

Following the original submission of the program review for Agriculture Education at Oklahoma Panhandle State University, we received the reviewer's report stating that our program was recognized with conditions. Upon further review of this report, it appears that the areas of concern lie within three sections:

1. Candidates' knowledge of content—"OSAT data is not disaggregated in a way to determine sub areas that need improvement"
2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions—"No data was available for the unit plan and impact on student learning"
3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning—"No data is provided that documents effect on P-12 student learning"

We respectfully submit the following documentation and attached charts which will completely answer the three areas of concern.

1. OPSU had a total of 11 program completers for the years 2004/2005 through 2006/2007, the data set used in this program review. The attached chart, "**042-Ag Ed OSAT 2004-2007**" presents both aggregated and disaggregated OSAT scores by sub-areas for the 11 program completers. As shown, only four OPSU Agriculture Education program completer scored below 260 in any of the sub-areas for the three years of data provided and all aggregate averages in all sub-areas is above 270 for all program completers. It is difficult to review this disaggregated and aggregated data and find any area in our program that needs improvement. OPSU Agriculture Education program completers are doing an outstanding job of showing that they have the content knowledge to be effective teachers.
2. Candidates' ability to understand and apply pedagogical and professional content knowledge, skills, and dispositions was addressed in Assessment Three. The attachments provided, "**Assessment 3 narrative,**" "**Attachment 3A,**" "**Attachment 3B,**" and "**Attachment 3C**" address this issue and provide the data that the original program review submission stated would begin in the fall 2007 semester.
3. Candidate effects on P-12 student learning was addressed in Assessment Five. The attachments provided, "**Assessment 5 narrative,**" "**Attachment 5A,**" "**Attachment 5B,**" and "**Attachment 5C**" address this issue and provide the data that the original program review submission stated would begin in the fall 2007 semester.

**OSAT exam #42, State Agriculture Education Content Licensure Exam Data
2004/2005 through 2006/2007**

(click the TAB at the bottom of the screen to move between years)

2006/2007		Subarea 1 Agricultural Business, Marketing, and Communications	Subarea 2 Animal Science	Subarea 3 Plant and Soil Science	Subarea 4 Agriculture Power and Technology	Subarea 5 Natural Resources
Pass/Fail	OVERALL SCORE					
1	PASS	289	281	257	263	272

N=1

Percent who passed 100%
Percent who failed 0%
Overall Mean Score 274
2006/2007 Aggregated 274

Percent who passed Subarea 1	100%	Subarea 1	# who scored 239 and below	0
Percent who failed Subarea 1	0%		# who scored between 240-250	0
Mean for Subarea 1	289		# who scored between 251-260	0
Percent who passed Subarea 2	100%	Subarea 2	# who scored between 261-270	0
Percent who failed Subarea 2	0%		# who scored between 271-280	0
Mean for Subarea 2	281		# who scored between 281-300	1
Percent who passed Subarea 3	100%	Subarea 3	# who scored 239 and below	0
Percent who failed Subarea 3	0%		# who scored between 240-250	0
Mean for Subarea 3	267		# who scored between 251-260	1
Percent who passed Subarea 4	100%	Subarea 4	# who scored between 261-270	0
Percent who failed Subarea 4	0%		# who scored between 271-280	0
Mean for Subarea 4	263		# who scored between 281-300	0
Percent who passed Subarea 5	100%	Subarea 5	# who scored 239 and below	0
Percent who failed Subarea 5	0%		# who scored between 240-250	0
Mean for Subarea 5	272		# who scored between 251-260	0
			# who scored between 261-270	0
			# who scored between 271-280	1
			# who scored between 281-300	0

Assessment #3 Candidates' Ability to Plan

A candidate's ability to plan instruction effectively is essential to creating classroom and laboratory learning environments in which students acquire the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective skills necessary for intellectual growth and development. Academic preparation supporting candidates gaining and practicing this ability includes the course *Methods of Teaching and Management in Agricultural Education* (AGED 4103)

Attachment 3A. Upon restructuring the Agricultural Education curriculum, assessment of the candidates' ability to plan has been implemented for the Fall 2007. A candidate's ability to plan, as demonstrated by developing units of instruction, is 30% of one's overall grade for the course AGED 4103. Candidates' performance as described by this assessment supports candidates' attainment of Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP) competencies A, B, C, D, F, G, H, K, and L. In AGED 4103 candidates will be required to plan and create comprehensive units of instruction based on significant content areas within the Oklahoma secondary agricultural education curriculum: animal science, plant science, soil science, horticulture, agricultural mechanics, agribusiness management, leadership, personal development, and natural resources management.

Candidates confer with their cooperating teachers to determine the list of courses and related topics they will teach during the clinical internship experience portion of their student teaching semester. Accordingly, candidates plan and develop units of instruction prior to the beginning of that experience. The units of instruction must contain the following components: four detailed lesson plans, including a review lesson, using the *OPSU AGED Lesson Plan Format Attachment 3A*; appropriate visual aids to accompany the lessons; instruments and/or procedures (e.g., authentic assessment activities) to evaluate student performance, including "daily" or formative tests; comprehensive unit examinations; answer keys for each evaluation instrument.

Candidates' units of instruction will be evaluated by the Agricultural Education Director. The Agricultural Education Director's evaluations of candidates' units of instruction include the following criteria: coherence, methodology, visual aids, formative assessments/evaluations, summative assessments/evaluations, and professionalism. Candidates' units of instruction are measured against a scoring rubric for each of the criteria, i.e., "3" = "Target," "2" = "Acceptable," or "1" = "Unacceptable" and are graded as well. **Attachment 3B** Candidates receive written and oral feedback from the Agricultural Education Director about their units of instruction, including recommendations for improvement. Following evaluation by the Agricultural Education Director, units of instruction are returned to candidates for improvement where needed and receive additional review.

Attachment 3C displays a composite of the Agricultural Education Directors' ratings and grades of candidates' units of instruction planned and developed starting in the Fall 2007 semester.

Assessment #5 Candidates' Effect on Student Learning

An essential aspect of teaching and learning includes the assessment of student performance per prescribed learning objectives. The evaluation of student learning should involve an element of formal or "pencil and paper" assessment, e.g., a unit examination. Accordingly, candidates are required to create comprehensive unit examinations for instructional units developed (Attachment 5A) prior to the clinical internship experience. Characteristics of an appropriate unit examination and procedures to follow when developing said tests are addressed as a part of candidates' on-campus learning experience in the course *Methods of Teaching and Management in Agricultural Education* (AGED 4103). Candidates' examinations are evaluated by the Agricultural Education Director (Attachment 5B) and unit examinations are returned to candidates for improvement when warranted. Candidates' performance, as described by this assessment, supports candidates' attainment of Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation (OCTP) competencies G, H, and L.

Starting with the fall 2007 semester clinical experiences, candidates will pre- and post-test at least one class of students using the unit examination they developed while on campus. Students' pre- and post-test grades will be recorded and a percent difference calculated (Attachment 5C). In sum, candidates plan instruction based on prescribed learning objectives, develop an examination to measure student learning as an outcome of the instruction, and measure student knowledge per the instructional unit taught in a pre/post fashion so that their "effect on student learning" can be assessed. Attachment 5C displays all pre- and post-test performance of secondary agricultural education students for a candidate-developed unit examination administered by candidates during their clinical internship experience starting in fall 2007.

The attached charts show the pre and post test scores, and percent change in the unit exams of classes of four interns from fall 2007 through spring 2009. On the average, the change in exam scores from the pre to the post was 48.93% across all four interns' unit exams. All but one intern assessed two different classes taught during their clinical experience. Indications from the percent change in pre and post exams scores, demonstrate that interns from OPSU have a positive effect on student learning.

Attachment 3A
Candidates' Ability to Plan

A candidate's ability to plan instruction effectively is essential to creating classroom and laboratory learning environments in which students acquire the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective skills necessary for intellectual growth and development. Academic preparation supporting candidates gaining and practicing this ability includes the course *Methods and Skills of Teaching and Management in Agricultural Education* (AGED 4103). During the four-week, on-campus portion of the student teaching semester, candidates are required to plan and create comprehensive units of instruction based on significant content areas within the Oklahoma secondary agricultural education curriculum: animal science, plant science, soil science, horticulture, agricultural mechanics, agribusiness management, leadership, personal development, and natural resources management. Starting in Fall 2008 AGED 4103 will become a semester long class. A candidate's ability to plan is demonstrated by developing Unit of Instruction. The unit is 30% of a candidate's overall grade for the course AGED 4103.

OPSU AGED
Lesson Plan Format

I. IDENTIFICATION:

- A. INSTRUCTOR: _____
 B. UNIT TOPIC: _____
 C. LESSON TITLE: _____
 D. CLASS: _____ DATE _____

II. OBJECTIVES:

- A. The student shall be able to:
 1. List behavior expected and level of performance

III. TEACHING MATERIALS AND RESOURCES:

- A. List each of the items you will use in teaching the lesson -- books, cards, equipment, demonstration materials, overheads and other visual aids, handouts, etc.

IV. TEACHING PROCEDURE:

- A. **Preparation** - Introduction of what will be done to get the students ready to learn. Must include the following:

1. **Overview** - outline of what the lesson is about
2. **Link** - to what the students already know
3. **Motivation** - stimulate student interest

- B. **Presentation** - of the new information and concepts being taught

Key Points	Methods and Media
1. Detailed outline of subject matter needed for reference by the teacher	List of specific techniques and media used to teach subject matter

- C. **Application** - applying information provided in the presentation into a real or simulated learning experience

Key Points	Methods and Media
1. Detailed outline of activities to be carried out by the students	List of specific techniques and media employed to apply information

- D. **Evaluation** - summary of lesson, review of important concepts, and measure of accomplishment of objectives

Key Points	Methods
1. Review points, questions, etc.	Format used and planned procedure

V. REFERENCES & RESOURCES:

- A. List of reference sources used to develop lesson

Attachment 3B

Evaluation Rubric for Unit of Instruction

Candidate's Name _____ Name of Unit _____

Criteria	Target (3) 90 – 100%	Acceptable (2) 80 – 89%	Unacceptable (1) < 80%	Rubric Score	% Score	Point Value
Coherence 45 pts. (30%)	40.50 – 45.00 pts.	36.00 – 40.49 pts.	< 36.00 pts.			
<i>Lesson plans are sufficiently related to one another and to the unit they support.</i>	Coherence is transparent and technically sound. Lesson plans support the unit holistically.	Coherence is somewhat transparent but not conclusive. At least one lesson plan requires some revision to improve the unit's coherence.	Coherence is not transparent or conclusive. Two or more lesson plans require significant revision to improve the unit's coherence.			
Methodology 30 pts. (20%)	27.00 – 30.00 pts.	24.00 – 26.99 pts.	< 24.00 pts.			
<i>Teaching method(s) selected are appropriate for the topic(s). A substantial description/explanation of the teaching method(s) to be used is provided.</i>	Teaching methods are very appropriate for lesson topics. Teaching methods are described/ explained in robust and meaningful ways.	Teaching methods are appropriate but more preferred methods exist for one or more lesson topics. Additional description/ explanation of teaching methods would improve the unit's transparency.	Teaching methods described are not appropriate for lesson topics identified; and/or description/explanation of use is not sufficient.			

Connection between unit plan's overall rubric score, overall % score, and overall point value for grade: "3" = 90 – 100% = 135.00 – 150.00 points; "2" = 80 – 89% = 120.00 – 134.99 points; "1" = < 80% = < 120.00 points.

Criteria	Target (3) 90 – 100%	Acceptable (2) 80 – 89%	Unacceptable (1) < 80%	Rubric Score	% Score	Point Value
Visual Aids 30 pts. (20%)	27.00 – 30.00 pts.	24.00 – 26.99 pts.	< 24.00 pts.			
<i>Appropriate visual aids are provided or described.</i>	Visual aids are very appropriate for the lesson topics. Appropriate visual aids are either provided or described in sufficient detail.	At least one visual aid is only somewhat appropriate. In some cases, superior choices of visual aids exist and could be provided or described.	Appropriate visual aids are not provided or in the case of realia description and detail regarding use are not sufficient.			
Formative Assessment/Evaluation 15 pts (10%).	13.50 – 15.00 pts.	12.00 – 13.49 pts.	< 12.00 pts.			
<i>Evidence of planning for formative assessment/evaluation is provided and/or indicated. Answer keys, where appropriate, are provided.</i>	Lesson plans include evidence of or indicate plans for formative assessment of student learning. Answer keys or other appropriate instruments for evaluation of student performance are included.	One lesson plan lacks clarity in its description of procedures for formative assessment of student learning. One or more answer keys or comparable evaluation tools could be improved.	Sufficient evidence of planning for formative assessment and evaluation of student learning on a lesson-by-lesson basis is lacking.			
Summative Assessment/Evaluation 15 pts. (10%)	13.50 – 15.00 pts.	12.00 – 13.49 pts.	< 12.00 pts.			

Connection between unit plan's overall rubric score, overall % score, and overall point value for grade: "3" = 90 – 100% = 135.00 – 150.00 points; "2" = 80 – 89% = 120.00 – 134.99 points; "1" = < 80% = < 120.00 points.

Criteria	Target (3) 90 – 100%	Acceptable (2) 80 – 89%	Unacceptable (1) < 80%	Rubric Score	% Score	Point Value
<i>A substantial unit examination, including a variety of questions reflecting the scope and depth of the lesson plans, is provided. An appropriate answer key is included in the unit plan.</i>	Examination is comprehensive. It is sufficiently rigorous and includes questions that address higher-order thinking skills. An appropriate and accurate examination answer key is provided.	Examination is somewhat comprehensive but lacks transparency per one or more of the lessons' student learning objectives. The variety of questions is minimally sufficient but could be improved. Evidence of attempts to measure students' higher-order thinking skills is only somewhat transparent. Answer key requires improvement per deficiencies identified in the examination.	Examination fails to include a variety of questions; items are primarily of one type. Evidence of comprehensiveness and sufficient rigor per student learning objectives and lesson content is very insufficient. An appropriate and accurate answer key is needed, or the answer key provided requires significant improvement per deficiencies identified in the examination.			
Professionalism 15 pts. (10%)	13.50 – 15.00 pts.	12.00 – 13.49 pts.	< 12.00 pts.			

Connection between unit plan's overall rubric score, overall % score, and overall point value for grade: "3" = 90 – 100% = 135.00 – 150.00 points; "2" = 80 – 89% = 120.00 – 134.99 points; "1" = < 80% = < 120.00 points.

Criteria	Target (3) 90 – 100%	Acceptable (2) 80 – 89%	Unacceptable (1) < 80%	Rubric Score	% Score	Point Value
<i>Appropriate rules for spelling, grammar, syntax, and punctuation were followed. A professional understanding and use of relevant subject matter is conveyed.</i>	Appropriate rules for spelling, grammar, syntax, and punctuation were followed. Any mistakes are minimal and easily corrected. An understanding and use of relevant subject matter is transparent and conveyed professionally.	In a few cases, appropriate rules for spelling, grammar, syntax, and punctuation were not followed completely. Mistakes, where noted, should be corrected. In at least one instance, professional understanding and use of relevant subject matter is somewhat unclear and could be improved.	Little attention is given to following appropriate rules for spelling, grammar, syntax, and punctuation. Numerous errors exist and must be corrected. And/or a professional understanding and appropriate use of relevant subject matter is lacking throughout the unit. Accordingly, the unit requires significant revision and improvement.			
Comments:						
Overall Rating:						
Additional Comments:						

Connection between unit plan's overall rubric score, overall % score, and overall point value for grade: "3" = 90 – 100% = 135.00 – 150.00 points; "2" = 80 – 89% = 120.00 – 134.99 points; "1" = < 80% = < 120.00 points.

Attachment 3C

Agricultural Education Director's Ratings ^{a, b, c} of Candidates' Ability to Plan and Develop Units of Instruction

<i>Evaluation Criteria</i>		<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Coherence		2.50	0.58	
Methodology		2.75	0.50	
Visual aids		2.75	0.50	
Formative assessments/evaluations		2.75	0.50	
Summative assessments/evaluations		2.75	0.50	
Professionalism		2.00	0.00	
Overall Rating of Units		2.58	0.30	

^a Rating scale for evaluation criteria: "3" = "Target," "2" = "Acceptable," or "1" = "Unacceptable." ^b Connection between unit plan's rubric score, % score, and point value for grade follows: "3" = 90 – 100% = 135 – 150 points; "2" = 80 – 89% = 120 – 135 points; "1" = < 80% = < 120 points. ^c Assessment of units of instruction began in the Fall 2007 semester.

Attachment 3C

Grades Assigned by Agricultural Education Director for Candidates' Units of Instruction, Fall 2007 through Spring 2009 Semesters (N = 4)

<i>Candidates</i>	<i>Score Earned</i>	<i>Score %</i>	<i>Grade</i>
Candidate #1	137.99/150	92	A
Candidate #2	134.24/150	89	B
Candidate #3	134.99/150	90	A
Candidate #4	120.00/150	80	B

Attachment 5A

Candidates' Effect on Student Learning

Beginning in Fall 2007, candidates' effect on student learning will be assessed per development and administration of unit examinations during their on-campus and clinical internship experiences. Candidates develop their unit examinations while on campus as a requirement of the course *Methods and Management in Agricultural Education* (AGED 4103; see excerpts from course syllabus below). Examinations will be assessed and critiqued by the Agricultural Director; improvements needed will be identified (Attachment 5B) and then made by the candidates. Candidates will administer examinations as pre- and post-tests of student knowledge. Students' examination scores will be recorded and percent difference or change (i.e., candidates' effect on student learning) will be determined by class (Attachment 5C).

The complete units must contain the following components:

- Four detailed lesson plans using the *OPSU Lesson Plan Format*. See the following URL:
<http://www.opsu.edu/education/StudentInternHandbook/Lesson%20Plan%20Format.html>
- Appropriate visual aids to accompany each lesson
- Instruments and/or procedures to evaluate student achievement, including daily or "short" quizzes and a comprehensive unit examination
- Answer keys to each evaluation instrument (quizzes and exams)

Attachment 5B
Candidates' Effect on Student Learning

Rationale

During their clinical experiences, candidates are required to pre- and post-test one class of students using the unit examination they developed while on campus. Following pre-test administration and evaluation of student performance, candidates are expected to adjust their instruction to meet student learning needs and abilities. Candidates are expected to reflect on their students' pre-test performance, modify their teaching behaviors where appropriate, monitor student learning formatively during instruction and continue to adjust their teaching as needed, and then post-test students using the same examination at the end of the unit to describe change in student learning. Results of students' pre- and post-test performance as well as pre/post percent difference (i.e., student gain) by candidate for a particular class are shown in Attachment 5C. These clinical experiences will begin in Fall 2007.

Attachment 5B

OPSU – Ag Ed

Unit Plan Rubric

	Exceeds Expectation	Meets Expectation	Does Not Meet Expectation
<p><u>Target Grade/ Subject</u></p> <p>Identify the target grade and the target ability level. (5 pts)</p>	<p>The grade and ability levels are identified and the appropriateness of the lesson (for this group) is obvious. (5 pts)</p>	<p>The grade level is identified (2 pts)</p>	<p>The grade and ability levels are missing and/or, the appropriateness of the lesson (for this group) is not convincing. (0 pts.)</p>
<p><u>Objective(s)</u></p> <p>Describe the behavior that the students will perform, the conditions under which it will be performed, and the criteria for assessing mastery. (20 pts)</p>	<p>Behavior, criteria, and conditions are clearly and concisely written (no unnecessary word). (20 pts)</p>	<p>Behavior, criteria, and conditions are a bit ambiguous and/or too "wordy." (10 pts)</p>	<p>Behavior, criteria, and/or conditions are unclear or poorly written. (2 pts)</p>
<p><u>Materials</u></p> <p>Include all materials (and explanations if necessary) that are needed for lesson. (10pts)</p>	<p>Materials provided and explained. (10 pts)</p>	<p>All materials are included but are unclear or use of materials is unclear. (5 pts)</p>	<p>All materials are not included or are sloppily organized. (1 pts)</p>
<p><u>Lesson Description</u></p> <p>Describe how the lesson will work. Describe the lesson so that another teacher could understand it and implement it without your presence. (20 pts)</p>	<p>Description is sufficiently clear to enable a third party to try the lesson out. Description is clear yet economical. (20 pts)</p>	<p>Description is fairly clear but is wordy and repetitive. (10 pts)</p>	<p>Description is unclear and difficult to follow. (2 pt)</p>
<p><u>Evaluation Procedure</u></p> <p>Describe the assessment measure for determining whether the lesson's objective(s) were met. (20 pts)</p>	<p>The behavior assessed exactly matches the behavior described in the objective and description of the lesson. (20pts)</p>	<p>The behavior assessed closely resembles the behavior described in the objective and description of the</p>	<p>The behavior assessed is inconsistent with the behavior described in the objective and description of the lesson. (2 pts)</p>

		lesson. (10 pts)	
<p><u>Guiding question 1</u></p> <p>Does technology SUPPORT instructional activity? Technology should not BE the lesson. Do not teach students how to use a word processor for example. Use technology as a tool.</p> <p><u>Guiding question 2</u></p> <p>Is the use of technology transparent? Students should learn how to use the application without being aware of it. It is a means to an end, not an end in and of itself.</p> <p>(10 pts)</p>	<p>The technology supports the instructional objective in a meaningful way. It enhances it and possibly facilitates additional beneficial outcomes not directly measured. (10 pts)</p>	<p>The technology does support the lesson but may "get in the way" somewhat, e.g., when students need to "learn" to use the software as a separate endeavor. (5 pts)</p>	<p>Technology tends to be the focus of the lesson. Technology intrudes into the lesson or becomes the activity itself, e.g., teaching students how to use a spreadsheet. (1 pt)</p>
<p><u>Guiding question 3</u></p> <p>Is the lesson/activity intrinsically motivating? If students hate to write, they will hate to write as much <i>using</i> a computer as they do <i>without</i> it. The activity must be engage and motivate. Ask yourself the question "Why will the students care?"</p> <p>(10 pts)</p>	<p>Activity is interesting and engaging for the target population. It is fun, even goofy enough to motivate students to do whatever it takes to accomplish it and would want to do it again.</p> <p>(10 pts)</p>	<p>Activity is reasonably different from students' normal classroom activities. Students are motivated to try the activity. (5 pts)</p>	<p>The activity is dry and boring. Technology cannot make a bad activity good or a boring activity exciting. The activity itself must be imaginative, thoughtful, and creative. (1 pt)</p>
<p><u>Guiding question 4</u></p> <p>Can the lesson be taught without technology? The answer to this question will often be "yes." But the lesson should be at least as easy and worthwhile with it as it is without it. (5 pts)</p>	<p>Technology definitely improves the lesson in some fashion.</p> <p>(5 pts)</p>	<p>Technology is appropriate but the lesson could have been carried out without it. (3 pts)</p>	<p>Poor or contrived use of technology -- the activity would be easier and more effective without it. (1 pt)</p>

Attachment 5B

STUDENT PRODUCT FINAL PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

CANDIDATE NAME _____ DATE _____

OVERALL SCORE _____

INDICATORS	TARGET=3	ACCEPTABLE=2	UNACCEPTABLE=1	Score
DESIGN OF LESSON	Lesson is developmentally appropriate to student cognitive, social, emotional, physical (4) needs. Follows prescribed format with clarity.	Lesson is developmentally appropriate to at least two or three student needs. Follows prescribed format.	Lesson demonstrates very little understanding of child development or does not follow prescribed format.	
MOTIVATION	Lesson indicates high level of knowledge and application of motivational practice that captures student interest or understanding of purpose for the lesson.	Lesson indicates average level of knowledge and application of motivational practice that captures student interest or understanding of purpose for the lesson.	Lesson indicates little or no knowledge of motivational practices.	
INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES	Instructional approaches are inclusive for differing learning styles, intelligences, cultural differences, etc.	Includes some instructional approaches to create learning opportunities for diverse students.	Lesson indicates little or no variation of instructional approaches to meet student needs.	
ADAPTATIONS TO DIVERSITY	Lesson indicates specific adaptations of learning activities and materials for diverse students.	Lesson indicates general adaptations of learning activities and materials for diverse students.	Lesson indicates little or no adaptations of learning activities and materials for diverse students.	
ASSESSMENTS	Lesson includes pre-assessment and post-assessment activities that are aligned with the objectives.	Lesson includes at least post-assessment activities aligned with objectives.	Lesson indicates little or no appropriate assessment activity.	
REFLECTION	Reflection describes teacher/student interaction; acceptable mastery of objectives; numbers of students who reached above average, average, below average levels; remediation action taken of those who were below level; and self reflection of teacher behaviors. Reflection written in clear manner.	Reflection description and addresses prescribed indicators somewhat but is unclear and warrants questions from the reader.	Reflection unclear and has little or no description of prescribed expectations.	
STUDENT WORK	Student work clearly and creatively reflects the objectives of the lesson and includes above average, average, below average work samples.	Student work reflects the objectives of the lesson and includes above average, average, below average work samples.	Student work does not reflect objectives of the lesson and work samples do not include above average, average, below average.	

Attachment 5C: Candidates Pre and Post Unit Exam Grades with Percent Difference

Student Intern: "A" Semester: Fall 2007 Course: Introduction to Agriscience Unit: Beef Breeds			
Student (N=7)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	80	70	-10
2	40	40	0
3	40	60	20
4	60	80	20
5	20	80	60
6	90	100	10
7	50	90	40
Average	54.29	74.28	20.00

Student Intern: "B" Semester: Spring 2008 Course: 8th Grade Agriscience Unit: Oxy-Acetylene Cutting			
Student (N=6)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	39	84	45
2	32	85	53
3	16	78	62
4	50	89	39
5	70	86	16
6	71	85	14
Average	46.33	84.50	38.17

Student Intern: "B" Semester: Spring 2008 Course: Introduction to Agriculture Unit: Oxy-Acetylene Cutting			
Student (N=10)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	26	77	51
2	63	88	25
3	64	76	12
4	67	90	23
5	72	97	25
6	75	94	19
7	64	97	33
8	42	80	38
9	47	95	48
10	66	100	34
Average	58.60	89.40	30.80

Student Intern: "C"

Semester: Fall 2008

Course: Introduction to Agricultural Mechanics and Power (Section 001)

Unit: Arc Welding

Student (N=8)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	40	90	50
2	50	90	40
3	10	90	80
4	30	90	60
5	20	100	80
6	40	70	30
7	50	60	10
8	40	80	40
Average	35.00	83.75	49.00

Student Intern: "C"

Semester: Fall 2008

Course: Introduction to Agricultural Mechanics and Power (Section 002)

Unit: Oxy-acetylene

Student (N=6)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	14	100	86
2	42	100	48
3	28	100	72
4	14	79	86
5	14	93	86
6	14	100	86
Average	21.00	95.33	77.33

Student Intern: "D"

Semester: Spring 2009

Course: Introduction to Agriculture

Unit: Agricultural Mechanics Orientation and Safety

Student (N=16)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	21	92	71
2	17	88	71
3	15	88	73
4	8	50	42
5	13	90	77
6	12	57	45
7	15	89	74
8	5	89	84
9	17	93	76
10	17	86	69
11	20	89	69
12	8	76	68
13	21	90	69
14	18	90	72
15	17	92	75
16	7	79	72
Average	14.44	83.63	69.19

Student Intern: "D"

Semester: Spring 2009

Course: Introduction to Animal Science

Unit: Horse Breeds/Terminology

Student (N=3)	Pre-test Score (%)	Post-test Score (%)	Change in Score (%)
1	53	96	43
2	24	84	60
3	20	91	71
Average	32.33	90.33	58.00