ADMINISTRATION, PURPOSE, USE

Purpose

The purpose of the Mid-Program Lesson Plans Assessment is to provide a system for candidates, faculty, cooperating teachers, and supervisors to assess and monitor a candidate’s ability to plan throughout the program.

Administration

The Lesson Plan Assessments is implemented mid-program and planning is also assessed twice during the internship experience in the initial licensure program to assess and monitor candidate development during preparation. Timing of implementation of mid-program lesson plan assessments is detailed on program assessment maps in the Initial Licensure Monitoring Plan.

Use of data

- Candidate level: Mid-program lesson plan assessment data are entered in Tk20 and available to candidates.
- Program level: Candidate data on mid-program lesson planning assessments are aggregated by the Office of Assessment annually at both the program level and the EPP level. Aggregate data reports are shared with program faculty, the Assessment Committee, the Professional Education Coordinating Council, and broadly via the SOE Public Data web page. Faculty review data in program and department meetings to inform needed revisions to curricula or training/communication with evaluators. Programs report on their analysis of data and any subsequent uses of data for improvement annually.
SCORING GUIDE

The Mid-Program Lesson Plan Assessment derives from standard 2 on the Clinical Evaluation Continuum, consisting of a series of key elements of planning for instruction. The candidate is assessed on each element from unacceptable to target. Each level presumes that the candidate has reached the previous level. The expectation is that the candidate reaches the beginning level based on coursework and practica experiences by mid-program.

Candidates are evaluated on each key element on a scale of 0 (unacceptable) to six (target). Scores of 1-2 may be given for candidates at the beginning level, 3-4 for those at the acceptable level, and 5-6 for those at the target level. For each level except for unacceptable (where the rating is 0), there is a high end (2, 4, 6) and a low end (1, 3, 5). The importance of each key element may vary from program to program, but all elements should be discussed and evaluated, even if not observed. A rating of “No opportunity to observe” (N) is permissible for the midterm evaluation.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

Guiding frameworks and standards

Item content reflects the proficiencies detailed in the VCU conceptual framework, Educator as Critically Reflective Practitioner. Further, Continuum items align to the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards categories (i.e., the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility) specified in CAEP component 1.1 and to CAEP components 3.3 and 3.4.

Rubric development

Because the Mid-Program Lesson Plan assessment rubric derives from the Clinical Evaluation Continuum assessment, the rubric development is the same as that which occurred for the overall clinical performance assessment. Details follow as reflected in the Guidance Document for the Clinical Evaluation Continuum:

Initial licensure programs initially adopted the Clinical Evaluation Continuum in 2004 as a common measure of clinical performance at the end of a candidate’s program. The Clinical Evaluation Task Force, composed of education preparation provider (EPP) faculty and public school partners was created in 2004 to refine the training, assessment and evaluation of candidates in student teaching and internship experiences. The Task Force drafted a rubric, adapted from the Continuum developed by the Santa Cruz New Teacher Project for its induction/mentoring program. Faculty discussed the rubric at department meetings and at a brownbag lunch. Additional refinements were made based on their comments and those of the former NCATE Assessment Subcommittee. Teachers enrolled in the Clinical Faculty Training course also reviewed the Continuum and shared their comments with the Task Force. The revised draft was shared with university supervisors at a training session in January 2005 and piloted during that semester. Subsequently, the Task
Force met with university supervisors in mid-May 2005 to review the pilot effort and discuss issues. The Task Force then made revisions to the document for use in 2005-2006. At each of these meetings, cooperating teachers/clinical faculty and university faculty, and public school partners, examined the clinical evaluation instrument to ensure its connection with requisite professional standards. In a study of reliability of the Clinical Evaluation Continuum, the School of Education Office of Assessment found that the instrument yielded consistent results. Further an analysis of inter-rater agreement on line item ratings indicated that 94% to 99% were in exact agreement or off by one point.

The CAEP Rubric Team, formed in 2016, collaborated to review the Continuum in light of new CAEP standards for assessment of candidate proficiencies. The team consisted of program faculty from elementary, secondary, early childhood special education, special education general education, art education, and music education content areas, as well as instructional technology. Through iterative cycles of review, the group revised item language and developed new items as needed to ensure alignment of Continuum items to the proficiencies detailed in CAEP Standard 1 components. The CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments and CAEP Evidence Guide guided item revisions and new item development, with a focus on evidence for test content by way of standards alignment and expert faculty participation, and evidence for response process with discussions centered on assessment fidelity in classrooms across grade levels, content areas, and school divisions.

In academic year 2016-17, EPP faculty from School of Education and School of the Arts reviewed the revised rubric and provided suggested revisions individually and collectively as program groups. Subsequently, the EPP invited P12 partners to engage in review the measure. Specifically, fifteen clinical faculty experienced in clinical evaluation of teacher candidates were invited to rate relevance of individual items, in an expert review activity to determine the content representativeness of the rubric items (Lynn, 1986). P12 partners work in varied content areas and across school levels. Ten clinical faculty provided complete responses (67%) including representation from all four neighboring school divisions (Chesterfield (2); Hanover (2); Henrico (4); Richmond (2)). and across content areas and school levels (Elementary (2); Music (1); Art (2); Secondary Social Studies (2); Secondary English (2); Secondary Science (1)). Respondents rated the relevance of each item on a four point scale (1=irrelevant, 4=extremely relevant) and offered specific language edits, as necessary. The Office of Assessment calculated item and scale level content validity indices. The Item-Content Validity Index (I-CVI) is the proportion of experts endorsing an item’s relevance, indicated by selecting 3 (relevant) or 4 (extremely relevant) for a particular item. With ten experts, a proportion of .78 or greater was required for item retention in the measure, based on recommendations by Lynn (1986). I-CVI for all 51 items exceeded .78. Seven of 51 items achieved I-CVI of 80% or 90%; the remaining 44 achieved I-CVI of 100%. These items were presented to the EPP Assessment Committee, along with item feedback from clinical faculty for review. The EPP Assessment Committee includes representation from each School of Education department and from art education and music education in the School of the Arts. Committee members discussed the feedback, reviewed rubric key elements and the associated behavioral indicators of those elements, and recommended items be retained without further revision given high I-CVI, indicating relevance to the construct.
VALIDITY EVIDENCE

- Mid-Program Lesson Plan assessment rubric items are aligned with nationally recognized professional standards, including InTASC standards and CAEP components, and are also aligned with state standards for teachers.
- Content area expert faculty participated in both the initial development and subsequent revisions and additions to the Continuum.
- Program faculty, clinical faculty, and P12 partners provided ratings of item relevance and clarity. From these ratings, the Office of Assessment computed scale and item content validity indices. (I-CVI > .80 for all items; S-CVI = 1.00)
- The EPP supports an appeals process that allows undergraduate and graduate students the right to appeal course grades they consider to have been arbitrarily and capriciously assigned or assigned without regard for the criteria, requirements, and procedures of the course stated in the syllabus or guidelines for assignments. All appeal files are confidential.

RELIABILITY EVIDENCE

- All raters (cooperating teachers, clinical faculty, university supervisors, program faculty) receive comprehensive training on the Continuum.
- Candidates are assessed using this rubric mid-program and two times subsequently using the complete Clinical Evaluation Continuum during the clinical experience.
- TO COME: (INSERT Reliability analysis (coefficient alpha) is calculated = XX)
## MID-PROGRAM LESSON PLAN ASSESSMENT FOR CANDIDATES IN INITIAL LICENSURE PROGRAMS

### Standard 2: Planning for Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignments</th>
<th>Key Elements</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Beginning (Awareness, articulation, identification)</th>
<th>Acceptable (Puts into practice, uses, implements, reflects)</th>
<th>Target (Builds on the reflection, makes changes to improve, adjusts, expands, connects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1, 1.4 InTASC 1, 4, 7, 8 VA 1, 2, 3</td>
<td>a. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter content including cross-disciplinary connections and student development.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate identifies key concepts from subject matter concepts and connections across disciplines and/or key factors in student development.</td>
<td>Identifies key concepts from subject matter concepts and connections across disciplines and key factors in student development.</td>
<td>Uses key ideas from subject matter, including cross-disciplinary connections, to develop instructional activities appropriate for the developmental level of students.</td>
<td>Reflects on instructional activities and makes adjustments for student social, emotional, and intellectual development to promote clear, coherent understanding of key ideas across disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5 InTASC 2, 7, 8 VA 3 Diversity Technology</td>
<td>b. Uses research-based instructional strategies and resources in planning instruction.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate has awareness of a variety of research-based instructional strategies and resources.</td>
<td>Has awareness of a variety of research-based instructional strategies and resources.</td>
<td>Effectively uses research-based instructional strategies and resources in planning instruction.</td>
<td>Effectively uses multiple research-based instructional strategies and resources in planning instruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1, 1.4 InTASC 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10 VA 1, 2, 3 Diversity</td>
<td>c. Selects and communicates learning goals that are consistent with state and national content standards and students’ development.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate articulates state and national content standards and develops learning goals consistent with content standards and student development.</td>
<td>Articulates state and national content standards and develops learning goals consistent with content standards and student development.</td>
<td>Uses learning goals that reflect content standards and student development to design appropriate educational activities; communicates goals to students.</td>
<td>Reflects on learning goals and links them closely to educational activities in a clear, coherent fashion. Goals set high expectation for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 1, 4, 7, 8 VA 3</td>
<td>d. Organizes curriculum and instructional sequences to support student understanding of content.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate articulates key elements of curriculum design that support student understanding of content and/or develops some lessons that teach an idea or skill.</td>
<td>Articulates key elements of curriculum design that support student understanding of content and develops some lessons that teach an idea or skill.</td>
<td>Uses knowledge of subject matter to organize units of instruction in a sequence that promotes student understanding of key ideas.</td>
<td>Reflects on units of instruction and makes improvements that integrate learning goals, content standards, and educational activities in a cohesive sequence that promotes student understanding of key ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignments</td>
<td>Key Elements</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Beginning (Awareness, articulation, identification)</td>
<td>Acceptable (Puts into practice, uses, implements, reflects)</td>
<td>Target (Builds on the reflection, makes changes to improve, adjusts, expands, connects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.4 InTASC 1, 2, 7, 8 VA 3 Diversity</td>
<td>e. Prepares and adjusts instructional options based on assessment of students in changing situations to make learning accessible to all students.</td>
<td>Shows no awareness of need for adjustment in response to student needs and unexpected events.</td>
<td>Shows an awareness of need for adjustment in response to student needs and unexpected events.</td>
<td>Adjusts lessons using on the spot assessment of student understanding and unexpected events without advance planning.</td>
<td>Adjusts plans in advance based on assessment of students and the possibility of changing situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.1 InTASC 10 VA 5</td>
<td>f. Coordinates the use of support personnel, families, and volunteers to achieve learning goals.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate identifies support personnel and volunteers nor articulates ways support personnel, families, and volunteers might assist.</td>
<td>Identifies support personnel and volunteers; articulates ways support personnel, families, and volunteers might assist.</td>
<td>Communicates with support personnel, families, and volunteers; organizes instructional activities and procedures that use support personnel, families and volunteers to assist learning.</td>
<td>Reflects on use of support personnel, families, and volunteers and make adjustments in their use that improves student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.5 InTASC 7 VA 3 Technology</td>
<td>g. Candidates demonstrate the ability to design meaningful digital learning experiences.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate utilizes digital tools in the design of learning experiences.</td>
<td>Utilizes digital tools in the design of learning experiences.</td>
<td>Effectively utilizes digital tools in the design of learning experiences to enhance student learning.</td>
<td>Maximizes the affordances of digital tools in the design of learning experiences to enhance student learning and teach students effective use of digital technology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEP 1.4 VA 2, 3</td>
<td>h. Plans for opportunities for students to problem-solve and think critically to make content meaningful and relevant.</td>
<td>No evidence candidate identifies educational practices that create opportunities for students to problem-solve and think critically to make content meaningful.</td>
<td>Identifies educational practices that create opportunities for students to problem-solve and think critically to make content meaningful.</td>
<td>Lesson plans include opportunities such as simulations, case studies, project based learning, and collaborative team work that encourage problem solving and critical thinking that make content meaningful and give students ownership.</td>
<td>Reflects on effectiveness of opportunities for students to problem-solve and think critically to adjust future plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Please mark level of growth for each criterion)
Level of Growth:  N=No opportunity to observe  0=Unacceptable (has not yet reached beginning level)  1-2=Beginning  3-4=Acceptable  5-6=Target