

Teacher Knowledge of Students
Grouping Students
Lesson Structure and Pacing

Standard #1: Learner Development
Standard #2: Learning

with districts using the TAP rubric to evaluate practicing teachers. In addition, the faculty attendees attended sessions on embedding ATR activities within classrooms and ways to use the ATR rubric to evaluate a student teacher's ability to work with diverse populations. The faculty reported out on the conference to their respective departments, and PEP reported on the conference to the ITP CC group. PEP will meet with the Senior Specialist-West Team of NIET (Ruhi Khan, EdD) to begin talks on a grant opportunity to build a co-constructed ATR-to-TAP student teaching placement approach within rural and regional districts using the TAP rubric.

2.

As noted above, NAU transitioned to the ATR in Fall 2020. Prior to Fall 2020, the NIET TAP Rubric was used for evaluating student teachers. This evidence file contains ATR data results from Fall 2020 to Spring 2023 (i.e., three-plus cycles of data). Data results are updated in this evidence file at the conclusion of each academic year. The decision to move from TAP, which is an evaluation measure most appropriate for practicing teachings, to ATR, which is established specifically for "Aspiring" teachers, is in alignment with RA5.4 Continuous Improvement.

that all student teaching requirements have been successfully completed by each candidate, including a passing score on the ATR.

At the conclusion of each semester, the ATR evaluation data are extracted from the learning management system a

- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials was noted as having the third highest ratings. Indicator 5, Activities and Materials is defined as activities and materials, grouping, and motivating students. The overall average mid-term scores for all programs for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022 were 3.10 and 3.22, respectively. Indicator 5 is aligned to InTASC Standards 5 and 8, Application of Content and Instructional Strategies, respectively.

Overall average scores at mid-term were lowest for Indicator 2, Assessment (aligned to InTASC Standard 4, Content Knowledge and Standard 6, Assessment), Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives (aligned to InTASC Standard 1, Learner Development, Standard 4, Content Knowledge, and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies), Indicator 6, Questioning (aligned to InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content), and Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving (aligned to InTASC Standard 5, Application of Content and Standard 8, Instructional Strategies). The overall average mid-term scores for Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 were:

- Indicator 2, Assessment—2.95 and 2.84, respectively
- Indicator 3, Standards and Objectives—3.11 and 2.97, respectively
- Indicator 6, Standards and Objectives—2.95 and 2.93, respectively
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem Solving—2.90 and 2.85, respectively

The overall final evaluation results from Fall 2022 and Spring 2023 were similar and indicate that candidates performed well. For these two semesters, the overall final evaluation results indicated average scores above 3.0 for all ATR indicators.

The ATR criteria with the highest overall final evaluation scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, respectively, demonstrate where candidates excelled most include:

- Indicator 1, Instructional Plans - 3.58 and 3.6, respectively
- Indicator 4, Presenting Instructional Content - 3.65 and 3.65, respectively
- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials - 3.59 and 3.68, respectively
- Indicator 8, Teacher Knowledge of Students - 3.66 and 3.66, respectively
- Indicator 10, Environment - 3.70 and 3.70, respectively
- Indicator 11, Engaging Students and Managing Behavior - 3.55 and 3.63, respectively
- Indicator 12, Professionalism and Ethical Behavior - 3.76 and 3.82, respectively

The ATR criteria with the highest overall final evaluation scores for Fall 2021 and Spring 2022, respectively, demonstrate where candidates excelled most include:

- Indicator 4, Presenting Instructional Content - 3.50 and 3.61, respectively
- Indicator 5, Activities and Materials - 3.45 and 3.65, respectively
- Indicator 8, Teacher Knowledge of Students - 3.48 and 3.62, respectively
- Indicator 10, Environment - 3.56 and 3.67, respectively
- Indicator 11, Engaging Students and Managing Behavior - 3.44 and 3.58, respectively
- Indicator 12, Professionalism and Ethical Behavior - 3.65 and 3.79, respectively

The ATR criteria with the lowest overall final evaluation scores demonstrating where candidates struggled the most included:

- Indicator 2, Assessment - 3.20 and 3.29, respectively
- Indicator 6, Questioning - 3.24 and 3.38, respectively
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem-Solving - 3.32 and 3.40, respectively



- Indicator 6, Questioning: *InTASC 5, Application of Content*
- Indicator 9, Thinking and Problem: *InTASC 5, Application of Content and InTASC 8, Instructional Strategies*

: In general, there are no clear trends of any race/ethnicity scoring below an overall average mean score of 3.0 for the final ATR evaluation. For example, in six semesters of ATR data, the 47 candidates ($n = 47$) who identify as American Indian/Alaska Native were above a 3.0 in all six semester for the

Standard #2: Learning Differences
Standard #3: Learning Environments

	3.14	2.84	2.97	3.16	3.10	2.93	3.04	3.21	2.85	3.35	3.05	3.41	3.09
--	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

				02. ASSESSMENT				03. STANDARDS AND OBJECTIVES				04. PRESENTING INSTRUCTIONAL CONTENT	

06. QUESTIONING

	06. QUESTIONING	07. ACADEMIC FEEDBACK	08. TEACHER KNOWLEDGE OF STUDENTS
10. ENVIRONMENT		11. ENGAGING STUDENTS AND MANAGING BEHAVIOR	