### Part One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A depth of content knowledge in the discipline</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 0% Not evident 100% Developing 0% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLRP: 1</td>
<td>- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)</td>
<td>Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #2 0% Not evident 22% Developing 78% Proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Technologies</td>
<td>- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)</td>
<td>Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #3 Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 17% Developing 83% Proficient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions: n/a</td>
<td>(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBPTS: 2A</td>
<td>- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Effective use of technology as appropriate | Advanced Candidate Assessments:   - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)   - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)   (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).   - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.   Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.   Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | Assessment #1 0% Not evident 100% Developing 0% Proficient  
Assessment #2 0% Not evident 33% Developing 67% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 33% Developing 67% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
| 3. The ability to apply content knowledge to practice | Advanced Candidate Assessments:   - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)   - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)   (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).   - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.   Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.   Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | Assessment #1 0% Not evident 100% Developing 0% Proficient  
Assessment #2 0% Not evident 33% Developing 67% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 22% Developing 78% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/ person responsible?</th>
<th>How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. An understanding and respect for professional ethics in the discipline</strong>&lt;br&gt;SERP: 1&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework:&lt;br&gt;Students, Subjects, Technologies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: PEP&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: n/a</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)&lt;br&gt;(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1: 0% Not evident 100% Developing 0% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: 0% Not evident 6% Developing 94% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation: 0% Not evident 11% Developing 89% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. A respect for the professional environment through their honesty, integrity, and professionalism</strong>&lt;br&gt;SERP: 1&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework:&lt;br&gt;Students, Subjects, Technologies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: PEP&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: n/a</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)&lt;br&gt;(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1: 0% Not evident 0% Developing 100% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: 0% Not evident 11% Developing 89% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation: 0% Not evident 11% Developing 89% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. The ability to effectively evaluate situations and identify an appropriate course of action</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 2&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Strategies, Technologies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: n/a&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 3C</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)&lt;br&gt;(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;100% Developing&lt;br&gt;0% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;39% Developing&lt;br&gt;61% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;28% Developing&lt;br&gt;72% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Effective oral communication skills</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 3&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Technologies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: EC&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 5C</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)&lt;br&gt;(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;63% Developing&lt;br&gt;37% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;17% Developing&lt;br&gt;83% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;17% Developing&lt;br&gt;83% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8. Effective written communication skills | Advanced Candidate Assessments:  
- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  
- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)  
(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  
- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  
Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  
Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | Assessment #1  
0% Not evident  
59% Developing  
41% Proficient  
Assessment #2  
0% Not evident  
6% Developing  
94% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation  
0% Not evident  
6% Developing  
94% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
| 9. Effective, fair, and honest communication considering not only the message but also the audience | Advanced Candidate Assessments:  
- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  
- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)  
(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  
- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  
Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  
Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | Assessment #1  
0% Not evident  
42% Developing  
58% Proficient  
Assessment #2  
0% Not evident  
0% Developing  
100% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation  
0% Not evident  
0% Developing  
100% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. An understanding of the role of research in the discipline</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments: - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester) - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters). - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level. Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level. Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 5% Not evident 95% Developing 0% Proficient Assessment #2 0% Not evident 0% Developing 100% Proficient Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 6% Developing 94% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The ability to conduct research and apply it to practice</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments: - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester) - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters). - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level. Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level. Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 0% Not evident 53% Developing 47% Proficient Assessment #2 0% Not evident 50% Developing 50% Proficient Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 44% Developing 56% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>12. An understanding of individual differences in clientele</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 5&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Strategies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: n/a&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 1B, 1D</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 16% Developing 84% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2 &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 50% Developing 50% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 28% Developing 72% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>13. A respect for all clientele by fostering a supportive and encouraging atmosphere in their workplace</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 5&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Strategies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: IWS, SDE&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 1D</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 21% Developing 79% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2 &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 28% Developing 72% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation &lt;br&gt;0% Not evident 11% Developing 89% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/ person responsible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. A respect for individual differences through the use of rich and varied approaches</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 5&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Societies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: IWS, PTLS&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 1B, 2C, 3A</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;63% Developing&lt;br&gt;37% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;50% Developing&lt;br&gt;50% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;28% Developing&lt;br&gt;72% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. Willingness to provide evidence of differentiation of curricula</strong>&lt;br&gt;SLRP: 5&lt;br&gt;Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects, Societies, Strategies&lt;br&gt;Dispositions: SDE, PTLS&lt;br&gt;NBPTS: 1B</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:&lt;br&gt;- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)&lt;br&gt;- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).&lt;br&gt;- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.&lt;br&gt;Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;100% Developing&lt;br&gt;0% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Assessment #2&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;50% Developing&lt;br&gt;50% Proficient&lt;br&gt;Portfolio/Oral Presentation&lt;br&gt;0% Not evident&lt;br&gt;22% Developing&lt;br&gt;78% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the learning objectives?</td>
<td>How, where, and when are they assessed?</td>
<td>What are the expectations?</td>
<td>What are the results?</td>
<td>Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **16. Willingness to provide evidence of inquiry based instruction**  
SLRP: 5  
Conceptual Framework:  
Students, Subjects, Strategies  
Dispositions: PTLS  
NBPTS: n/a | Advanced Candidate Assessments:  
- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  
- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)  
(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  
- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  
Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  
Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | **Assessment #1**  
0% Not evident  
100% Developing  
0% Proficient  
**Assessment #2**  
0% Not evident  
44% Developing  
56% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation  
0% Not evident  
28% Developing  
72% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
| **17. Willingness to engage in reflective practice**  
SLRP: 5  
Conceptual Framework:  
Students, Subjects, Strategies  
Dispositions: PEP  
NBPTS: 4C | Advanced Candidate Assessments:  
- #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  
- #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester)  
(these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  
- #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  
Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  
Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | **Assessment #1**  
0% Not evident  
47% Developing  
53% Proficient  
**Assessment #2**  
0% Not evident  
28% Developing  
72% Proficient  
Portfolio/Oral Presentation  
0% Not evident  
22% Developing  
78% Proficient | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the learning objectives?</th>
<th>How, where, and when are they assessed?</th>
<th>What are the expectations?</th>
<th>What are the results?</th>
<th>Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. The ability to collaborate with other professionals to promote the success of their clientele</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:  - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 0% Not evident 47% Developing 53% Proficient  Assessment #2 0% Not evident 33% Developing 67% Proficient  Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 11% Developing 89% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLRP: 6  Conceptual Framework: Societies  Dispositions: n/a  NBPTS: 5A, 5C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The ability to effectively work with the community to promote the success of their clientele</td>
<td>Advanced Candidate Assessments:  - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester)  - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters).  - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel)</td>
<td>Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level.  Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level.  Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level.</td>
<td>Assessment #1 5% Not evident 63% Developing 32% Proficient  Assessment #2 0% Not evident 44% Developing 56% Proficient  Portfolio/Oral Presentation 0% Not evident 28% Developing 72% Proficient</td>
<td>Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What are the learning objectives?

How, where, and when are they assessed?

What are the expectations?

What are the results?

Committee/person responsible? How are results shared?

| 20. Commitment to professional growth and development | Advanced Candidate Assessments: | Assessment #1: at least 35% at or above the “Developing” level. | Assessment #1
0% Not evident
16% Developing
84% Proficient |
| SLRP: 6 | - #1 (end of 1st/2nd semester) | Assessment #2: at least 70% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 25% at the “Proficient” level. | Assessment #2
0% Not evident
22% Developing
78% Proficient |
| Conceptual Framework: Students, Subjects | - #2 (end of 3rd/4th semester) (these assessments are completed by group consensus by the faculty members who have taught the cohort in the most recent semesters). | Assessment #3: 100% at or above the “Developing” level and at least 50% at the “Proficient” level. | Portfolio/Oral Presentation
0% Not evident
22% Developing
78% Proficient |
| Dispositions: PEP | - #3 (end of 5th/6th semester - NBPTS portfolio and/or oral presentation to faculty panel) | | |
| NBPTS: 4A | | | Department graduate faculty. Results to be shared in graduate faculty meetings. |

(Continue objectives as needed. Cells will expand to accommodate your text.)

PART TWO

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

Our primary formal assessment accomplishment since our last report was the development of a required, integrative, capstone paper and oral presentation. The focus, format, and assessment criteria of this capstone was developed by the cohort members themselves, with facilitation by one faculty member and feedback/response by another. Cohort members developed the theme of “Teacher, Learner, Leader” to reflect upon, synthesize, and evaluate their growth through the two years of the Master Teacher Program. The candidates wrote their papers, prepared a poster, and made an oral presentation to a panel of four faculty: one senior faculty member who taught in the program; one junior faculty member who had not yet taught in the program; the department chair/graduate coordinator; and a faculty member from outside the department who had expertise in the content area of the candidate (e.g., English, Elementary Education, Special Education, etc.). The faculty members filled out rubric/feedback sheets organized by the program’s learning objectives. The results of these presentations were synthesized with those of the program portfolio to create the assessment results detailed above.

Our primary informal assessment accomplishment since our last report was the development of an improved department culture focused on continuous conversation about the program, its curriculum, and the progress of students as the cohort worked through the course schedule. This resulted in better understanding of student strengths and challenges, as well as how the curriculum was functioning in this, the second cohort of this program. As a result, some adjustments were made to curriculum “on the fly”—not a change in actual course offerings, but adjustment of emphases and even assignments within the existing courses as they were delivered. This process engendered the development of the capstone paper / poster / presentation described above.
PART THREE

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

The assessment data reported above reflect the achievement of the second cohort (2011-13) of the Master Teacher Program. The regular use of the 20-item rubric (based on the program’s learning objectives) by instructors each semester enabled us to keep in mind the goals of the program as we progressed through the curriculum. This was important because the department has experienced significant personnel change in the past two years, so a focus on the program’s objectives has facilitated positive student achievement.

Additionally, the faculty engaged in more conversations about the progress of the students, both collectively as a cohort and as eighteen individuals. We were better able during this second cohort to talk authentically about how the students were doing. In a few instances, we noted student regression on some of the objectives. We adjusted some learning activities to address these issues, sometimes successfully, sometimes not.

At this time, the Master Teacher Program is facing some possibly significant challenges. We were unable to successfully recruit a cohort for a planned August 2013 start-up in Champaign, and will be attempting to recruit a cohort for a start-up in January 2014 on campus. This may actually be a blessing in disguise, as we think we learned significant things during this cohort, and having a “break” between cohorts will—we hope—enable us to consider how to better do a number of things, such as:

- How can we better facilitate student use of research throughout the program **after** the introductory research methods class?
- How can we better engender student application of program objectives in their own classrooms?
- How can we develop a more constructivistic, collaborative approach to our teaching in the program in order to support more active student learning?

As for assessment itself, we continue to need to do a better job at actively aligning the program’s learning objectives with the individual courses so that we can do more focused, rich assessment within the courses themselves. Currently, we assign ratings in the program learning objectives in a holistic fashion at the end of each semester. We need to explore the idea of aligning specific objectives to courses, assignments, and projects in order to produce ratings that are better grounded in evidence found in student performance.

At the same time, we are considering significant modification to the program curriculum and delivery model (e.g., campus, off-campus, online) as well. The program was developed in the late 1990s to prepare students to engage in the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards assessment process; however, this has not turned out to be a significantly important attraction for the students in our first two cohorts. At the same time, the principles underlying the NBPTS are very powerful and should not be abandoned. We anticipate having conversations this coming year (2013-14) to review the program’s objectives to see if they are truly what we want for the program, and then work on possible curricular revision to support any changes in those objectives.

Additionally, because of enrollment considerations, we will have serious discussion about the impact of delivery mode on program viability. It does not seem that the off-campus cohort model seems viable at this time, and it is uncertain if another on-campus cohort recruitment will be successful. One possible solution may be to create an entirely (or primarily) online version of the program so that it can be marketed state-wide. Of course, this has significant implications for what has been one of the program’s strengths: the use of a closed-cohort model to develop what is in essence a two-year professional learning community. It is uncertain if that community can be authentically developed in an online model, and the department faculty will have to have serious discussions about this before moving forward.
**Student Learning Requirements for Graduate Programs (SLRP)**

1. A depth of content knowledge including effective technology skills and ethical behaviors.
2. Critical thinking and problem solving.
3. Oral and written communication skills.
4. Advanced scholarship through research and/or creative activity.
5. Ability to work with a diverse clientele, recognizing individual differences.
6. Ability to collaborate and create positive relations with the school, community, and profession in which they work.

**Conceptual Framework**

**Diverse Students** – Educators must consider a range of individual differences….Educators must have the knowledge bases to make educational decisions that are appropriate in the framework of a pluralistic society. Within educational environments and in the context of all collaborative relationships, educators must reflect their understanding and acceptance of diversity.

**Diverse Strategies** – Diverse strategies include flexible, interactive, multiple and varied opportunities to learn and practice while accommodating individual learning styles, differing stages of development and individual needs or interests.

**Diverse Technologies** – What students must know and understand about information technology in order to use in working effectively with students and professional colleagues; the systematic application of scientific or organized knowledge to practical tasks.

**Diverse Societies/Communities** – The effective educator must collaborate, create positive relationships with colleagues, and interact with parents and communities that vary greatly from one school to another. It is necessary for educators to have an understanding of a broad array of situations and populations with whom they may work. Educators must have the opportunity to reflect on how their own background and experiences will impact their ability to meet the needs of students coming from diverse societies.

**Diverse Subjects and Levels** – Professional education programs build upon a foundation of general education and culminate in the acquisition and demonstration of professional knowledge. Educators must facilitate the transformation of disciplinary knowledge into forms of knowledge that are appropriate for students in their respective environments.

**Dispositions**

**IWS – Interaction with Students/Others** – Refers to behaviors that demonstrate the candidate's regard for the learners/others. These may include acts of fairness, respectful tone of voice, positive use of humor, and interest in students/others as individuals. Candidate should demonstrate a supportive and encouraging atmosphere for learning through interactions with students/others.
PEP – Professional Ethics & Practices – May be evidenced through acceptable dress and grooming, and timeliness, not only in arrival and departure, but in completion of tasks. Includes appropriate use of language, academic integrity and honesty, the ability to keep professional confidences, and accepting of constructive criticism. The candidate incorporates and values the reflective process.

EC – Effective Communication – Refers to one's regard for honest, fair, and accurate communication. Encompasses the belief that teachers must model effective communication. Effective, non-judgmental communication considers the audience as well as the message.

PTSL – Planning and Teaching for Student Learning – Refers to the belief that all individuals can learn. These beliefs are evidenced in the acts of planning and teaching. Positive dispositions in this area are reflected in rich and varied teaching approaches and assessments.

SDE – Sensitivity to Diversity and Equity – Candidate demonstrates sensitivity to diversity through his/her actions, language and discourse. This is evidenced by modifying instructional approaches to meet the needs of diverse learners. Opportunities are equitable regardless of student characteristics such as race, gender, disability, and socio-economic status.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Core Propositions

Proposition 1: Teachers are Committed to Students and Their Learning
- NBCTs are dedicated to making knowledge accessible to all students. They believe all students can learn.
- They treat students equitably. They recognize the individual differences that distinguish their students from one another and they take account for these differences in their practice.
- NBCTs understand how students develop and learn.
- They respect the cultural and family differences students bring to their classroom.
- They are concerned with their students’ self-concept, their motivation and the effects of learning on peer relationships.
- NBCTs are also concerned with the development of character and civic responsibility.

Proposition 2: Teachers Know the Subjects They Teach and How to Teach Those Subjects to Students.
- NBCTs have mastery over the subject(s) they teach. They have a deep understanding of the history, structure and real-world applications of the subject.
- They have skill and experience in teaching it, and they are very familiar with the skills gaps and preconceptions students may bring to the subject.
- They are able to use diverse instructional strategies to teach for understanding.

Proposition 3: Teachers are Responsible for Managing and Monitoring Student Learning.
- NBCTs deliver effective instruction. They move fluently through a range of instructional techniques, keeping students motivated, engaged and focused.
- They know how to engage students to ensure a disciplined learning environment, and how to organize instruction to meet instructional goals.
- NBCTs know how to assess the progress of individual students as well as the class as a whole.
- They use multiple methods for measuring student growth and understanding, and they can clearly explain student performance to parents.
Proposition 4: Teachers Think Systematically about Their Practice and Learn from Experience.

- NBCTs model what it means to be an educated person – they read, they question, they create and they are willing to try new things.
- They are familiar with learning theories and instructional strategies and stay abreast of current issues in American education.
- They critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen knowledge, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new findings into their practice.

Proposition 5: Teachers are Members of Learning Communities.

- NBCTs collaborate with others to improve student learning.
- They are leaders and actively know how to seek and build partnerships with community groups and businesses.
- They work with other professionals on instructional policy, curriculum development and staff development.
- They can evaluate school progress and the allocation of resources in order to meet state and local education objectives.
- They know how to work collaboratively with parents to engage them productively in the work of the school.