

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

Data from Fall 2007: Number of candidates = 7

	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 (100.0%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	2 (28.6%)	1 (14.3%)
3	0 (0.0%)	4 (57.1%)	3 (42.9%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	4 (57.1%)	1 (14.3%)
1	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)	1 (14.3%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)

	Shows ability to use technology for creating assessment tools	Shows ability to use technology for record keeping and grading
4	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)
3	7 (100.0%)	3 (42.9%)
2	0 (0.0%)	1 (14.3%)
1	0 (0.0%)	2 (28.6%)

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 2008: Number of candidates = 6

	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	5 (83.3%)	4 (66.7%)	4 (66.7%)	3 (50.0%)	2 (33.3%)
3	0 (0.0%)	1 (16.7%)	2 (33.3%)	3 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (66.7%)
1	1 (16.7%)	1 (16.7%)	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	3 (50.0%)	5 (83.3%)
3	3 (50.0%)	1 (16.7%)
2	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)

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.