

### Assessment 6 – Data Table for Student Teaching Assessment Project

Data from Fall 2006: Number of candidates = 11

	Selecting instructional goals for assessment	Congruency of assessments with instructional goals	Age appropriateness of assessments	Assessment results serve to improve learning	Uses assessment data to provide for student & parent feedback on learning
4	11 (100%)	5 (45.5%)	9 (81.8%)	4 (36.4%)	2 (18.2%)
3	0 (0.0%)	5 (45.5%)	1 (9.1%)	4 (36.4%)	4 (36.4%)
2	0 (0.0%)	1 (9.1%)	1 (9.1%)	3 (27.2%)	3 (27.2%)
1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (18.2%)

	Shows ability to use technology for creating assessment tools	Shows ability to use technology for record keeping and grading
4	5 (45.5%)	4 (36.4%)
3	5 (45.5%)	3 (27.2%)
2	1 (9.1%)	2 (18.2%)
1	0 (0.0%)	2 (18.2%)

Acceptable Level

Candidates need to attain a cumulative average score at **level 3** (when averaging all seven categories) with no category score at level 1.

### Assessment 6 – Data Table for Student Teaching Assessment Project

Data from Spring 2007: Number of candidates = 8

	Selecting instructional goals for assessment	Congruency of assessments with instructional goals	Age appropriateness of assessments	Assessment results serve to improve learning	Uses assessment data to provide for student & parent feedback on learning
4	7 (87.5%)	2 (25.0%)	7 (87.5%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)
3	0 (0.0%)	4 (50.0%)	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	5 (62.5%)
2	0 (0.0%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (25.0%)	2 (25.0%)
1	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

	Shows ability to use technology for creating assessment tools	Shows ability to use technology for record keeping and grading
4	4 (50.0%)	6 (75.0%)
3	3 (37.5%)	1 (12.5%)
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
1	1 (12.5%)	1 (12.5%)

Acceptable Level

Candidates need to attain a cumulative average score at **level 3** (when averaging all seven categories) with no category score at level 1.