 and Spring 2021, respectively, demonstrate where candidates excelled most include:

- Indicator 1, Instructional Plans - 3.44 and 3.59, respectively
- Indicator 4, Presenting Instructional Content - 3.46 and 3.54, respectively
- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials - 3.40 and 3.53, respectively
- Indicator 8, Teacher Knowledge of Students - 3.49 and 3.54, respectively
- Indicator 10, Environment - 3.56 and 3.64, respectively
- Indicator 12, Professionalism and Ethical Behavior - 3.77 and 3.84, respectively

Areas for Improvement

The ATR criteria with the lowest overall scores demonstrating where candidates struggled the most included:

- Indicator 2, Assessment - 3.19 and 3.23, respectively
- Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives - 3.29 and 3.37, respectively
- Indicator 6, Questioning - 3.21 and 3.30, respectively
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem-Solving - 3.19 and 3.36, respectively

4. Findings, Implications, and Use of Data

- ***Findings/Implications:*** The overall passing score as recommended by NIET for the ATR is 2.5 or higher on the final evaluation and no “1” score on any rubric indicators. NAU’s goal is to focus continuous improvement efforts in relation to program preparation for indicators where the overall average at the mid-term or final evaluation falls below an average score of 3.0 points.

Evidence suggests that candidates struggle the most, especially at mid-term evaluations, on:

- Indicator 2, Assessment: *InTASC 4, Content Knowledge, and InTASC 6, Assessment*

- Indicator 6, Questioning: *InTASC 5, Application of Content*
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem: *InTASC 5, Application of Content and InTASC 8, Instructional Strategies*
- **Race/Ethnicity and Gender:** In general, there are no clear trends of any race/ethnicity scoring below an overall average mean score of 3.0 for the final ATR evaluation. For example, in six semesters of ATR data, the 47 candidates ($n = 47$) who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native were above a 3.0 in all six semesters for the College of Education Initial Teacher Preparation programs; however, the seven ($n = 7$) candidates who identified as American Indian/Alaska Native and who were in secondary education programs scored below 3.0 in two semesters (Spring 2022, Spring 2021), and scored above 3.1 in two semesters (Fall 2022, Fall 2022). Secondary Education candidates who identified as White scored below 3.0 in Spring 2022, but in all other semesters scored above 3.0. In Spring 2022, the three ($n = 3$) COE candidates who identified as Black/African American had the highest overall mean score of all race/ethnicities, but in the following semester of Fall 2022, the two ($n = 2$) COE candidates identifying as Black/African American had the lowest overall mean score of all race/ethnicities.

Use of Data: These data results were shared internally with the Initial Teacher Preparation (ITP) Coordinating Council in Fall 2021 and Fall 2022, respectively, and with Cooperating Teachers (key stakeholders) through additional evaluation items added to the instrument mentor teachers complete. The additional items regarding these evaluation results were piloted in Fall 2021 and fully implemented in Spring 2022. The raw data results and data analyses from these additional items as well as open ended comments provided by Cooperating Teachers have been provided to ITP Coordinating Council members and program coordinators to review further and determine if any instructional or program improvements are needed and if so, what curriculum changes should be made. These additional items are discussed in Evidence File “Clinical Partners and Stakeholder Interactions” (**CAEP Standard Components R2.1 / R5.3**).

In addition, at the conclusion of each fall and spring semester, program-level assessment files (i.e., Assessment 4) are updated as appropriate with ATR results. Use of data results are noted in the interpretation section of this assessment file (i.e., item d) and the Assessment 4 file is submitted as part of the formal program review process through the CAEP/SPA process or can be utilized as a supplemental document for the Arizona Department of Education program review process. A few examples of how programs have utilized the ATR results from their program graduates include:

- BSED Secondary Education – English: Interpretation and use of Fall 2020-Spring 2021. Most of the candidates scored at the Proficient, Distinguished, or Exemplary level for the twelve instrument indicators. The results indicated some struggles by candidates in relation to the Questioning and Academic Feedback, suggesting a need for teacher candidates to increase practice with higher-order questioning skills and teaching the various types of thinking and facilitate student-led problem solving. Both indicators can be effectively practiced in the pedagogy classes required for the program. Faculty plan to more intentionally model these skills and ask candidates to practice these indicators in peer groups.
- BSED Secondary Education - History and Social Studies: Interpretation and use of Fall 2020, Spring 2021, and Fall 2021 data results; data from these cycles show teacher candidates are meeting the InTASC standards across a variety of domains. The ATR was

recently adopted, and program faculty are pleased with both the hard data showing teacher candidate success, in addition to positive anecdotal evidence from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Program faculty noted several program areas that may be contributing to teacher candidate success. Across five methods courses, teacher candidates work extensively on lesson and unit planning, meeting the diverse needs of learners, incorporating various assessment strategies, developing data literacy, working with content standards, developing questioning techniques, and learning about the ethics of the teaching profession. Work in these areas is carefully scaffolded, with signature assessments to monitor candidate content knowledge and their ability to plan instruction (**CAEP Standard Components 3.2 and 3.3**), and we believe the data indicates candidates are translating this work to their capstone, student teaching experience. Faculty also attribute positive data results to the required fieldwork experience (67.5 hours across four different secondary classrooms) is significantly contributing to candidate understanding of students. Additionally, the most common area where candidates score at the exemplary level is in professionalism and ethical behavior. Teacher candidates are required to complete disposition instruction modules (emphasizing legal issues, dispositions, and special education aligned to the Model Code of Ethics for Educators) and legal issues are also discussed in depth in HIS 407: Practicum in the Schools, which may be contributing to candidate success in this area. Faculty will continue to monitor ATR data results to identify strengths and weaknesses, but there are a few immediate actions that faculty plan to take. Faculty noted candidates' scores overall were lower in Fall 2021. These results could be due to limited, authentic fieldwork and classroom experiences prior to student teaching due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The program has also had turnover with respect to the university supervisors evaluating student teachers, and additional calibration training related to the ATR may be needed. Finally, faculty would like to update and improve the evaluation instrument completed by cooperating teachers in terms of alignment to the most recent NCSS Teacher Preparation Standards and more specific use of results.

- BSEd Special and Elementary Education/MEd Special Education – Mild/Moderate Disabilities Certified: Interpretation and use of Fall 2020-Spring 2022 data results; the Questioning and Thinking and Problem-Solving indicators were two areas of improvement noted in the ATR data results. To address these findings, faculty opted to create opportunities in practica experiences that emphasize these indicators and allow candidates to apply their learning in an authentic setting prior to their student teaching experience.
- BSEd Elementary Education/MEd Elementary Education – Certification: Interpretation and use of Fall 2020-Spring 2022 data results; the Questioning and Thinking, Problem-Solving, and Assessment indicators were three areas of improvement noted in the ATR data results. Faculty will be considering these areas for improvement in terms of emphasizing these areas more during the core methods program courses prior to the student teaching experience.

5. **Data**

**NIET® ATR® Rubric - Student Teaching Midterm and Final Evaluation of Observation
EPP-Level Summary Data Disaggregated by Program
Fall 2020 to Spring 2023**

Note: The NIET® ATR® Rubric has five performance levels (or scales), with a score of “3” indicating the target performance. Mean scores are presented in the tables below by rubric indicator (e.g., 1 = Instructional Plans, 2 = Assessment, etc.). The overall mean score for each program shown in the last column is an overall average score of all rubric indicators. The NIET® ATR rubric indicators listed at the top of each table also document alignment to appropriate InTASC Standards.

NIET Aspiring Teacher Rubric Indicators (ATR)	InTASC Standards
Instructional Plans (01)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #7: Planning for Instruction
Assessment (02)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #6: Assessment
Standards and Objectives (03)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #1: Learner Development • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Presenting Instructional Content (04)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #4: Content Knowledge • Standard #5: Application of Content • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Activities and Materials (05)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
Questioning (06)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content
Academic Feedback (07)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content
Teacher Knowledge of Students (08)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #1: Learner Development • Standard #2: Learning Differences • Standard #6: Assessment
Thinking and Problem-Solving (09)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard #5: Application of Content • Standard #8: Instructional Strategies

Environment (10)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #3: Learning Environments
Engaging Students and Managing Student Behavior (11)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #2: Learning Differences Standard #3: Learning Environments
Professionalism and Ethical Behavior (12)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practice Standard #10 Leadership and Collaboration

*ATR evaluation results available by Gender and Ethnicity/Race upon request.

Spring 2023 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
Initial Teacher Preparation Program	Mean Score by Program by ATR (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Special Education, Elementary Education													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs</i>	3.24	2.97	3.12	3.20	3.26	2.98	3.15	3.26	2.91	3.33	3.18	3.46	3.17
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs</i>	3.18	2.83	3.00	3.10	2.98	2.80	2.93	3.08	2.88	3.13	2.98	3.30	3.01
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs</i>	3.24	2.95	3.11	3.19	3.22	2.95	3.12	3.23	2.90	3.30	3.15	3.44	3.15

Spring 2023 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)			
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT	03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES	04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT

05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
	Mean Score by Program by ATR (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Special Education, Elementary Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	4.00	3.25	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	3.75	4.00	4.00	4.00	3.85
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	3.50	3.16	3.32	3.50	3.53	3.34	3.34	3.42	3.42	3.55	3.39	3.87	3.45
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.60	3.34	3.51	3.65	3.68	3.50	3.49	3.66	3.44	3.70	3.63	3.82	3.58

Fall 2022 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
	Mean Score by Program by ATR Category (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Special Education, Elementary Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.23	2.87	3.01	3.19	3.11	2.95	3.04	3.24	2.86	3.39	3.10	3.45	3.12
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	2.70	2.70	2.76	3.00	3.03	2.81	3.05	3.05	2.81	3.16	2.81	3.24	2.93

Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.14	2.84	2.97	3.16	3.10	2.93	3.04	3.21	2.85	3.35	3.05	3.41	3.09
--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Fall 2022 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT				03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT				
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING				07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS				
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT				11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR				
	Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
	Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Special Education												
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.33	4.67	4.33	4.42
	Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs												
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	3.37	3.16	3.08	3.34	3.45	3.32	3.24	3.26	3.32	3.39	3.26	3.53	3.31
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.58	3.25	3.38	3.65	3.59	3.37	3.46	3.66	3.30	3.71	3.55	3.76	3.52

Spring 2022 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT				03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT				
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING				07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS				
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT				11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR				
	Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
	Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Special Education												

Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.16	2.90	3.07	3.20	3.20	2.92	3.02	3.19	2.96	3.29	3.07	3.39	3.12
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	2.99	2.68	2.85	3.12	3.02	2.83	3.02	3.21	2.87	3.42	3.09	3.62	3.06
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.13	2.87	3.04	3.19	3.18	2.91	3.02	3.19	2.95	3.31	3.07	3.42	3.11

Spring 2022 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)													
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, and Special Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.48	3.31	3.43	3.58	3.64	3.38	3.47	3.60	3.38	3.63	3.56	3.74	3.52
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	3.49	3.17	3.48	3.78	3.76	3.39	3.54	3.78	3.52	3.94	3.70	4.11	3.63
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.48	3.29	3.43	3.61	3.65	3.38	3.48	3.62	3.40	3.67	3.58	3.79	3.53

Fall 2021 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)			
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT	03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES	04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT

05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK			08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS						
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR			12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR						
	Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, and Special Education													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs</i>	3.03	2.83	3.00	3.06	3.10	2.80	2.92	3.04	2.87	3.17	3.02	3.35	3.01
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs</i>	2.77	2.55	2.66	2.77	2.94	2.49	2.83	2.91	2.83	3.09	2.83	3.11	2.81
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs</i>	2.91	2.74	2.91	2.97	3.04	2.71	2.88	2.99	2.85	3.13	2.97	3.26	2.95

Fall 2021 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES			04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT						
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK			08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS						
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR			12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR						
	Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)												
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
Elementary Education, Early Childhood Education, and Special Education													
<i>Overall Average Final Scores for COE Programs</i>	3.63	3.27	3.40	3.57	3.54	3.32	3.43	3.54	3.38	3.64	3.54	3.74	3.50
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
<i>Overall Average Final Scores for Secondary Programs</i>	3.47	3.00	3.18	3.31	3.27	3.04	3.24	3.37	3.22	3.33	3.14	3.43	3.25

Overall Average Final Scores for All Programs	3.36	3.20	3.36	3.50	3.45	3.24	3.36	3.48	3.32	3.56	3.44	3.65	3.41
--	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

Spring 2021 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Overall Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Special Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.18	2.83	2.96	3.03	3.00	2.86	2.98	3.07	2.90	3.22	3.05	3.35	3.04
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	3.04	2.65	2.87	3.09	3.07	2.81	2.87	2.91	2.85	3.30	2.98	3.87	3.03
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.15	2.80	2.95	3.04	3.01	2.85	2.96	3.04	2.89	3.24	3.04	3.44	3.03

Spring 2021 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)													

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Overall Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Special Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.59	3.19	3.37	3.53	3.47	3.25	3.43	3.56	3.31	3.60	3.48	3.72	3.46
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs</i>	3.63	3.21	3.28	3.48	3.60	3.26	3.36	3.38	3.38	3.59	3.34	4.10	3.47
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs</i>	3.60	3.19	3.35	3.52	3.49	3.25	3.42	3.53	3.32	3.60	3.45	3.79	3.46

Fall 2020 (Midterm Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT				03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT				
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING				07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS				
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT				11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR				
Mean Score by Program by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)													
	01.	02.	03.	04.	05.	06.	07.	08.	09.	10.	11.	12.	Overall Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Special Education													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs	3.07	2.73	2.94	3.03	2.97	2.80	3.01	3.02	2.80	3.15	3.04	3.36	2.99
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs	3.03	2.89	2.92	2.97	2.97	2.87	2.95	3.16	2.92	3.29	2.97	3.53	3.04
Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs	3.06	2.76	2.94	3.02	2.97	2.81	3.00	3.04	2.82	3.17	3.03	3.39	3.00

Fall 2020 (Final Evaluation of Observation Results)													
01. INSTRUCTIONAL PLANS	02. ASSESSMENT			03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT					
05. ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS	06. QUESTIONING			07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK				08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS					
09. THINKING AND PROBLEM-SOLVING	10. ENVIRONMENT			11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR				12. PROFESSIONALISM AND ETHICAL BEHAVIOR					
Mean Score by ATR Component (Scale 1-5)													
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Overall Mean Score
Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Special Education													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for COE Programs</i>	3.49	3.15	3.28	3.40	3.35	3.18	3.39	3.45	3.13	3.53	3.45	3.71	3.38
Secondary Education Initial Teacher Preparation Programs													
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for Secondary Programs</i>	3.59	3.29	3.16	3.58	3.42	3.18	3.29	3.47	3.24	3.61	3.45	3.97	3.44
<i>Overall Average Midterm Scores for All Programs</i>	3.51	3.18	3.26	3.43	3.36	3.18	3.37	3.45	3.15	3.54	3.45	3.76	3.39