

Data and summaries of results on key assessments in relation to InTASC and CAEP standards and the EPP’s instructional themes (Initial Program)

Initial Program

Key assessments of content knowledge, professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions are based on InTASC standards and aligned to CSC’s Visionary Leader instructional themes. Key assessments are designed to measure candidate performance during the clinical practice (teacher internship/student teaching) semester. Multiple reviewers rate the candidate’s performance, including the candidate’s own self-evaluation and reflection. Each of the clinical practice ratings is based on the common Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation (NCPE) rubric. Additionally, measures of content knowledge proficiency and results of an evidence-based case study (Teacher Work Sample) (TWS) are collected at this level. The target criterion for successful performance is *Proficiency (3)* for NCPE, Content Knowledge, and TWS measures. Data are presented for Fall 2015-Spring 2016, Fall 2016-Spring 2017, Fall 2017-Spring 2018, and Fall 2018.

Key Assessment # 1: Senior Level—Performance during Teacher Internship/Student Teaching (clinical practice)

Presented below are the summary tables for candidate performance during the teacher internship. Data are summarized by InTASC Standard/ Domain and disaggregated by endorsement area. Data links provide additional data tables which are disaggregated by individual InTASC standard and other factors.

Scoring guides/rubrics: [Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation \(NCPE\) Rubric \[P-12 Cooperating Teacher \(CT\); College Supervisor \(CS\); Candidate Self-Evaluation \(SR\)\]](#)

Table 1.1a: *Mean Ratings of InTASC Standards/Domains Items for Initial Program Candidates as Measured by Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation (NCPE--Multiple Forms) Rubric (Summary Disaggregated by Endorsement)*

	N	The Learner and Learning InTASC 1, 2, 3; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5			Content Knowledge InTASC 4, 5; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5			Instructional Practice InTASC 6, 7, 8; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5			Professional Responsibility InTASC 9, 10; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5			InTASC Standards Items Grand Mean/SD		
		Cooperating Teacher Rating	College Supervisor Rating	Self Rating	Cooperating Teacher Rating	College Supervisor Rating	Self Rating	Cooperating Teacher Rating	College Supervisor Rating	Self Rating	Cooperating Teacher Rating	College Supervisor Rating	Self Rating	Cooperating Teacher Rating	College Supervisor Rating	Self Rating
Fall 2015-Fall 2018																
Art																

<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	8	3.53 (0.39)	3.78 (0.17)	3.38 (0.41)	3.41 (0.31)	3.86 (0.19)	3.61 (0.22)	3.45 (0.38)	3.79 (0.16)	3.46 (0.33)	3.50 (0.41)	3.86 (0.19)	3.69 (0.21)	3.50 (0.32)	3.82 (0.16)	3.53 (0.23)
Biology																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Business, Marketing, & Information Technology (BMIT) N = 3 & Basic Business (being phased out) N = 3																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	6	3.29 (0.61)	3.79 (0.23)	3.43 (0.39)	3.65 (0.26)	3.79 (0.25)	3.83 (0.26)	3.63 (0.30)	3.75 (0.24)	3.58 (0.26)	3.75 (0.30)	3.73 (0.23)	3.76 (0.26)	3.58 (0.37)	3.78 (0.20)	3.63 (0.30)
Chemistry																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Early Childhood Inclusive																
<i>Total/Mean/SD</i>	4	3.83 (0.33)	3.93 (0.09)	3.71 (0.34)	3.73 (0.49)	3.80 (0.15)	3.68 (0.34)	3.68 (0.46)	3.85 (0.11)	3.71 (0.41)	3.79 (0.42)	3.95 (0.10)	3.85 (0.30)	3.74 (0.43)	3.89 (0.08)	3.77 (0.25)
Earth & Space																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	0	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Elementary Education																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	157	3.61 (0.37)	3.65 (0.36)	3.51 (0.41)	3.56 (0.41)	3.55 (0.41)	3.41 (0.45)	3.57 (0.39)	3.57 (0.40)	3.46 (0.43)	3.69 (0.35)	3.69 (0.37)	3.62 (0.36)	3.61 (0.35)	3.62 (0.36)	3.51 (0.38)
English, Language Arts																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	17	3.22 (0.52)	3.62 (0.46)	3.48 (0.34)	3.36 (0.47)	3.71 (0.41)	3.54 (0.37)	3.05 (0.46)	3.70 (0.44)	3.47 (0.39)	3.49 (0.39)	3.69 (0.49)	3.71 (0.24)	3.45 (0.39)	3.68 (0.44)	3.55 (0.30)
Family & Consumer Sciences																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	7	3.83 (0.16)	3.77 (0.29)	3.50 (0.42)	3.70 (0.24)	3.74 (0.41)	3.55 (0.47)	3.70 (0.33)	3.73 (0.38)	3.69 (0.25)	3.96 (0.05)	3.83 (0.30)	3.72 (0.25)	3.86 (0.10)	3.81 (0.24)	3.66 (0.27)
Health																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	0	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Health, Physical Education &																

Health																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	23	3.49 (0.38)	3.53 (0.37)	3.48 (0.38)	3.36 (0.42)	3.46 (0.33)	3.41 (0.46)	3.46 (0.44)	3.49 (0.39)	3.34 (0.38)	3.40 (0.44)	3.52 (0.41)	3.40 (0.42)	3.47 (0.40)	3.53 (0.34)	3.46 (0.36)
History																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	5	3.58 (0.37)	3.73 (0.33)	3.53 (0.30)	3.51 (0.42)	3.64 (0.43)	3.49 (0.32)	3.45 (0.65)	3.44 (0.54)	3.44 (0.58)	3.70 (0.45)	3.87 (0.30)	3.67 (0.47)	3.60 (0.40)	3.69 (0.36)	3.59 (0.28)
Mathematics																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	8	3.47 (0.52)	3.66 (0.31)	3.69 (0.16)	3.35 (0.41)	3.56 (0.40)	3.52 (0.35)	3.48 (0.47)	3.59 (0.43)	3.51 (0.43)	3.11 (0.60)	3.57 (0.41)	3.36 (0.48)	3.47 (0.48)	3.68 (0.29)	3.54 (0.33)
Middle Grades																
MG ELA	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Business	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG FCS	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Math MG	12	3.51 (0.56)	3.66 (0.50)	3.42 (0.54)	3.25 (0.50)	3.43 (0.41)	3.13 (0.36)	3.52 (0.48)	3.67 (0.39)	3.51 (0.30)	3.65 (0.39)	3.78 (0.35)	3.70 (0.22)	3.55 (0.46)	3.70 (0.36)	3.54 (0.30)
MG Health & PE	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Social Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<i>Total/Mean/SD</i>	20	3.58 (0.49)	3.76 (0.42)	3.56 (0.48)	3.27 (0.41)	3.50 (0.44)	3.14 (0.30)	3.60 (0.41)	3.73 (0.38)	3.58 (0.27)	3.67 (0.33)	3.82 (0.35)	3.68 (0.38)	3.62 (0.39)	3.76 (0.34)	3.61 (0.26)
Library Media Specialist*	2	Phased out, included in overall data														
Physical Education P-6																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	3	3.54 (0.47)	3.38 (0.70)	2.67 (0.00)	3.53 (0.46)	3.40 (0.72)	2.00 (0.00)	3.54 (0.47)	3.33 (0.69)	2.00 (0.00)	3.61 (0.54)	3.56 (0.77)	4.00 (0.00)	3.56 (0.48)	3.41 (0.70)	2.63 (0.00)
Physical Education 7-12																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	6	3.42 (0.27)	3.52 (0.49)	3.47 (0.30)	3.27 (0.45)	3.58 (0.45)	3.32 (0.41)	3.40 (0.38)	3.53 (0.51)	3.45 (0.32)	3.42 (0.56)	3.58 (0.56)	3.61 (0.45)	3.40 (0.40)	3.57 (0.49)	3.48 (0.36)
Social Science																
<i>Total N/Mean/SD</i>	13	3.45 (0.5)	3.66 (0.39)	3.55 (0.35)	3.45 (0.37)	3.60 (0.39)	3.49 (0.29)	3.46 (0.47)	3.58 (0.46)	3.66 (0.31)	3.65 (0.44)	3.68 (0.34)	3.79 (0.26)	3.51 (0.43)	3.65 (0.33)	3.64 (0.26)
Special Education Generalist																

(Mild/Moderate)																
Total N/Mean/SD	31	3.50 (0.61)	3.70 (0.39)	3.63 (0.33)	3.45 (0.62)	3.63 (0.42)	3.44 (0.48)	3.52 (0.55)	3.70 (0.38)	3.53 (0.40)	3.51 (0.64)	3.73 (0.39)	3.70 (0.38)	3.49 (0.59)	3.68 (0.38)	3.59 (0.35)
Music Field																
Total N/Mean/SD	7	3.21 (0.50)	3.38 (0.36)	3.40 (0.42)	3.67 (0.21)	3.36 (0.38)	3.59 (0.26)	3.37 (0.37)	3.35 (0.36)	3.42 (0.44)	3.31 (0.35)	3.76 (0.26)	3.60 (0.31)	3.39 (0.35)	3.46 (0.29)	3.51 (0.33)
*Vocal Music Subject	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Total N/Mean/SD																
**Supplemental Endorsements																
InTASC Standards Items Grand Mean/SD																
Grand Mean/SD N = 323*	323	3.55 (0.43)	3.66 (0.38)	3.52 (0.39)	3.49 (0.43)	3.58 (0.41)	3.43 (0.44)	3.52 (0.43)	3.60 (0.41)	3.49 (0.41)	3.61 (0.42)	3.69 (0.38)	3.63 (0.36)	3.57 (0.39)	3.65 (0.36)	3.54 (0.35)

Scale: 4—Advanced (A-level), 3—Proficient (B-level), 2—Progressing (C-level), 1/0 Unacceptable (D/F level) *N includes multiple endorsements
 *Specialized Accreditation –Music Field and Vocal Music subject; data included in All Candidates. *Library Media Specialist (phased out) and Basic Business (phased out) data included in All Candidates.
 **Supplemental Endorsements -- Data included with candidates’ primary endorsement field: Coaching (N = 7), Early Childhood Education (N = 6), Health Sciences (N = 0), and Work-based Learning (N = 3).

Link to: [Table 1.1a: Mean Ratings of InTASC Standards Items for Initial Program Candidates as Measured by Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation \(NCPE—Multiple Forms\) Rubric \(Full Table--Disaggregated by Endorsement Area, Semester/Year\) -- Expanded Tables and Key Assessments Total Data- NCPE tab.xlsx and Key Assessments Disaggregated by Elementary Ed Groups](#)

Table 1.1b: Mean Ratings of InTASC Standards Items for All Initial Program Candidates as Measured by Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation (NCPE--2018-2019) Rubric (Summary) (InTASC 1-10; CAEP 1, 2.3, 2.5)

Initial Program Candidates’ InTASC Standards Items	Fall 2015-Fall 2018 N= 323*		
	CT Rating	Super Rating	Self Rating
The Learner and Learning			
Standard 1 -- Uses data about students and their development to adjust teaching and build on student strengths resulting in student learning. InTASC 1; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5	3.58 (0.47)	3.64 (0.42)	3.55 (0.42)
Standard 2 -- Identifies students’ needs for differentiation and responds with individualized instruction, flexible grouping, and varied learning	3.54	3.61	3.51

experiences to include bringing multiple perspectives and cultural resources to the discussion of content. InTASC 2; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5	(0.47)	(0.44)	(0.44)
Standard 3 -- Communicates and reinforces clear task and behavior expectations to students, develops routines that support expectations and minimizes the loss of instructional time. InTASC 3; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5	3.54 (0.51)	3.70 (0.43)	3.52 (0.49)
The Learner and Learning Domain Grand Mean	3.55 (0.43)	3.66 (0.38)	3.52 (0.39)
Content Knowledge			
Standard 4 -- Communicates accurate content, uses academic vocabulary correctly, provides relevant opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding and uses knowledge of common misconceptions to create accurate understanding in the content area. InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3	3.61 (0.45)	3.69 (0.40)	3.56 (0.44)
Standard 5 -- Links concepts to help students make connections and engages students in applying methods of inquiry in the discipline to engage learners in critical thinking. InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5	3.43 (0.48)	3.50 (0.49)	3.34 (0.50)
Content Knowledge Domain Grand Mean	3.49 (0.43)	3.58 (0.41)	3.43 (0.44)
Instructional Practice			
Standard 6 -- Uses classroom formative and summative assessments that match objectives and inform instructional decisions to guide implementation of differentiated instructional strategies to include designing and/or adapting interventions as a result. InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5	3.53 (0.48)	3.52 (0.51)	3.47 (0.47)
Standard 7 -- Sequences learning experiences linked to the learning objectives, performance tasks and assessments to provide multiple ways for students to demonstrate knowledge and skills to include using data to adjust for recurring learning needs throughout planning. InTASC 7; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5	3.56 (0.45)	3.64 (0.43)	3.53 (0.45)
Standard 8 -- Uses a broad range of evidence-based strategies to support learning in the content area, poses questions that elicit student thinking about information and concepts to build critical thinking skills. InTASC 8; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5	3.51 (0.44)	3.64 (0.43)	3.47 (0.46)
Instructional Practice Domain Grand Mean	3.52 (0.43)	3.60 (0.41)	3.49 (0.41)
Professional Responsibility			
Standard 9 -- Invites constructive feedback, responds positively, independently sets and implements goals to improve practice. InTASC 9; CAEP 1.1 <i>Dispositions</i>	3.72 (0.44)	3.74 (0.40)	3.76 (0.35)
Standard 10 -- Conveys a confident, professional decorum when interacting with learners, peers, colleagues and the community in small and large group situations to include seeking out leadership opportunities in the school and/or community. InTASC 10; CAEP 1.1 <i>Dispositions</i>	3.63 (0.50)	3.74 (0.40)	3.67 (0.45)
Standard 10 Demonstrates professional oral, written and electronic communication, deals with people, problems and crises effectively and communicates with families through a variety of means (i.e. notes home, e-mails or websites, phone calls, conferences, meetings). InTASC 10; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5 <i>Dispositions</i>	3.50 (0.53)	3.65 (0.47)	3.46 (0.56)
Standard 10 Overall Mean	3.56 (0.46)	3.69 (0.41)	3.57 (0.43)
Professional Responsibility Domain Grand Mean	3.61 (0.42)	3.69 (0.38)	3.63 (0.36)
InTASC Standards Items Grand Mean/SD Grand Mean/SD N = 323*	3.57 (0.39)	3.65 (0.36)	3.54 (0.35)

Scale: 4—Advanced (A-level), 3—Proficient (B-level), 2—Progressing (C-level), 1/0 Unacceptable (D/F level)

*N includes multiple endorsements

*Specialized Accreditation –Music Field and Vocal Music subject; data included in All Candidates. *Library Media Specialist (phased out) and Basic Business (phased out) data included in All Candidates.

**Supplemental Endorsements -- Data included with candidates' primary endorsement field: Coaching (N = 7), Early Childhood Education (N = 6), Health Sciences (N = 0), and Work-based Learning (N = 3).

Link to: [Key Assessments Total Data- NCPE tab.xlsx](#)

Key Assessment # 2: Senior Level—Content Knowledge

Content knowledge is measured using: 1) the grade point average (GPA) calculated ONLY on the candidate's subject matter/content area endorsement courses; 2) Praxis II score; and 3) the content knowledge performance during the teacher internship as measured using the *NCPE InTASC Content Knowledge Rating (InTASC Standard 4)*.

Scoring guides/rubrics: [Nebraska Clinical Practice Evaluation \(NCPE\) Rubric \[P-12 Cooperating Teacher \(CT\); College Supervisor \(CS\); Candidate Self-Evaluation \(SR\)\]](#)

Table 1.1c: *Candidates' Content Knowledge Scores (Summary) (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1)*

Fall 2015-Fall 2018	N	Overall GPA @ Graduation	Endorsement Content GPA	Praxis II Average /SD	NCPE Content Knowledge Cooperating Teacher	NCPE Content Knowledge Supervisor	NCPE Content Knowledge Self
Art	8	3.54 (0.30)	3.66 (0.20)	169 (12.26)	3.62 (0.27)	3.91 (0.19)	3.90 (0.20)
Biology	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Business (BMIT) & Basic Business (being phased out)	6	3.63 (0.31)	3.62 (0.28)	176 (12.48)	3.83 (0.24)	3.81 (0.22)	3.90 (0.22)
Chemistry	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Early Childhood Inclusive	4	3.64 (0.17)	3.72 (0.22)	181 (9.06)	3.71 (0.50)	3.83 (0.25)	3.58 (0.58)
Earth & Space	0	#	#	#	#	#	#
Elementary Education	157	3.59 (0.29)	3.61 (0.36)	167 (10.54)	3.62 (0.43)	3.64 (0.41)	3.46 (0.48)
English Language Arts	17	3.76 (0.20)	3.74 (0.23)	176 (6.43)	3.51 (0.39)	3.80 (0.37)	3.75 (0.35)
Family & Consumer Sciences	7	3.69 (0.40)	3.76 (0.39)	165 (6.73)	3.83 (0.24)	3.95 (0.13)	3.81 (0.28)
Health	0	#	#	#	#	#	#
Health, Physical Education & Health	23	3.63 (0.23)	3.73 (0.33)	172 (8.87)	3.45 (0.55)	3.63 (0.35)	3.55 (0.42)
History	5	3.21 (0.17)	3.39 (0.76)	151 (16.79)	3.60 (0.38)	3.83 (0.20)	3.60 (0.30)
Mathematics	8	3.45 (0.21)	2.87 (0.37)	160 (16.77)	3.62 (0.45)	3.79 (0.23)	3.67 (0.24)
Middle Grades	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Business	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG ELA	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG FCS	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Math	12	3.63 (0.32)	3.33 (0.38)	169 (12.29)	3.71 (0.64)	3.88 (0.23)	3.67 (0.35)

MG Health & PE	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Social Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Middle Grades Total	20	3.68 (0.29)	3.44 (0.44)	NA – multiple exams	3.77 (0.53)	3.89 (0.21)	3.67 (0.36)
Library/Media Specialist	2	Phased out, included in overall data					
Physical Education P-6	3	3.62 (0.31)	3.82 (0.32)	162 (5.29)	3.67 (0.58)	3.56 (0.51)	3.00 (0.00)
Physical Education 7-12	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science	6	3.69 (0.31)	3.37 (0.74)	172 (14.87)	3.33 (0.49)	3.70 (0.41)	3.67 (0.19)
Social Science	13	3.48 (0.47)	3.39 (0.51)	162 (9.05)	3.60 (0.34)	3.73 (0.32)	3.69 (0.29)
Special Education Generalist (Mild/Moderate)	31	3.50 (0.35)	3.50 (0.45)	170 (9.36)	3.57 (0.63)	3.66 (0.45)	3.52 (0.46)
Music Field*	7	3.57 (0.27)	3.54 (0.30)	167 (12.99)	3.80 (0.22)	3.56 (0.34)	3.76 (0.39)
Vocal Music*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grand Mean/SD N = 323	323*	3.59 (0.30)	3.57 (0.40)	##	3.61 (0.45)	3.69 (0.39)	3.56 (0.44)

GPA is on a 4-point scale. NCPE Scale: 4—Advanced (A-level), 3—Proficient (B-level), 2—Progressing (C-level), 1/0 Unacceptable (D/F level). *N includes multiple endorsements

No Praxis II summative data is given on this table as various endorsement areas take different Praxis II tests which are not comparable in scale or cut score. Praxis II data is shown on Table 1d below.

*Specialized Accreditation – No folios for Music Field and Vocal Music subject

**Supplemental Endorsements -- Data included with candidates' primary endorsement field: Coaching (N = 7), Early Childhood Education (N = 6), Health Sciences (N = 0), and Work-based Learning (N = 3).

Link to: [Key Assessments Total Data- Content Knowledge tab.xlsx](#) and [Key Assessments Disaggregated by Elementary Ed Groups](#)

Candidate performance on the Praxis II for the reporting period is compared to state and national groups by median score and pass rate percentages. The number of test takers does not match with the number of program completers due to possible middle level and concentration test takers. Chadron State College required candidates to take the Praxis II exam before required for Nebraska institutions; therefore, there is not state comparison data for 2015–2016. Praxis II performance was compared and analyzed to the median national score and pass rate in order to set cut scores in Nebraska and to determine the relative performance of our candidates. The comparison is as follows:

Table 1.1d: *Benchmarked Comparison Candidate Performance on Praxis II--Summary* (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 5.3)

Fall 2015-Fall 2018	N of CSC Students taking the test	N of Nebraska Students taking the test	Median Score CSC	Median Score National	N of CSC Students Reaching Cut off Score	CSC Pass Rate	Nebraska Pass Rate

Art	9	76*	171	166	8	89%	87%*
Biology	1		NA	163	NA	NA	NA*
Business (BMIT) & Basic Business (being phased out)	12	63*	179	171	12	100%	97.5%*
Chemistry	2	23*	182	160	2	100%	91%
Early Childhood Inclusive	4	67*	172	169	4	100%	86%*
Earth & Space	0	#	#	#	#	#	#
Elementary Education	182	1,277*	166	170	164	90%	95%*
English Language Arts	16	231	172	175	14	88%	89%
Family & Consumer Sciences	6	47	165	162	6	100%	94%
Health	0	#	#	#	#	#	#
Health, Physical Education and Health	22	68*	172	165	20	91%	83%
History	6	50*	152	161	5	83%	89%
Mathematics	8	183	169	158	7	88%	84%*
Middle Grades Math	14	15*	175	169	12	86%	93%*
MG ELA	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Science	1	*	*	*	*	*	*
Physical Education P-6 & 7-12	5	41*	156	155	5	100%	100%*
Science	8	73	172	164	8	100%	98%*
Social Science	16	154	197.75	166	13	81%	91%*
Special Education Generalist (Mild/Moderate)	26	458	171	173	26	100%	100%*
Music Field & Vocal Music*	9	121	167	167	8	89%	93%*

@Ne
brask
a
comp

arison data is not available prior to Fall 2016-2017 due to the Praxis II not being required. Nebraska was in the phase in process; CSC piloted the Praxis II exam as part of the process.

*Nebraska comparison data is calculated yearly; Fall 2018-Spring 2019 data will not be available until August, 2019.

Link to: Table 1.1d: Detailed Breakdown of *Candidate Performance on Praxis II* -- Expanded Tables

Key Assessment # 3: Senior Level—Effects on P-12 Student Learning

The Teacher Work Sample is a case study activity designed to measure all 10 InTASC standards, focusing on the candidate's ability to 1) use research, data, and technology skills in designing instruction which addresses college- and career-ready standards, 2) consider contextual

factors that impact learning, 3) use assessment practices in measuring his/her PK-12 students' progress, and 4) demonstrate his/her ability to be a reflective educator. Candidates are prompted to assess their overall impact on their PK-12 students.

Scoring Guide/Rubric and assignment: [Teacher Work Sample Rubric](#), [TWS assignment](#), and [TWS lesson reflection questions](#)

Table 1.1e: *All Candidates - Teacher Work Sample--Fall 2015 through Fall 2018*

Fall 2015-Fall 2018	N	Professional Presentation	Contextual Factors/ Instructional Setting (InTASC 1; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5)	Initial Instructional Plan (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)	Assessment Plan (1) Pre-/Post-tests (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4)	Assessment Plan (2) Pre-Assessment Data (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5)	Revised Initial Instructional Plan (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)	Assessment Plan (3) Data Analysis & Display (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 2.3, 3.5)	Decision Making, Self-Reflection/ Evaluation (InTASC 6; CAEP 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5)	Mean/ SD
TWS Fall 2015 - Spring 2018 Totals										
Art	8	15.00 (0.00)	19.38 (0.25)	13.63 (1.49)	15.38 (0.75)	11.63 (0.48)	18.38 (1.38)	17.25 (2.22)	18.13 (1.80)	128.75 (6.33)
Biology	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Business BMIT & Basic Business	6	15.33 (0.75)	19.08 (1.32)	15.00 (0.71)	15.75 (0.42)	11.33 (1.17)	19.42 (0.58)	18.25 (2.75)	18.83 (1.75)	133.00 (7.56)
Chemistry	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Early Childhood Inclusive	4	14.25 (1.32)	19.13 (1.11)	14.38 (1.25)	14.50 (1.78)	11.38 (0.75)	18.38 (1.02)	19.00 (1.68)	17.75 (2.22)	128.75 (8.87)
Elementary Education	157	14.90 (0.92)	18.77 (1.28)	13.94 (1.55)	14.42 (1.67)	10.84 (1.06)	18.09 (1.55)	17.66 (1.89)	18.38 (2.10)	127.00 (9.85)
English Language Arts	17	14.97 (0.74)	18.29 (1.34)	14.18 (1.13)	14.09 (2.34)	10.91 (1.31)	18.38 (1.38)	18.79 (1.69)	19.15 (1.00)	128.76 (8.61)
Family & Consumer Sciences	7	15.21 (0.49)	19.21 (0.70)	14.64 (1.14)	15.21 (1.07)	11.43 (0.79)	18.79 (1.25)	19.50 (0.58)	19.36 (0.56)	133.36 (5.00)
Health	0	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#	#
Health, Physical Education & Health	23	14.87 (0.66)	18.83 (0.94)	13.91 (1.01)	14.61 (1.05)	11.17 (0.49)	18.48 (1.01)	18.24 (1.95)	18.83 (1.14)	123.50 (8.75)
History	5	14.80 (0.45)	18.60 (0.74)	13.20 (1.44)	14.10 (1.29)	10.60 (0.89)	17.70 (1.48)	15.90 (3.83)	18.60 (0.42)	128.93 (5.16)
Mathematics	8	15.36 (0.38)	19.14 (0.63)	14.14 (1.07)	15.64 (0.48)	11.50 (0.65)	18.07 (1.21)	19.07 (0.61)	18.93 (0.53)	131.86 (1.97)
Middle Grades (non-duplicated)	13	15.08 (0.81)	18.88 (0.74)	14.38 (0.89)	15.08 (0.79)	11.27 (0.73)	18.92 (1.10)	18.31 (1.09)	18.88 (1.45)	130.81 (5.02)
MG Business	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

MG ELA	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG FCS	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Math	12	15.00 (0.80)	18.83 (0.75)	14.25 (0.78)	15.04 (0.81)	11.21 (0.72)	18.83 (1.09)	18.21 (1.08)	18.79 (1.47)	130.17 (4.66)
MG Health & PE	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
MG Social Science	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Library/Media Specialist	2	Phased out, data included in primary endorsement								
Physical Education P-6	3	14.67 (1.04)	17.50 (2.29)	12.33 (2.93)	13.33 (1.76)	9.50 (1.00)	15.83 (2.47)	16.00 (3.77)	15.67 (0.76)	114.83 (14.84)
Physical Education 7-12	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Science	6	14.58 (0.49)	18.58 (1.39)	14.67 (0.61)	14.42 (1.32)	10.75 (1.21)	18.75 (0.82)	18.50 (1.79)	18.92 (1.53)	129.17 (7.70)
Social Science	13	14.96 (0.69)	18.79 (1.10)	14.00 (1.26)	14.08 (1.68)	10.79 (1.34)	18.42 (1.53)	18.08 (2.12)	18.08 (1.78)	127.21 (10.02)
Special Education Generalist (Mild/Moderate)	31	14.94 (0.77)	18.89 (1.09)	13.66 (1.50)	14.03 (1.57)	10.52 (1.09)	17.66 (2.04)	17.35 (1.92)	17.90 (1.94)	124.95 (9.36)
Music Field*	7	15.14 (0.24)	19.43 (0.61)	13.50 (0.65)	15.07 (0.98)	11.21 (0.91)	18.00 (0.91)	18.36 (0.94)	19.00 (1.19)	129.71 (4.13)
Vocal Music*	2	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Grand Mean Total Endorsements N = 323	323									
Grand Mean Total No Duplicates N = 296 (Candidates)+	296	14.93 (0.81)	18.80 (1.18)	14.01 (1.39)	14.52 (1.59)	10.92 (1.03)	18.20 (1.69)	17.93 (2.04)	18.50 (1.63)	127.82 (8.87)

Scale: 132-140 = 4—Advanced (A-level), 120-131 = 3—Proficient (B-level), 109-119 = 2—Progressing (C-level), < 108 = 1/0 Unacceptable (D/F)

Data include: *Specialized Accreditation – No folios for Music Field and Vocal Music Subject and **Supplemental Endorsements -- Data included with candidates' primary endorsement field: Coaching (N = 7), Early Childhood Education (N = 6), Health Sciences (N = 0), and Work-based Learning (N = 3).

+Middle grades non-duplicated total is calculated on the number of candidates completing a Middle Grades endorsement with the TWS counted once. The Grand Mean No Duplicates is calculated by omitting any data included in multiple endorsements. Candidates complete one TWS per student, not for each endorsed area.

Link to: [Key Assessments Total Data- TWS Total Tab and TWS All Endorsements Tab.xlsx](#) and [Key Assessments Disaggregated by Elementary Ed Groups](#)

Key Assessment # 4: Post-graduation—Follow-up Surveys

Follow-up studies are conducted to measure initial program completers' perception of their preparation and their employers' assessment of their preparation as teachers. Surveys are conducted by the Nebraska Department of Education of first year teachers and principals of first year teachers within the state of Nebraska. The CSC Education Department surveys graduates who are first year teachers not teaching in Nebraska and their principals, if provided with their contact information. Third year teachers are now being surveyed by NDE as well; results forthcoming in fall 2019. The target criterion for successful performance is between *Consistent (3)* and *Frequent (2)* for follow up surveys. Data are presented for 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

First Year Teacher Survey Response and Overall Effective Preparation

The CSC FYTS summary reports for 2015 and 2016 include responses only from principals; teacher surveys were not sent from NDE. The FYTS summary for 2017 and 2018 includes both teachers and principals. Responding Nebraska principals believed CSC graduates were effectively prepared for continued employment in their district (*YES*--111 to *NO*--2). CSC first year teachers also believed they were prepared to be an effective first year teacher (*YES*--42 to *NO*--2). (See Chadron State College Reports 2015, 2016, 2017 & 2018, Continuing Employment Responses.) (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4)

Table 1.1f: *CSC and Nebraska Survey Responses and Effective Preparation Question.* (CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4)

Report Year	Employment year/endorsement year	CSC N/Total N (Return Rate)		NE N/Total N		Would you consider this teacher effectively prepared for continuing employment in your district? (Principal)	Do you believe you were prepared to be an effective first year teacher? (Teacher)
		Principals	Teachers	Principals	Teachers	CSC Responses	CSC Responses
2015	2014-2015/ 2013-2014	28/41 (68.29%)	*	554/965 (57.41%)	*	25 yes; 1 no	*
2016	2015-2016/ 2014-2015	35/40 (87.5%)	*	683/987 (69.2%)	*	35 yes; 0 no	*
2017	2016-2017/ 2015-2016	27/33 (82%)	19/33 (58%)	578/903 (64%)	534/903 (59%)	26 yes; 1 no	18 yes; 1 no
2018	2017-2018/ 2016-2017	25/37 (68%)	18/37 (49%)	481/864 (56%)	441/864 (51%)	25 yes; 0 no	24 yes; 1 no
Totals		115/151 (76%)	37/70 (53%)	2,296/ 3,719 (62%)	975/1,767 (55%)	111 yes; 2 no	42 yes; 2 no

* No survey for teachers until 2017.

First Year Teacher Performance on InTASC Indicators (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4)

2015. CSC teachers were rated predominately at the *Consistent (3)* and *Frequent (2)* levels with very few ratings at the *Occasional (1)* or *Rare (0)* levels. CSC average responses were very close to the statewide average on all InTASC indicators, falling between *Frequent* and *Consistent*. Data were reported for Content Endorsements ($N = 17$), Elementary ($N = 5$), Middle Grades ($N = 2$), Special Education ($N = 4$) and Total ($N = 28$). (See Chadron State College Report 2015, Average Responses, Figures 3 and 4.) Ratings on all indicators for endorsement type were between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except one. Elementary Education performance on Application of Content was noted as being lower than other indicators ($N = 5$).

2016. CSC teachers were rated predominately at the *Consistent (3)* and *Frequent (2)* levels with few ratings at the *Occasional (1)* or *Rare (0)* levels. CSC average responses were very close to the statewide average on all InTASC indicators, falling between *Frequent* and *Consistent*. Data were reported for Content Endorsements ($N = 12$), Elementary ($N = 15$), Middle Grades ($N = 3$), Special Education ($N = 5$) and Total ($N = 35$). (See Chadron State College Report 2016, Average Responses, Figures 3 and 4.) Ratings on all indicators for endorsement type were between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except one. Content Endorsements performance on Application of Content was noted as being lower than other indicators ($N = 12$).

2017. CSC teachers were rated predominately at the *Consistent (3)* and *Frequent (2)* levels with very few ratings at the *Occasional (1)* or *Rare (0)* levels. CSC average responses were at or above the statewide average on all InTASC indicators, falling between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, as rated by principals and teachers. (See Chadron State College Report 2017, Average Responses, Figures 4 and 5.) Data were reported for Content Endorsements ($N = 7$), Elementary ($N = 15$), Middle Grades ($N = 1$), Early Childhood ($N = 1$), Special Education ($N = 3$) and Total ($N = 27$). Ratings on all indicators for endorsement type were between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, as reported by principals. Ratings for teachers were also between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except for Early Childhood ($N = 1$). (See Chadron State College Report 2017, Average Responses by Endorsement Type, Figures 6 and 7.)

2018. CSC teachers were rated predominately at the *Consistent (3)* and *Frequent (2)* levels with very few ratings at the *Occasional (1)* or *Rare (0)* levels. CSC average responses were about the same as the statewide average on all InTASC indicators, falling between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, as rated by principals and teachers. (See Chadron State College Report 2018, Average Responses, Figures 4 and 5.) Teachers' ratings of Application of Content were slightly lower. Data were reported for Content Endorsements ($N = 14$), Elementary ($N = 8$), Special Education ($N = 3$) and Total ($N = 25$). Ratings on all indicators for endorsement type were between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, as reported by principals. However, Content Endorsements were slightly lower than the other groups. Ratings for teachers were also between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except for Special Education ($N = 1$). (See Chadron State College Report 2018, Average Responses by Endorsement Type, Figures 6 and 7.)

Overall ratings of CSC first year teachers' performance in relation to InTASC standards fell between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except in for lower ratings by Elementary Education and Content Endorsements for Standard 5, Application of Content. Ratings for Impact on Student Learning and Professional Dispositions rate consistently high. Performance was lower for one Early Childhood first year teacher and one Special Education teacher. These individual performances are noted, but less useful for program evaluation. NDE provides CSC raw data, allowing endorsement programs to further evaluate their graduates' performance individually and as groups.

First Year Teacher Impact on Student Learning (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 5.4)

Impact on student learning was evaluated as a separate question, Indicator 11.1. CSC's first year teachers performed higher than the Nebraska group in 2015 ($N = 28$) (See Chadron State College Report 2015, Average Responses by Endorsement Type, Figure 3.); at the statewide average in 2016 ($N = 35$) (See Chadron State College Report 2016, Average Responses by Endorsement Type, Figure 3.); above the statewide average in 2017 for both principals ($N = 27$) and teachers ($N = 19$) (See Chadron State College Report 2017, Average Responses by Endorsement Type, Figures 4 and 5.); and above the statewide average in 2018 for principals ($N = 27$) and at the same level for teachers ($N = 17$) (See Chadron State College Report 2018, Survey Responses by Endorsement Type Figures 4 and 5.). Impact on student learning results are disaggregated by endorsement type below:

Table 1.1g: *Impact on Student Learning Disaggregated by Endorsement Type as Measured by NFYTS for Chadron State College. (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4)*

Indicator 11.1 The teacher positively impacts the learning and development for all students.	Endorsement Type	n	Consistent	n	Frequent	n	Occasional	n	Rare	N
2015	Content Endorsements	12	66.67%	5	27.78%	1	5.56%		0.00%	18
	Elementary	4	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	4
	Middle Grades	2	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2
	Special Education	2	50.00%	2	50.00%		0.00%		0.00%	4
2015 CSC	Total	20	68.97%	7	24.14%	1	3.45%		0.00%	28
2016	Content Endorsements	5	41.67%	6	50.00%	1	8.33%		0.00%	12
	Early Childhood		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	0
	Elementary	10	66.67%	5	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	15
	Middle Grades	2	66.67%	1	33.33%		0.00%		0.00%	3
	Special Education	5	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	5
2016 CSC	Total	22	62.86%	12	34.29%	1	2.86%		0.00%	35
2017 Principals	Content Endorsements	7	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	7
	Early Childhood		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1

	Elementary	11	73.33%	4	26.67%		0.00%		0.00%	15
	Middle Grades	1	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	1
	Special Education	1	33.33%	2	66.67%		0.00%		0.00%	3
2017 CSC Principals	Total	20	74.07%	7	25.93%					27
2017 Teachers	Content Endorsements	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
	Early Childhood		0.00%		0.00%	1	100.00%		0.00%	1
	Elementary	5	83.33%	1	16.67%		0.00%		0.00%	6
	Middle Grades	2	100.00%		0.00%		0.00%		0.00%	2
	Special Education	4	100.00%		0.00%				0.00%	4
2017 CSC Teachers	Total	16	84.21%	2	10.53%	1	5.26%			19
2018 Principals	Content Endorsements	8	57.14%	5	35.71%	1	7.14%	0	0.00%	14
	Early Childhood	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Elementary	8	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	8
	Middle Grades	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Special Education	2	66.67%	1	33.33%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3
2018 CSC Principals	Total	18	72.00%	6	20.00%	1	4.00%	0	0.00%	25
2018 Teachers	Content Endorsements	9	81.82%	2	18.18%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	11
	Early Childhood	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Elementary	5	83.33%	1	16.67%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	6
	Middle Grades	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Special Education	0	0.00%	1	100.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	1
2018 CSC Teachers	Total	14	77.78%	4	22.22%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	18
2015-2018 CSC Totals for Principals										
	Content Endorsements	32		16		3		0	0.00%	
	Early Childhood	0		1		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
	Elementary	33		9		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
	Middle Grades	5		1		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
	Special Education	10		4		0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
2015-2018 CSC All Results for Principals	Total	80	69.56%	32	27.83%	3	2.60%	0	0.00%	115
2017-2018 CSC Totals for Teachers										
	Content Endorsements	14		3		1		0	0.00%	
	Early Childhood	0		0				0	0.00%	
	Elementary	10		2				0	0.00%	

	Middle Grades	2		0				0	0.00%	
	Special Education	4		1				0	0.00%	
2017-2018 CSC All Results for Teachers	Total	30	81.08%	6	16.21%	1	2.70%	0	0.00%	37

Rating Scale: Consistent (3), Frequent (2), Occasional (1), or Rare (0).

In 2017 and 2018, a direct question was added asking both principals and teachers to rate impact on student learning using four levels, corresponding to the type of evaluation descriptors used with teachers in Nebraska schools. (See Chadron State College Report 2017 & 2018, Impact on Student Learning, Figures 8 and 9.)

Table 1.1h: *Impact on Student Learning (Principals and Teachers) as Measured by NFYTS (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.4)*

Principal -- Based upon the performance of this first year teacher, how would you rate his/her impact on student learning?	Highly Effective	Moderately Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	N
2017 CSC	17	10	0	0	27
2018 CSC	17	7	1	0	25
Total CSC Principal	34	17	1	0	52
Teacher -- Based upon your performance as a first year teacher, how would you rate your impact on student learning?	Highly Effective	Moderately Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	N
2017 CSC	3	16	0	0	19
2018 CSC	7	10	1	0	18
Total CSC Teacher	10	26	1	0	37

Rating Scale: Highly Effective, Moderately Effective, Somewhat Effective, or Ineffective.

First Year Teacher Survey scoring follow-up survey instruments: [Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey - Teacher 2017.pdf](#), [Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey - Principal 2017.pdf](#)

First Year Teacher Survey Linked Reports: [NFYTS CSC 2015 report](#), [NFYTS CSC 2016 report](#), [NFYTS CSC 2017 report](#), [NFYTS CSC 2018 report](#), [Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey 2015.pdf](#), [2016 NFYTS Summary Report v0.03.pdf](#), [2017 Statewide Report - Summary v0.02.pdf](#), [2018 NFYTS Summary Report v0.03](#)

Summary and Analysis of CSC Third Year Teacher Survey (Principals)

Third Year Teacher Survey Response and Overall Effective Preparation

2018 marked the beginning of the Nebraska Third Year Teacher Survey. The CSC FYTS summary report for 2018 includes responses from principals only. Responding Nebraska principals believed CSC graduates were effectively prepared for continued employment in their district (*YES*--30 to *NO*--3). (See Chadron State College Report NTYTS 2018, Continuing Employment Responses (Principals), Figure 6.) (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4)

Table 1.1i: *CSC and Nebraska Survey Responses and Effective Preparation Question.* (CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4)

Report Year	Third Full Year of Teaching	CSC N/Total N (Return Rate)	NE N/Total N	Would you consider this teacher effectively prepared for continuing employment in your district? (Principal)
		Principals	Principals	CSC Responses
2018	2017-2018	34/46 (73.91%)	802/1112 (72%)	30 yes; 3 no
Totals		34/46 (73.91%)	2,296/ 3,719 (62%)	30 yes; 3 no

Third Year Teacher Performance on InTASC Indicators (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4)

2018. CSC teachers were rated at the *Consistent* (3) and *Frequent* (2) levels with some ratings at the *Occasional* (1) level and or isolated ratings at the *Rare* (0) level. CSC average responses were slightly below the statewide average on all InTASC indicators, falling between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, as rated by principals. (See Chadron State College Report NTYTS 2018, Average Responses, Figures 2 and 3.) Data were reported for Content Endorsements ($N = 15$), Elementary ($N = 17$), Special Education ($N = 2$) and Total ($N = 34$). Ratings on all indicators for endorsement type were at or between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except Leadership and Collaboration for Special Education ($N = 2$) and Learning Differences for Content endorsements ($N = 15$). (See Chadron State College Report NTYTS 2018, Average Responses, Figure 4.)

Overall ratings of CSC third year teachers' performance in relation to InTASC standards fell between *Frequent* and *Consistent*, except as noted above. Data monitoring will continue, especially due to low numbers for some content types and only one year of data for third year teachers.

Third Year Teacher Impact on Student Learning (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4)

Impact on student learning was evaluated as a separate question, Indicator 11.1. CSC's third year teachers were rated mostly at the *Consistent* and *Frequent* levels with three teachers rated at the *Occasional* level. CSC's third year teachers performed somewhat lower than the Nebraska group in 2018 ($N = 34$) (See Chadron State College Report NTYTS 2018, Impact on Student Learning, Figures 2 and 3.)

Table 1.1j: *Impact on Student Learning Disaggregated by Endorsement Type as Measured by NFYTS for Chadron State College.* (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 5.4)

Indicator 11.1 The teacher positively impacts the learning and development for all students.	Endorsement Type	Consistent		Frequent		Occasional		Rare		N
		n		n		n		n		
2018 Principals										
	Content Endorsements	7	46.67%	7	46.67%	1	6.67%	0	0.00%	15
	Early Childhood	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Elementary	11	64.71%	4	23.53%	2	11.76%	0	0.00%	17
	Middle Grades	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0
	Special Education	1	50.00%	1	50.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	2
2018 CSC All Results -- Principals	Total	19	55.88%	12	35.29%	3	8.82%	0	0.00%	34

Rating Scale: Consistent (3), Frequent (2), Occasional (1), or Rare (0).

The Third Year Teacher Survey included the same question asked of principals and teachers on the First Year Teacher Survey. In 2018, principals were asked to rate the third-year teacher's impact on student learning using four levels, corresponding to the type of evaluation descriptors used with teachers in Nebraska schools. (See Chadron State College Report NTYTS 2018, Impact on Student Learning, Figure 5.)

Table 1.1k: *Impact on Student Learning (Principals and Teachers) as Measured by NFYTS.* (InTASC 1-10, CAEP 1.1, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.4)

Principal -- Based upon the performance of this first year (third) teacher, how would you rate his/her impact on student learning?	Highly Effective	Moderately Effective	Somewhat Effective	Ineffective	N
2018 CSC	18	12	3	0	33
Total CSC Principal	18	12	3	0	33

Rating Scale: Highly Effective, Moderately Effective, Somewhat Effective, or Ineffective.

Scoring follow-up survey instruments: [2018 Nebraska Third Year Teacher Survey.pdf](#)

Linked Reports: [2018 NTYTS Summary Report vs0.03](#)

CSC Education Department Post-Undergraduate Survey Graduates not Teaching in Nebraska (InTASC 1-10; CAEP 1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

The Education Department sends a follow up survey to initial program completers who are not teaching in Nebraska. This survey is intended to glean information similar to the Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey used for completers who are teaching in Nebraska. The

survey is sent to completers who in turn are asked to supply CSC with their employers contact information. The NFYTS is not dependent on first year teachers reporting their employers' contact information, thus, the higher return rate by principals. The CSC survey indicates that first year teachers rate their preparation on each of the four InTASC domains at approximately the *Proficient (3)* level. *Proficient* is the target for the CSC survey. It is significant to note that the ratings declined in several areas, particularly in the 2017 survey data. Content Knowledge and Instructional Practice domains show the most decline from 2015 and 2016 data. The Education Department examined the data at the May data retreat to seek explanation. The data is not disaggregated by endorsement area, due to the low numbers tied to many endorsement areas. Further disaggregation may be warranted to investigate the decline in ratings. (InTASC 1-10; CAEP 1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4) Data are reported for 2015, 2016, and 2017.

Table 1.11: Mean Ratings of CSC Education Dept. Post-Undergraduate Survey Graduates not Teaching in Nebraska (Summary)
(InTASC 1-10; CAEP 1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 2.3, 2.5, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Initial Program Candidates' InTASC Standards Items	2015 N = 53/94 (56%) Self	2015 N = 14/16 (88%) Super	2016 N = 20/71 (28%) Self N = 0 (0%) Super	2017 N = 35/86 (41%) Self	2017 N = 2/5 (40%)* Super
The Learner and Learning					
The Learner and Learning Domain Grand Mean	3.39 (0.59)	3.18 (0.60)	3.17 (0.67)	3.11 (0.89)	3.00 (1.00)*
Content Knowledge					
Content Knowledge Domain Grand Mean	3.31 (0.60)	3.22 (0.55)	3.24 (0.63)	2.94 (0.89)	3.00 (1.00)*
Instructional Practice					
Instructional Practice Domain Grand Mean	3.32 (0.61)	3.09 (0.62)	3.09 (0.63)	2.90 (0.89)	3.00 (1.00)*
Professional Responsibility					
InTASC Standards Items Grand Mean/SD	3.41 (0.15)	3.18 (0.13)	3.25 (0.21)	3.11 (0.91)	3.00 (1.00)*

Scale: 4—Advanced (A-level), 3—Proficient (B-level), 2—Progressing (C-level), 1/0 Unacceptable (D/F level)

*The employer data from 2017 were evenly split: 1 rated as *Proficient (3)* and 1 rated as *Advanced (4)*.

Scoring follow-up survey instruments: [CSC Education Department Graduate Follow-up Self-Survey](#); [CSC Education Department Graduate Follow-up Employer Survey](#)

Linked Reports: [Undergrad Follow up Tables 2015.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Supervisor Survey graphs 2015.pdf](#), [Undergrad Self Survey graphs 2015.pdf](#), [Undergrad Follow up Tables 2016.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Supervisor Survey 2016graphs.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Self Survey 2016graphs.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Follow up Tables 2017.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Supervisor Survey 2017graphs.xlsx](#), [Undergrad Self Survey 2017graphs.xlsx](#)

Analysis of Praxis II Testing

CSC participated in the initial pilot testing for Nebraska. The following table shows the Praxis II pass rates from the pilot testing period through the current year. CSC reports data for 17 initial program Praxis II tests.

Table 1.1m: *Change in Praxis II Pass Rate by Endorsement Area 2012-2018 (InTASC 4; CAEP 1.1. 5.3)*

Endorsement Area	Pass Rate in 2017-2018	Pass Rate in 2016-2017	Pass Rate in 2015-2016	Pass Rate in 2014-2015	Pass Rate in 2013-2014	Pass Rate in 2012-2013
Art	100%	67%	100%	50%	25%	67%
Basic Business	100%	100%	NA	100%	83%	100%
Biology	NA	NA	0%	NA	NA	NA
Chemistry	100%	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Early Childhood	100%	100%	NA	86%	100%	100%
Elementary Ed	89%	89%	96%	86%	91%	88%
English Language	89%	83%	100%	50%	100%	60%
FCS	100%	100%	100%	100%	NA	NA
General Science	100%	100%	NA	100%	NA	NA
History	100%	50%	100%	NA	NA	NA
HPE	100%	80%	100%	55%	27%	33%
Library Media Specialist	NA	100%	NA	NA	NA	NA
Mathematics	50%	100%	100%	75%	17%	43%
Middle Level Math	50%	100%	80%	NA	NA	NA
Music	100%	75%	100%	50%	100%	50%
Physical Education	NA	100%	100%	NA	NA	NA
Social Science	100%	80%	50%	80%	75%	83%
Special Education	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%