

**SUBMISSION**  
**Common Standards**  
**Established by State Law or Commission Policy**



1942 Randolph Street  
Delano, CA 93215  
Phone: 661-454-3012 Fax: 661-454-3098  
Website: [www.bard.edu/mat](http://www.bard.edu/mat)  
February 2011

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

STANDARD ONE	3
STANDARD TWO	18
STANDARD THREE	77
STANDARD FOUR	81
STANDARD FIVE	86
STANDARD SIX	88
STANDARD SEVEN	93
STANDARD EIGHT	95
STANDARD NINE	110

## **Standard 1: Educational Leadership**

*The institution and education unit create and articulate a research-based vision for educator preparation that is responsive to California's adopted standards and curriculum frameworks. The vision provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance and experiences, scholarship, service, collaboration, and unit accountability. The faculty, instructional personnel, and relevant stakeholders are actively involved in the organization, coordination, and governance of all professional preparation programs. Unit leadership has the authority and institutional support needed to create effective strategies to achieve the needs of all programs and represents the interests of each program within the institution. The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.*

Founded in 1860, Bard College is a four-year residential college emphasizing the liberal arts and sciences. The main campus in New York is located in the Hudson Valley. This campus offers the Bachelor of Arts degree with concentration in more than forty (40) academic program serving approximately 2600 students in both graduate and undergraduate programs.

Bard College proposes to establish a presence on the west coast with a commitment to provide the south Central Valley farming communities with a graduate teacher education program that will offer students a Masters of Arts in Teaching (MAT) while also earning a California Teaching Credential. The campus is located in Delano, a farming community north of Bakersfield. The Bard College administration is collaborating with Paramount Farms, the leading employer in the area, to provide more effective teachers for under-represented minority students traditionally located in such farming communities.

Necessary changes in the public schools will not be achieved only by policy changes at the national and state levels. Such changes will be more-fully realized as a result of decisions made at the local level as teacher-leaders, administrators, parents and the community work together, using the California State adopted content standards and framework, toward the realization of a different idea about the goals of education. It is shortsighted to align institutional purposes based only on results of standardized tests; in fact, it may be a dis-service to the population served. And, it is certainly not helpful to establish institutional purposes by vaguely defined goals of life-long learning and a general curriculum, or by the ever-changing demands of the marketplace for workers with particular kinds of skills and knowledge. The goals of education must serve the individual and democracy by fostering the kinds of thoughtful self-determination that comes from a knowledge base and understanding in the academic disciplines, applying methods of inquiry, and an understanding of critical concepts applied to the work of living more fully and responsibly in the environment in which the student interacts and in the world in which the student lives.

These goals will be achieved in the classroom through the interactions of teachers and students; however, these goals can only be achieved by teachers who are highly

competent practitioners in the disciplines they teach and experts in the discipline of teaching itself. Specifically in California teachers must be cognizant of the challenges posed by a rapidly changing population and the need to tie instruction to the California State Adopted Content Standards and Frameworks so that the curriculum is assessable to all students. Unfortunately, many teachers are only minimally trained in the disciplines they teach and education courses fail to make connections that permit the revelations of research and pedagogical analysis to be applied to the work of teaching. These two (2) issues are key initiatives in the design of the Bard College/MAT program and shape the yearlong program from initial expectation to final result.

Uniquely, candidates will not only have an undergraduate degree in their major discipline but also must continue study in their major discipline at the graduate level, including a final research project that requires a demonstration of high-level understanding within their major discipline and the application of the California State adopted content standards and frameworks for their respective content areas. At the same time, study in the major includes a study of how understanding in the major develops. Common sense tells us that a math major, for instance, is drawn to this area of study by some combination of interest and aptitude. For such a student, learning math is a very different process than it is for the majority of students required to complete math requirements for a high school diploma. At Bard College graduate level study in the major discipline will not only develop a deeper understanding but will also require a candidate to consider how such understanding is achieved and how alternative approaches to teaching and learning fosters broader access to competency in the major. Thus, graduate courses are instructionally innovative and, combined with the student teaching experience, are able to provide the basis for critical reflections about educational practice. To train teachers to teach differently requires that they be active as participant observers in a model that operates differently than what they have experienced during their elementary and secondary years as a student. (Kennedy 1999)

In a recent report, the Carnegie Corporation provides a challenge to think of teaching as a clinical profession. (Hind 2002) This is not a new concept but it is perhaps the first time that the critical work of teaching has been defined in such a singular way for broad dissemination. Educational course work in the Bard College/MAT program is designed as an intensive study of critical issues in teaching and learning in the day-to-day context of current public school practice. Knowledge is applied to real problems and candidates are required to engage in the kinds of active research that is a guiding principle of reflective practice. (Schon 1983) Teachers need to make decisions based on what is known and revise instructional models using both the California State adopted content standards and frameworks along with student work as the basis for ongoing research. Educational course work provides the theory and published research provides the direction to begin this work but ideas become actions through the practice of teaching and teacher research carried-out in collaboration with mentor teachers in the public schools and faculty in the graduate education program at Bard College. It is this intensive preparation cycle that provides the critical context for building the habits that will shape teachers as clinical professionals, able to teach effectively and adapt to change over time in response to complex student needs and educational priorities.

It is this focus on teachers as professionals, skilled in applying the knowledge of learning to the different needs of individual learners, coupled with a high level of competence within the candidate's major discipline, that defines the direction for the Bard College/MAT program. Candidates, through the use of the California State adopted content standards and frameworks, are expected to provide instruction that moves all learners toward mastery of the same standards and curriculum. Additionally, the program recognizes as well the important context of collaborative support among school faculty, educational administration, parents, and community that permits these teachers to perform their work most effectively. For this reason, the MAT program is not only responsible for providing graduating candidates with essential learning but is also responsible for structuring this unique educational experience in ways that effectively incorporates the dynamic relationships between all members of the school community.

Partnerships with public schools emphasize the work of educational change. This means that participant public schools, MAT candidates, and Bard College faculty work together to ask, and more importantly, construct answers to important education questions that results in improved instruction and subsequently increased student learning. A Bard College /MAT graduate is prepared to enter the teaching field not only committed to best practices but also with experience in the work of effecting institutional change that can be replicated within and across school communities.

The Bard College outlook is purposively optimistic and realistic. Currently, contemporary preparation models exist that emulate the institution's best hopes. It is the responsibility of Bard College to devote a portion of its skills, knowledge and resources to the work of effecting positive change in public schools. This will be achieved by holding to the broadest idea of what a credential candidate should know and be able to do, and by partnering with public schools that welcome the educational challenges that Bard College embraces.

### **Candidate Preparation for Certification**

- **Bard College Ideas about Teaching:** Initial immersion is an approach to learning that recognizes the role of language in the development of thinking and, more particularly, how writing as an educational technology facilitates individual learning in the classroom and challenges conventional ideas about how students learn. This emphasis, a hallmark of the Bard College Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT), combined with other models of teaching, characterizes the structure of all MAT courses. Candidates are challenged to rethink their own assumptions about teaching and learning while being exposed firsthand to a different educational model. In the IWT experience candidates are provided an initial look at the California State Adopted content standards and frameworks as part of the immersion into the role of language development as a point of entry into the educational system of California.

- Models of Difference: In addition to the influence and practices of the Institute for Writing and Thinking, the structure of courses in education and in the academic disciplines emphasize best practices in teaching and learning, immersing candidates in classroom experiences that challenge teachers, and candidates to re-evaluate the learning environment of the classroom.
- Mastery of an Academic Discipline: There are six (6) graduate level courses in each major discipline that builds on a candidate's undergraduate learning. There is added emphasis on understanding how the discipline works, and how this integrates with California's state adopted content standards and curriculum frameworks (See descriptions of the "Teaching Lab Classes" – History 516, Literature 516, Math 516, Biology 516), "how particular ideas evolved in the history of a field", as well as a graduate level research project that emphasizes expert practice in the candidate's field. (Ball and Cohen 1999).
- Relevant Understanding of the Adolescent Learner: There are six (6) graduate level courses in education that address the relevant range of issues, ideas, and practices in adolescent education (See the section of the application that describes these courses for particulars – especially, ED512, ED514, ED522, ED524, ED516, ED526, ED536, ED542.) These courses are designed thematically to answer essential question in teaching and learning so that theories and research in cognitive psychology or curriculum design are taught in the context of trying to answer critical questions about what gets taught, how it is taught and why it is taught. These courses are framed by practice-based research, requiring MAT candidates to make relevant connections between their educational studies and experience in the public schools. This research includes the uses of the California State adopted content standards and frameworks. Candidates through case studies realize research initiatives, critical examination of different kinds of classroom data, participant observation in the classroom, and in the context of the field and student teaching experiences.
- The Practice of Teaching as a Clinical Profession: Selected mentor teachers in the public schools will partner with MAT candidates throughout the academic year. A candidate, as a teaching apprentice, will work closely with a mentor teacher in the classroom, designing and teaching lessons and units, assessing student understanding, and modifying practices to adapt to the needs of students in the context of educational priorities. Through the clinical practice the candidates will specifically focus on the use of the California state adopted content standards and how they link with the goals of the lessons. Mentor teachers will participate in guided writing seminars with MAT candidates that explore common educational questions as collaborators in candidate research initiatives, as co-learners in the classroom, and as advisors, helping candidates develop a better understanding of the classroom, the school environment, and their work as teachers.

- Connecting Theory and Practice: The Bard College/MAT faculty will act in an advisory capacity throughout the academic program. The core work of advising occurs in weekly meetings of the advisory group. The group, composed of MAT candidates and two (2) MAT faculty members, one representing education and the other representing the major discipline, meets to process the work of linking theory and practice, and is supported through-out the year by mentor teachers from participating public schools. Candidates meet individually with advisors on a bi-monthly basis as well. This follows a model developed at Bank Street College. (Pignatelli 2000)
- Guided Practice Leading to Professional Competence: Candidates are assigned to work in public schools from September through June, beginning as participant observers, engaged in research and teaching, and finishing with complete responsibility for a full teaching load. During each phase of the school experiences, candidates pursue a research question, engaging them in the kinds of reflective practices that are essential to effective teaching and growth in the teaching profession.

### **The Improvement of Post-secondary Education**

- Leading by Example: Bard College/MAT faculty, in collaboration with the Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT), provides leadership in developing alternative approaches to conventional classroom practices. This is essential for MAT candidates since research indicates that teachers tend to teach as they were taught, despite any flaws in the methods experienced and the admonitions of their own teacher training. An apprenticeship experience in an alternative model permits tacit assumptions to be changed in the process of constructing a new educational perspective from these experiences.
- Learning from the Experiences of Others: The protracted involvement of Bard College/MAT faculty with public schools, for the purposes of improving education, will provide a better understanding of secondary school issues to inform the structure of learning at the college level, especially for entry-level students. For example, issues in physics education at the undergraduate level may well be illuminated by a clearer picture of the process by which high school students come to understand concepts and applications in the field.
- Changing Practices and Challenging Expectations: Simon's Rock College, a division of Bard College located in Great Barrington, Massachusetts and the Bard High School Early College (BHSEC) in New York City (one site for the student teaching experience) both provide models of education in which younger students, typically junior and/or senior high school students, are challenged to perform college level work. BHSEC is currently engaged in exploring ways in which high schools and Bard College faculty can collaborate to move 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> grade students into college level work by the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> grades. These models will help Bard College/MAT faculty explore ways in which public school

teachers and college faculty can benefit from conversations that help both groups re-think issues in learning and teaching as they affect the adolescent learner. The Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT) will contribute to this process based on its work from the past few years, which involved facilitating these kinds of collaborations through “Faculty Writing Seminars” at public and private schools.

### **Continued Revision of Public School Programs**

- **Collaborating for Research and Change:** Public schools partner with Bard College/MAT faculty and MAT candidates to pursue, in a collaborative process, agendas for change that brings the expertise of college faculty and the critical support of aspiring future teachers in intimate conversations with classroom issues. The work begins in developing essential questions and moves to engagement in research that leads to thoughtful changes in practice and further questions. “Professional Development Schools” provide models to adapt to the Bard College/MAT program. (Darling-Hammond 1994)
- **Substantive Professional Development:** The Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT) provides teachers with workshops that address identified needs. This involves facilitating teacher collaboration in curriculum development or developing strategies for learning in the science laboratory. For over twenty (20) years, IWT has worked with thousands of teachers in a range of contexts and the opportunity for close continuous work with identified school districts is an opportunity for extended growth and institutional change.
- **Shared Expertise:** Bard College/MAT faculty is able to answer to a variety of school change initiatives. Bard College faculty within the major disciplines offer courses that include topics specific to the high school curriculum, broadening teacher expertise, or offering guidance in the construction of new curricula. Through this experience candidates will have as a focus the California State adopted content standards and frameworks. A recent project at Bard High School Early College (BHSEC) was devoted to merging the biology and chemistry curricula in ways that make more sense for both fields of inquiry. This is just one of many possible cross-curricular projects that would meaningfully engage high school and college faculty in school improvement.
- **The Contributions of Competent Candidates:** MAT candidates bring a level of disciplinary expertise and a developing awareness of current research and thinking in the field of education. Their work in the public schools creates an opportunity for mentor teachers to engage in dialogue and research about issues that are central to student learning. In the life of most public school teachers, there is little time or support for the kinds of questions and investigations that help teachers shift their practice to accommodate individual learning issues in the classroom. The Bard College/MAT program is a partnership with public schools that permits participants to grow and honors principles of training that are evident in other clinical professions.

## **Relationship with Local Schools**

Discussions with local school districts were held regarding this proposal and each district approached indicated a desire to be a part of this initiative as it was presented to them. The plan, developed in the early 1980's, involves building partnerships with public schools that are shaped by the concept of a Professional Development School (PDS), which reflects a unique partnership between a college, a public school, and mentor teachers. (Darling-Hammond 1994) The principal goal of a PDS is the "improvement of teaching and learning for P-12 students, pre-service educators, and in-service educators at the school and the university." (Teitel 2001) A successful PDS depends on close collaboration between the public school, Bard College, and MAT candidates. Each party has unique contributions to make and all participants become the beneficiaries of the shared work of improving student learning.

- 1 **Improving the Preparation of Teachers:** Candidates gain critical experiences in the classroom while contributing to innovation and research in teaching in collaboration with public school faculty (mentor teachers). This apprenticeship exceeds the expectations of the more conventional student teaching experiences by requiring students to become active participants by partnering with classroom teachers to solve school problems through active research during the candidate's experience. It also demands a commitment from mentor teachers to invite the kinds of inquiry and experimentation that make educational change possible.
- 2 **Improving Teaching and Learning at the Institution:** Bard College faculty gain valuable insights into central issues of teaching and learning as they participate in research and collaborative efforts for educational change in the public school setting. The challenges provided by public schools provoke useful reconsiderations of teaching at the college level across major disciplines and programs. Questions about the concept of transfer, for example, are as appropriate to post-secondary courses as they are to the high school curricula. The difficulties that students have generalizing some principle in physics, learned in a specific context to solve a novel problem set, are as evident in college as they are in high school. There is much to be learned from increased observation and dialogue across all levels of education.
- 3 **Improving Teaching and Learning in the Schools:** Candidates and public school teachers as a whole are supported in their own initiatives and development by Bard College faculty and the Bard College's Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT). The public school teacher mentor, who is open to the reflection that is necessary to effective mentoring and a desire for continued growth, cannot help but become a leader in the improvement of education. "For school-based faculty, professional development follows from a great expansion of roles, a stretching of new teaching methods, and a broader conceptualization of the role and definition of teacher." (Teitel 2001)

The Bard College vision of the Professional Development School (PDS) model is one in which a small cluster of public schools individually define their needs and priorities in close conversation with MAT program faculty so that the goals of each partner become the focus of mutual efforts. Additionally, the partners should be seen as clusters of teachers within a school and in this respect the Bard College/MAT program departs from conventional PDS models by eschewing the view that a school faculty as a whole needs to support the PDS initiative. Moreover, the Bard College/MAT view subscribes to a more realistic view of public schools in general in an effort to develop a model for far-reaching institutional change which suggests that close work with clusters of teachers committed to research for change will prove most effective in shifting practice across districts over time. It has been observed that institutional change may ultimately depend on smaller units of change within the larger structure in which teachers are supported in structural change at an individual level. (Elmore 1996, Peterson et al. 1996) This approach by the MAT program across a variety of public school settings allows for unique dialogue and collaboration between districts that will help all involved realize the best for public education and address the challenges to be faced.

### **Improving Teaching and Learning in High-need Schools**

Partnerships with public schools will include “high-need” schools. The majority of MAT candidates will spend time in these classrooms and Bard College faculty will work closely with mentor teachers. By focusing on student learning as the center of teacher decision-making means that even in schools that may not be recognized as “high-need”, those high-need students who are in these classrooms will inevitably be the focus of central questions about teaching and learning that address those critical factors (social, cultural, economic, etc.) which contribute to that set of problems identified as “high-need”.

The Bard College/MAT vision is simply stated. The program seeks to educate teachers who can create learning environments that are clinically responsive to the varied learning needs of all students in the classroom and who are deeply trained in their respective disciplines so that learning goes beyond mere textbook knowledge, thus students emerge from classrooms with deep understanding and literacy in each academic field. To achieve this end, the Bard College/MAT program is carefully structured from candidate recruitment and selection through an intensive one-year residency program that integrates advanced studies in education with graduate level courses in the discipline and daily engagement in public school classrooms, working with the same kinds of students these future teachers will work with in California Schools. The goal is simple: educate highly effective teachers, who have a deep and practical knowledge of the California State Adopted Content Standards and Curriculum Frameworks and who can help all students succeed in meeting or exceeding these standards. The vision of this program is elaborated further in the rationale for assessment and evaluation as described in Standard 2.

The design for the program can succeed to the degree that it is well implemented through well structured leadership and shared governance and through a program of continual assessment and evaluation that is built into the program design for purposes of monitoring, accountability and regular improvement. This later issue of assessment and evaluation is addressed in Common Standard 2, below. But the vision of teacher education provides the basis for assessment and evaluation since it requires a balance of components – graduate course work and carefully guided clinical experiences – that are integrated in ways that model the interplay of theory and doing that are the defining quality of good reflective practice. Therefore, unit accountability requires modes of assessment that examine the various components and their integration. Most importantly, it means accounting for final outcomes, which can only be effectively assessed by post-graduation measures that determine teacher efficacy in terms of student achievement and teacher retention, leading to lasting improvement in public schools through teacher leadership at the level of classroom instruction. The issue of unit leadership, or program governance merits further explanation, here under Common Standard 1.

The MAT Program operates four (4) distinct campuses. Two (2) of these campuses are implementing residency programs – in Delano, CA and in the south Bronx, NY. The governance structure is similar at both sites and both sites are identical in having the entire program function on the campus of a public school with increasing collaboration between graduate teacher education program and public school in an effort to address school improvement while modeling learning practices and processes of school improvement for the graduate teacher candidates as pre-service teachers.

The governance or unit leadership structure is best represented as a tabular diagram, as seen below. At the Delano, CA Campus, a program director oversees all program operations, a program administrator acts in a supportive capacity with management responsibilities for admissions processes, student life, campus activities, room and course scheduling, liaison with public school partners/mentor teachers as clinical faculty, and other administrative functions that arise. One (1) other key role of the program administrator is managing the data and procedures related to the credential recommendation process, which is described in greater detail below.

The graduate faculty works collaboratively with public school teachers as clinical faculty, monitoring candidate performance and progress as a function of graduate studies and residency experiences. Through co-teaching models and regular visits to public school classrooms, the entire faculty is in constant conversation about candidate progress and program improvement.

## **Organizational Chart**

### ***Bard College***

***Board of Trustees***  
***Leon Botstein, President***

***Dean of Graduate Studies***

### **Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program**

**Dean of Teacher Education**  
**Director, MAT Program**

**Program Director, Delano, CA Campus**

### **Program Administrator and Paramount Bard Academy Principal**

**Working Collaboratively, Co-Teaching, and Mentoring:**

**1) Full-time  
Graduate Faculty  
in the Academic  
Disciplines**

**2) Full-time  
Graduate Faculty  
in Education**

**3) Clinical Faculty,  
Paramount Bard  
Academy**

**4) Clinical Faculty,  
Regional Public  
Schools**

In accordance with California's State Adopted Content Standards and Curriculum Frameworks, Bard College/MAT Program educates candidates as teachers who can effectively help all students meet or exceed the standards adopted by the State of California Department of Education. To this end, the credential recommendation process is a yearlong process that carefully monitors MAT candidate work in various arenas and documents evidence of proficiency through program measures, such as course evaluations, GPA, and assessment narratives from formal observations of candidates working as teachers in classrooms. Additionally, California credential tests and the Teaching Performance Assessment become a part of the candidate's academic and practice performance record, all of which is documented and stored using TaskStream technology software. Recommendations for a California Teaching Credential are based on the successful completion of all CCTC designated tasks and the requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching degree. Using the California Teaching Performance Expectation as a benchmark all candidates' final portfolios are reviewed by at least two (2) faculty members, and based on their recommendation, the program administrator is responsible for filing the recommendation with all appropriate documentation with the Commission Teacher Credentialing.



**Measures of graduate student progress and outcomes, from admissions through graduation.**

	<b>Matriculation</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	1. Undergraduate Transcript with major in single subject, GPA = or > 3.0  2. Academic letter of reference	1. Two graduate courses in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.	1. One graduate course in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.  2. CSET, passing score	1. One graduate course in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.  2. Academic Research Project  3. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form
<b>General Knowledge and Professional Competencies</b>	1. Undergraduate Transcript, GPA = or > 3.0  2. CBEST, passing score  3. Three letters of reference  4. CV/Resume  5. Cover letter	1. Quarterly Review	1. Quarterly Review	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form  2. Final evaluation (by mentor and field supervisor)	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form  2. Final evaluation (by mentor and field supervisor)

**Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills\***

<b>Curriculum and Instruction</b>	N/A	ED502 ED514 ED512 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Cognitive Development</b>	N/A	ED514 ED502 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Diversity Issues</b>	N/A	ED512 ED502 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Literacy/Language Development</b>	N/A	ED512 ED502 ED517	ED522  ED526: TOP Form	ED524  ED536: TOP Form	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation

		ED516	and Final Evaluation ED525	and Final Evaluation ED535 ED518	ED545 ED518
<b>Instructional Strategies</b>	N/A	ED502 ED514 ED 512 ED 517 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Uses of Technology</b>	N/A	ED516 ED515	ED526 ED525	ED532 ED535	ED542 ED545
<b>CDE Standards and Assessments</b>	N/A	ED516 ED515	ED526 ED525	ED536 ED535	ED546 ED545

- NOTE: Pedagogical Knowledge covers the entire array of knowledge and skills that are critical to highly effective teaching. They are acknowledged here in a categorization or breakdown of various areas of educational knowledge and practice. This breakdown permits a review and justifies how well the program is addressing a range of important attributes of effective teachers but it is an artificial separation from the perspective of how these areas of knowledge and skills are learned within the program. For example, though issues of diversity are studied in depth in ED512, these issues are present as key elements in many other courses and the clinical or field experiences and are explicitly addressed as students construct unit plans in ED522, or prepare and teach lessons during their 4<sup>th</sup> quarter apprenticeship in a public school classroom. Consider also the example of the “Uses of Technology,” which are not part of a stand-alone course but are taught in authentic contexts as part of decisions about effective instruction or modes of assessment. The use of program software like EXCEL, for example, has little use in a literature classroom but plays a pivotal role in learning from data in the science classroom. Software that allows for immediate feedback loops, leading to effective practice of basic arithmetic skills can be instrumental in supporting math learning.

Databases unique to history and literature as well as word processing programs that support appropriate referencing and bibliographies in these fields are essential to instruction leading to college-ready competencies. These kinds of technology applications are taught in courses and in classroom contexts that focus on content-specific teaching and learning. General uses of technology for teaching purposes – such as PowerPoint presentations – are also addressed in the practical aspects of graduate courses as well as in applications in the field during clinical experiences.

**Standard 2: Unit and Program Assessment and Evaluation**

*The education unit implements an assessment and evaluation system for ongoing program and unit evaluation and improvement. The system collects, analyzes, and utilizes data on candidate and program complete performance and unit operations. Assessment in all programs includes ongoing and comprehensive data collection related to candidate qualifications, proficiencies, and competence, as well as program effectiveness, and is used for improvement purposes.*

Bard College has developed a variety of data collection procedures and instruments to provide ongoing assessment and evaluation of the various elements that constitute this one-year graduate teacher education program. Together these procedures and instruments provide a comprehensive system for determining the degree to which the Bard College MAT program achieves its goals and, most importantly, illuminating those dimensions of the program that may need revision and further development. A formal “Internal Audit” protocol has been developed and implemented as a way to make further use of the program assessment and evaluation documents and processes. This Internal Audit protocol not only holds the program responsible for regular checks of what the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) has identified as a program’s Quality Control System but also meets the standards of TEAC national accreditation criteria. (The Bard College program will host its TEAC accreditation visit in May 2011.) The Internal Audit was completed at the New York campus and will be executed at the California campus in a few weeks time, once all data is available. But it clearly indicates one of many ways we assess the quality of unit operations.

The chart below identifies the key elements that provide assessment and evaluation data. The chart is organized by the major areas of program learning for Bard College/MAT students as well as the developmental categories of assessment criteria that ensure program outcomes. Within these categories the various assessment instruments are listed that provide the basis for student assessment and evaluation, and/or the title of the course that provides teaching and learning in these areas is noted, and thus determines the reliability of program outcomes.

**Measures of graduate student progress and outcomes, from admissions through graduation.**

	<b>Matriculation</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup> Quarter</b>
<b>Content Knowledge</b>	1. Undergraduate Transcript with major in single subject, GPA = or > 3.0  2. Academic letter of reference	1. Two graduate courses in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.	1. One graduate course in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.  2. CSET, passing score	1. One graduate course in content area, grades of 3.0 or better.  2. Academic Research Project  3. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form
<b>General Knowledge and Professional Competencies</b>	1. Undergraduate Transcript, GPA = or > 3.0  2. CBEST, passing score  3. Three letters of reference  4. CV/Resume  5. Cover letter	1. Quarterly Review	1. Quarterly Review	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form  2. Final evaluation (by mentor and field supervisor)	1. Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form  2. Final evaluation (by mentor and field supervisor)

**Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills\***

<b>Curriculum and Instruction</b>	N/A	ED502 ED514 ED512 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Cognitive Development</b>	N/A	ED514 ED502 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Diversity Issues</b>	N/A	ED512 ED502 ED515 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Literacy/Language Development</b>	N/A	ED512 ED502 ED517	ED522  ED526: TOP Form	ED524  ED536: TOP Form	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation

		ED516	and Final Evaluation ED525	and Final Evaluation ED535 ED518	ED545 ED518
<b>Instructional Strategies</b>	N/A	ED502 ED514 ED512 ED517 ED516	ED522  ED526: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED525	ED524  ED536: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED535  ED518	ED546: TOP Form and Final Evaluation  ED545  ED518
<b>Uses of Technology</b>	N/A	ED516 ED515	ED526 ED525	ED532 ED535	ED542 ED545
<b>CDE Standards and Assessments</b>	N/A	ED516 ED515	ED526 ED525	ED536 ED535	ED546 ED545

- NOTE: Pedagogical Knowledge covers the entire array of knowledge and skills that are critical to highly effective teaching. They are acknowledged here in a categorization or breakdown of various areas of educational knowledge and practice. This breakdown allows us to recognize how well the program is addressing a range of important attributes of effective teachers but it is an artificial separation from the perspective of how these areas of knowledge and skills are learned within the program. For example, though issues of diversity are studied in depth in ED512, these issues are present as key elements in many other courses and the clinical or field experiences and are explicitly addressed as students construct unit plans in ED522 or prepare and teach lessons during their 4<sup>th</sup> quarter apprenticeship in a public school classroom. Consider also the example of the “Uses of Technology,” which are not part of a stand-alone course but are taught in authentic contexts as part of decisions about effective instruction or modes of assessment. The use of program software like EXCEL, for example, has little use in a literature classroom but plays a pivotal role in learning from data in the science classroom. Software that allows for immediate feedback loops, leading to effective practice of basic arithmetic skills can be instrumental in supporting math learning.

Databases unique to history and literature as well as word processing programs that support appropriate referencing and bibliographies in these fields are essential to instruction leading to college-ready competencies. These kinds of technology applications are taught in courses and classroom contexts that focus on content-specific teaching and learning. General uses of technology for teaching purposes – such as PowerPoint presentations – are also addressed in the practical aspects of graduate courses as well as in applications in the field during clinical experiences.

Attached below is the tracking of progress form used by both college supervisors and mentors to evaluate each candidate's performance. It is directly aligned with the Teaching Performance Expectations.

Name of Teacher Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_

Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_

School Site: \_\_\_\_\_

**Grading Scale:**

**NA – not applicable; not yet evaluated**

**1 – not present: The apprentice has not demonstrated these skills or aptitudes.**

**2 – minimal: The apprentice has demonstrated these skills or aptitudes minimally and sporadically.**

**3 – emerging: The apprentice’s skills/aptitudes in this area are early in their development but are regularly present.**

**4 – developing: The apprentice’s skills/aptitudes in this area are average to above average, are continuing to grow, and are regularly present.**

**5 – thoroughly: The apprentice has mastered these skills/aptitudes.**

## Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form

### Planning and Preparation

\_\_\_\_\_ a) **Effective planning:**

**TPE 4: Candidates for a teaching Credential incorporate specific strategies, teaching/instructional activities, procedures and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students in order to provide a balanced and comprehensive curriculum.**

**TPE 6: Candidates for a Single Subject Teaching Credential establish intellectually challenging academic expectations and provide opportunities for students to develop advanced thinking and problem-solving skills.**

**TPE 7: Candidates for a Single Subject Teaching Credential know and can apply pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for comprehensive instruction of English learners.**

**TPE 8: Candidates for a Teaching Credential draw upon an understanding of patterns of child and adolescent development to understand their students.**

**TPE 9: Candidates for a teaching Credential plan instruction that is comprehensive in relation to the subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standard for students.**

The apprentice...

\_\_\_\_\_ Creates objectives that are clear and realistic.

\_\_\_\_\_ Anticipates different learner needs in planning

\_\_\_\_\_ Ensures that each lesson fits within a sequence of unit plans and yearlong goals

- Plans activities that are appropriate to desired learning outcomes
- Plans activities that are authentic to disciplinary practice
- Is thorough but flexible in her/his planning
- Submits lesson plans to mentor in advance, according to the schedule preferred by the mentor
- Provides clear instruction for ELL students

**b) Assessments and feedback:**

**TPE 3: Candidates for a teaching Credential understand and use a variety of informal and formal, as well as formative and summative assessments, to determine students' progress and plan instruction.**

The apprentice...

- Provides explicit, transparent, and useful feedback on a regular basis
- Designs assessments that are appropriate for age and ability levels of students
- Uses a variety of evaluative tools and data sources to assess learning
- Modifies plans in light of ongoing assessment

**The Discipline**

**TPE 1: Candidates for a Single Subject Credential demonstrate the ability to teach the state-adopted academic content standards for students in grades 7-12.**

- a) The apprentice's plans and instruction are based on a firm grasp of the subject matter
- b) The apprentice communicates passion for and mastery of the discipline while satisfying national and state learning standards
- c) The apprentice links subject matter to other areas of knowledge within and beyond the discipline

**Instruction**

**a) Role of teacher in classroom:**

**TPE 4**

**TPE 6**

**TPE 10: Candidates for a teaching Credential allocate instructional time to maximize student achievement in relation to state-adopted academic content standards for students, instructional goals and scheduled academic tasks.**

The apprentice...

- Demonstrates effective pacing and clear communication.
- Adjusts plans to the needs and (when appropriate) interests of the students
- Draws on a variety of appropriately chosen instructional resources

\_\_\_\_\_ **b) Role of students in classroom:**

**TPE 7**

**TPE 5: Candidates for a teaching Credential clearly communicate instructional objectives to students.**

The apprentice...

- \_\_\_\_\_ Attempts to engage all students in classroom activity
- \_\_\_\_\_ Addresses needs of ELL students.

### Learning Environment

\_\_\_\_\_ **a) Classroom procedures:**

**TPE 2: Candidates for a teaching Credential use progress monitoring at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately toward achieving the frameworks and state-adopted academic content standards for students.**

The apprentice...

- \_\_\_\_\_ Establishes effective classroom routines that support student learning
- \_\_\_\_\_ Creates opportunities for students to take responsibility for their own learning
- \_\_\_\_\_ Manages technological resources efficiently
- \_\_\_\_\_ Anticipates logistics of a classroom: materials are ready; appointments with other personnel, such as librarians or AV specialists, have been arranged in advance; student movements in the room have been anticipated and planned for.

\_\_\_\_\_ **b) Management of student behavior:**

**TPE 8**

**TPE 11: Candidates for Teaching Credential develop and maintain clear expectations for academic and social behavior.**

\_\_\_\_\_ The apprentice monitors and appropriately addresses disruptive behaviors

\_\_\_\_\_ **c) Classroom climate:**

**TPE 11**

\_\_\_\_\_ The apprentice establishes a climate of fairness and respect

### Professional Responsibilities

\_\_\_\_\_ **a) Record-keeping:** The apprentice...

- \_\_\_\_\_ Maintains an accurate grade book
- \_\_\_\_\_ Makes a practice of recording student behavior and parent/guardian contacts
- \_\_\_\_\_ Returns papers to students promptly

\_\_\_\_\_ **b) Professionalism:**

**TPE 12: Candidates for a Teaching Credential take responsibility for student academic learning outcomes.**

The apprentice...

- Meets deadlines, is punctual, has regular attendance, and is positive.
- Recognizes need for support and seeks expertise from others as needed
- Dresses professionally in a manner acceptable to the culture of the school
- Enforces policies of the school, follows procedures established by the school's administration
- Keeps deadlines and appointments set by mentor teacher
- Communicates with parents/guardians\*<sup>1</sup>
- Is aware of legal responsibilities as mandated by the state

\_\_\_\_\_ c) **Collegiality:**

**TPE 13: Candidates for a Teaching Credential evaluate their own teaching practices and subject matter knowledge in light of information about the state-adopted academic content standards for students and student learning.**

The apprentice...

- Establishes connections with other professionals in the department and the school
- Collaborates with fellow teachers as needed to foster student learning

---

<sup>1</sup> (this is often not applicable, but *may* be in some candidates' circumstances)

The unit evaluation/assessment protocol is based on a rationale and data collection procedures as described below. The program as a whole, with sites in three (3) locations nationally has recently revised and improved its assessment and evaluation process as part of the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) process as the Bard College program shifts its national accreditation from the New York State Board of Regents accreditation process to that of TEAC. Both these assessment/evaluation protocols are described below in terms of goals and objectives and actual data collection procedures.

Unit evaluation and assessment: The classroom teacher is the most significant factor in determining the quality of student learning (Sanders and Rivers, 1996; Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006). Yet a recent national study on teacher education, commissioned by the United States Congress and carried out by the National Research Council, concluded that while there are myriad approaches to teacher preparation, little or no reliable data links any particular approach to the successful preparation of highly effective teachers (National Research Council, 2010). The national need to develop and demonstrate effective teacher preparation programs, especially those that prepare teachers to succeed in schools with our most underserved students, is a priority recognized not just by the U.S. Department of Education but also by the National Research Council. This problem is clearly addressed by the Bard College Teacher Rural Residency Program. As common core standards are quickly being adopted by states, shouldn't the common core criteria that create an effective teacher, especially in high-need schools, also be quantified and qualified and then rigorously evaluated in a well-designed, sustainable and easily-replicated project? The Council's recent report suggested that the effects of the type and timing of field experiences and the integration of teacher preparation training with coursework in academic disciplines on student outcomes be studied. These factors are integral to the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching program. While there has been limited research in this area, Monk (1994) found that the test scores of 2,829 high school students from the Longitudinal Study of American Youth were positively correlated with the number of college-level mathematics or science courses their math and science teachers had taken. A study by Goldhaber and Brewer (1995), which analyzed the data on 5,149 high school students and 2,245 mathematics teachers from 638 schools, found that majoring in mathematics was correlated highly with math scores in students. Indeed, the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program has, from its inception, recognized that the historical separation of teacher education from advanced studies in the academic disciplines is unwarranted and would not lead to the certification of teachers who will be most effective in the classroom.

So, how does the Bard College/MAT Program seek to answer the question "What creates an effective teacher?" The primary focus of this proposal is the integration of the design, the development and the assessment of an innovative model of teacher education that will demonstrate significant student outcomes, which will inform program revisions. This model has two (2) critical features: a commitment to parallel and linked studies in a specific academic discipline and in education as well as the integration of graduate teacher education in the daily life of high needs public schools through field experiences

that begin at the onset of the program. This residency experience is the outcome of a singular move on the part of the Bard College/MAT program, sharing a common campus with high-needs urban and rural public schools.

A second focus of this proposal is establishing a campus in a high-needs community to accommodate the interest of high quality teacher candidates in participating in a unique urban residency program designed to positively affect student outcomes. This, ultimately, is the vision for the future of teacher education. Every school has the potential to be a satellite campus for a college teacher education program. These two aspects of the project are described more fully in later sections of this proposal.

The Bard College/MAT program is the only teacher education program in the country that employs full-time graduate faculty in academic disciplines (Biology, Mathematics, History and English) as well as in critical areas of educational studies. As a consequence, the number of full-time faculty in the disciplines is greater than the number of educational faculty, and there is full integration of coursework across fields of study. And, as stated above, this expertise in one's discipline has been shown to increase student achievement in that discipline. An anchor course called the Teaching Lab Strand, co-taught by disciplinary and education faculty in each subject area addresses the issues of authentic inquiry in a field as the basis for curriculum design and instructional approaches in public school classrooms. Fieldwork or clinical practice is critical in the development of effective teachers (AACTE, June 2010). While the integration of clinical practice and coursework has been part of the Bard College/MAT program from its inception in 2004, it is in the last year that Bard College has taken the significant step of fully integrating the entire graduate teacher education program in the daily life of high-needs schools.

In June 2010, the Bard College/MAT program established two (2) new program sites. One is the Paramount Bard Academy (PBA), a public charter school serving a representative demographic of students in Delano, California. Eighty-five percent of PBA students qualify for free or reduced-fee lunches and at least 50 percent are English language learners. Twenty (20) MAT teacher candidates are enrolled in this yearlong residency program, which currently receives support under a five-year \$8.1 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education Teacher Quality Partnership program. A portion of that funding will be applied to researching the questions raised here and will provide the basis for unit evaluation and assessment.

Ultimately, the success of the program will be reflected in positive outcomes in the targeted student population, which is the "bottom line" measure of success for any educational program. The focus is on the delivery of instruction, recognizing that the single greatest factor-impacting student learning is the quality of the classroom teacher (Kane, Rockoff, & Staiger, 2006; Rice, 2003; Sanders & Horn, 1998). Studies that controlled for students' socio-economic status and family contribution to the educational process found that teacher quality mattered most (O'Donnell, 2010; Education Week, 2003). Mertens, Flowers and Mulhall (2002) found that students learn more when their teachers have high academic and instructional skills. A Tennessee study found that

students taught by high-quality teachers had increased their standardized test scores by 50 percentile points when compared to students taught by low-quality teachers (Sanders & Rivers, 1996). The importance of the quality of the teacher is especially important in high-poverty school districts. An Illinois study of 140,000 teachers found that in low-income schools, students with high-quality teachers were more than twice as likely to meet state academic standards as other students (O'Donnell, 2010).

As cited previously, much relevant literature exists that supports the design and the approach pioneered by the Bard College/MAT program in Delano, CA. Retention of teachers, both novice and experienced, is another benefit of the Bard College/MAT approach. A significant percentage of teachers leave the teaching field after their first year of teaching. On an annual basis, approximately 10 percent of first year teachers permanently leave the teaching field (Miller, 2004); however, this rate is significantly higher for teachers in high-poverty and high-minority schools where up to 18 percent of first year teachers permanently leave the teaching profession (Boyd et al., 2007). Studies in New York City have found that “novice” teachers, those with fewer than three (3) years of teaching experience, are significantly more likely to leave the teaching profession if they teach in high-poverty, high-minority, or low-scoring schools. According to the data, on average, 26 percent of New York City’s novice teachers will leave the teaching field within two (2) years compared to 47 percent of novice teachers working in high-poverty, high-minority or low-achieving school campuses (Boyd et al., 2007). Also in New York City, Goodnough (2004) found that low-achieving schools had an annual attrition rate of 25 percent compared to only 8 percent attrition in high-achieving schools. In fact, in certain high-poverty and high-minority schools the teacher “dropout rate” is higher than the student dropout rate (Useem, Offenber, & Farley, 2007). The result is larger numbers of less experienced teachers in schools that need high quality and experience the most. This negatively impacts low-income and minority students as novice teachers are often less successful compared to more experienced teachers in improving student outcomes (Abdallah, 2009).

Research into why teachers leave the field highlights several different reasons but a significant one is that new teachers are often unprepared for the realities of today’s classrooms (Croasmun et al., 1997). Ingersoll (2003) found that teacher preparation programs had a direct impact on teacher attrition. “In all instances, beginning teachers receiving pre-service training had far lower attrition rates than beginning teachers not receiving such pre-service training.”

Clearly, one way to improve teacher quality is to improve teacher preparation. A small but growing body of research has noted that teaching really is a clinical practice profession in the same manner as that of clinical psychology and medicine (Hinds, 2002; Alter & Cogshall, 2009). One way to include a rigorous clinical practice component to teacher preparation is through the use of Professional Development Schools (PDS). Teacher candidates enrolled in a PDS receive supervised, rigorous clinical practice. With increased emphasis on supervised clinical practice, graduates from PDS programs tend to have more effective teaching capabilities (AACTE, June 2010). These studies have found a strong link between teacher preparation programs that contain, like the Bard

College/MAT, rigorous, clinical practice and teacher improvement, including: 1) teacher retention; 2) a teacher's sense of preparedness; and 3) student achievement (AACTE, March 2010).

PDS-based teacher preparation programs have been shown to produce higher functioning beginning teachers who are more competent in “instruction, management, and assessment and more integrated and student-centered in their thinking about planning, assessment, instruction, management, and reflection” (Castle, Fox & Souder, 2006). Castle, Fox and Souder compared students in classes taught by teachers from PDS-based programs and students taught by teachers from non-PDS-based teacher preparation programs around three components: Instruction (e.g., presenting content accurately and clearly), Classroom Management (e.g., handling disruptions firmly and fairly), and Assessment (e.g., keeping records of student progress, using a variety of assessment methods). The results indicated that PDS-trained teachers performed at higher levels on various aspects of the three (3) components and that the results suggest that these higher levels of performance “may be intertwined with their ownership of their teaching and their sophisticated understanding of the connections between the various aspects of teaching” (p.80).

In addition to improving teacher quality, other research studies have found that PDS-based teacher preparation programs reduced teacher attrition rates. In 2004, Kenreich et al., looked at approximately 100 PDS-prepared versus non-PDS-prepared teachers from one university over a three-year period and found that significantly more PDS-prepared teachers remained after Years One and Two. This study supports Fleener's (1998) study that found after examining attrition rates of 871 PDS-prepared teachers compared to 1,088 non-PDS-prepared teachers in Texas over a three-year period that PDS-prepared teachers had an attrition rate that was two (2) percent compared to seven (7) percent for the non-PDS-prepared teachers.

After controlling for individual demographic and academic characteristics of 1,000 teacher graduates, Latham and Vogt (2007) found that PDS preparation significantly and positively impacted teachers' persistence in the field of education. Moreover, PDS-prepared teachers were more likely to teach in high-poverty, high-minority, and low-achieving school campuses than non-PDS prepared teachers. Despite the knowledge gained by the research on Professional Development Schools, there continues to be significant gaps in the literature, such as the lack of knowledge about the impact on teacher attrition and student achievement of PDS-based teachers in a variety of circumstances: 1) teachers completing a full-year of supervised clinical practice with diverse student populations; 2) teachers completing rigorous training in education; 3) teachers completing a research project specific to the teacher's subject area; and 4) teachers graduating with an advanced degree in Teaching (i.e., Masters of Arts). The design of the Bard College/MAT Program addresses these shortcomings addressed in the research literature.

Specifically, the goals, objectives, and expected outcomes of the Bard College/MAT Program are the following:

Goal 1: Increase the quality of teachers in high-needs schools.

Objective: Students taught by Bard College/MAT graduates in the proposed program will show improved achievement on standardized tests as well as performance-based assessments as compared to a students taught by a matched sample of teachers. This means that teachers will increase the number of students meeting or exceeding California adopted standards as delineated by the curriculum frameworks.

Goal 2: Increase the average number of years of service of high-quality teachers in high-needs schools.

Objective: Bard College/MAT graduates from the participating campuses will remain in teaching positions longer than teachers completing other urban teacher education programs.

Outcomes: 1) Increased achievement by students in high-needs public schools in the program; 2) Increased high school graduation rate in participating high-needs public schools; 3) Increased rates of teacher retention; 4) Increased number of graduates of the Bard College/MAT teacher residency programs; 5) Increased collaboration between colleges and public schools; 6) Demonstration of a replicable model for other regions.

#### Unit Assessment/Evaluation Plan

What follows is the evaluation plan for the Bard College/MAT Program in Delano. This evaluation plan is being carried out by an independent outside evaluation firm and is funded through September 30, 2014. At this point, there will have been established an internal process and funding to support it that will allow this evaluation plan to continue beyond the term of the current funding.

The Bard College/MAT Residency Project is comprised of three (3) major components: 1) MAT Recruitment, which is ongoing; 2) MAT Residency, lasting approximately one full year; and 3) MAT Induction lasting three years. These components align with recent scientifically-based research that documents when highly-qualified beginning teachers are provided with appropriate supports and resources during their first years in the teaching profession, this is essential to retaining high quality instructors who specialize in teaching in high-need areas and/or who teach high-need academic subject areas. Each year the Bard College/MAT Residency Project will recruit and educate a “cohort” consisting of 25, 30, 35, and 40 prospective teachers in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Tables 1 and 2, below, provide each Cohort’s schedule and documents which service each Cohort will be receiving each year.

1 **TABLE 1: BARD COLLEGE/MAT SERVICES COHORT SCHEDULE**

Cohort	Recruitment	Residency	Induction Year 1	Induction Year 2	Induction Year 3
1	Fall 09 / Summer 10	Summer 10 / Spring 11	Summer 11 / Spring 12	Summer 12 / Spring 13	Summer 13 / Spring 14
2	Summer 10 / Spring 11	Summer 11 / Spring 12	Summer 12 / Spring 13	Summer 13 / Spring 14	Summer 14 / Spring 15*
3	Summer 11 / Spring 12	Summer 12 / Spring 13	Summer 13 / Spring 14	Summer 14 / Spring 15*	Summer 15 / Spring 16*
4	Summer 12 / Spring 13	Summer 13 / Spring 14	Summer 14 / Spring 15*	Summer 15 / Spring 16*	Summer 16 / Spring 17*

2 \* Denotes the fact that Bard University will sustain the Induction component and services for all  
3 Cohorts.

4 **TABLE 2: BARD COLLEGE/MAT SERVICES FOR COHORT BY GRANT YEARS 1-5**

Cohort	GRANT Y1	GRANT Y2	GRANT Y3	GRANT Y4	GRANT Y5
1	Recruitment	Residency	Induction Y1	Induction Y2	Induction Y3
2		Recruitment	Residency	Induction Y1	Induction Y2*
3			Recruitment	Residency	Induction Y1*
4				Recruitment	Residency*

5 \* Denotes the fact that Bard University will sustain the Induction services component to ensure  
6 that all Cohorts receive at least three full years of induction services.

7 .  
8 The Bard College/MAT Evaluation Plan includes assessing performance against each  
9 Project Goal, Objective, Output, and Outcome (**Table 3**). In addition to the 130 Bard University  
10 MAT Residency students the Evaluation Plan will follow, for up to five (5) years, 60 randomly  
11 selected beginning teachers (i.e., 15 beginning non-Bard College/MAT Resident teachers that  
12 will become the comparison group) from partnering high-need LEAs that are not participants in  
13 the Bard College/MAT Resident Project. The comparison group teachers, to the maximum extent  
14 possible, will be matched by the Program Evaluator to the Bard College/MAT Residency  
15 participants in terms of ❶ educational experience, ❷ ethnicity, ❸ gender, ❹ high-need academic  
16 subjects taught (e.g., reading, mathematics, science, etc.), ❺ high-need area(s) taught (e.g.,  
17 special education, language instruction educational programs for limited English proficient  
18 students, etc.), and ❻ teaching in high-need campuses. As an incentive for participation in the  
19 comparison group, Bard College/MAT will provide access to workshops and other selected  
20 professional development opportunities for the comparison group’s teachers during the Project’s  
21 final year. Three (3) other significant evaluation factors are also noteworthy: 1) the Project’s  
22 goals and objectives address the evaluation requirements in Title II, Part A, section 202, and  
23 section 204(a) of the Higher Education Opportunity Act of 2008 (HEA); 2) because of the  
24 unique partnerships developed through the Bard College/MAT Resident Project, Bard College,  
25 TCOE, and the other participating high-need LEAs have committed themselves to collecting  
26 teachers’ data year to year (i.e., longitudinal data) to determine their individual achievements;  
27 and 3) the Project Evaluator, has extensive experience collecting and utilizing longitudinal data  
28 in projects to develop recommendations for continuous improvements in quality and  
29 performance.

**TABLE 3: BARD COLLEGE/MAT EVALUATION PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS, AND OUTCOMES**

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
<p>❶ To increase the number of highly qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs.</p>	<p>❶ Increase the number of beginning teachers graduating from the Bard MAT Residency Program who are members of underrepresented groups.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of beginning teachers, compared to Cohort 1, graduating from the Bard MAT Residency Program who are members of under-represented groups by 10%, 12%, and 15%, in Years 3, 4, and 5, respectively, as measured by the demographic data of the graduates.</li> </ul>
	<p>❷ Increase the number of students who persist in the Bard MAT Residency Program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of students, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, who persist in the Bard MAT Residency Program by 3%, 5%, 7%, and 10% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the number of Bard MAT Residency students who did not graduate in the previous year but did continue in the program in the following year. <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA Short-Term Performance Measure 1: Persistence.]</i></li> </ul>
	<p>❸ Increase the academic achievement of Bard MAT Residency Program students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the academic achievement of Bard MAT Residency Program students, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, by 10%, 12%, 15%, and 18% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the Teacher Performance Assessment.</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
	<p>④ Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who earn a master's degree within one year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who earn a master's degree within one year, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, by at least 5% in Years 3, 4, and 5 as measured by official transcripts from Bard MAT. [NOTE: This is GPRA Performance Measure 1(i).]</li> </ul>
	<p>⑤ Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who document improved their scale scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, who document improved scale scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers by 5%, 7%, 9%, and 11% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the <i>California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET)</i>. [NOTE: This is GPRA Performance Measure 3: Improved Scores.]</li> </ul>
	<p>⑥ Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who become highly accomplished educators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who become highly accomplished educators by at least 5% more than the comparison group as measured by the number of Bard MAT Residency graduates that successfully complete the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.</li> </ul>
<p>② To increase the</p>	<p>① Increase the number of Bard</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide at least one</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
number of highly qualified teachers who remain in the teaching field at high-need LEAs.	MAT Residency Program graduate teachers who are retained in teaching at partnership high-need LEAs one year after initial employment.	year of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 90 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., 25, 30, and 35 students in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3, respectively).	Residency Program graduates in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who are retained in teaching at partnership high-need LEAs one year after initial employment by at least 10%, 12%, and 15% more than their comparison groups in Years 3, 4, and 5, respectively, as measured by the employment retention records of the LEAs. <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA Short-Term Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention.]</i>
	② Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who remain teaching at a high-need LEA for at least three years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who remain teaching at partnership high-need LEAs for at least three years by at least 5% more than the comparison groups by the end of Grant Year 5 as measured by employment retention records of the LEAs. <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention.]</i></li> </ul>
③ To increase student academic achievement in the high-need LEAs by developing highly qualified teachers.	① Increase the academic achievement of secondary school students whose teachers are Bard MAT Residency Program graduates.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the academic achievement of secondary school students whose teachers are Bard MAT Residency Program graduates, compared to comparison group data, by 10%, 12%, 15%, and 18%, in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the CST (California Standards Test, which includes the</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
			California Achievement Test), the secondary school students' GPA, and End-of-Course Tests for high school students.
④ To decrease the cost of retaining a highly qualified teacher at high-need LEAs.	① Decrease the costs of a successful outcome (i.e., teacher retained by partnership high-need LEAs three years after initial employment) for a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate teacher.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease the costs of a successful outcome by 10%, as calculated by dividing the cumulative total program expenditures by the number of Bard MAT Residency Program Cohort 1 graduates who are still teaching in partnership high-need LEAs three years after initial employment. [NOTE: This is the GPR Efficiency Measure: Employee Retention.]</li> </ul>

**Table 4** details the assessment measures, the schedule of assessments, and the person(s) responsible for collecting the data for each Bard MAT Project Goal and Objective. Each assessment measure was chosen because it provides objective performance measures that are clearly related to the desired Project Outputs and Outcomes. The assessment measures chosen will provide quantitative and qualitative data for analysis. [Note: To save space, the Project Goals and Objectives were not repeated; however, they are numbered identically to Table 3.]

**TABLE 4: BARD COLLEGE/MAT EVALUATION PLAN ASSESSMENT MEASURES BY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
①	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student recruitment records provided by TCOE;</li> <li>List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester; and</li> <li>From list of students attending the first</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment records collected at beginning of each academic semester;</li> <li>List of students attending BART MAT collected each academic semester; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>Bard MAT to provide lists of attending students; and</li> <li>Bard MAT will provide demographic information</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		day, identify those that are members of under-represented groups.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demographic information of each student in the Bard MAT Residency Program will be collected each academic semester.</li> </ul>	for each student in the Residency program.
	②	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student recruitment records provided by TCOE;</li> <li>List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester;</li> <li>List of students attending the last day of the MAT Residency each academic semester; and</li> <li>List of students who did <i>not</i> graduate in the previous year but who <i>persisted</i> and did continue in the Residency program in the current year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recruitment records collected semi- annually;</li> <li>List of students attending Bard MAT collected semi-annually; and</li> <li>Graduation records collected every academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>Bard MAT to provide lists of attending students;</li> <li>Bard MAT to provide lists of all students who graduate; and</li> <li>Bard MAT will provide a list of all students who did not graduate in the previous year but who remain in the Residency program in the current year.</li> </ul>
	③	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA of students in the Bard MAT Residency Program; and</li> <li>Results of the Teacher Performance Assessment for each Bard MAT Residency Program student.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA of each Bard MAT Residency Program student collected at the end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>Disaggregated results by subscale (i.e., Pedagogy; Designing Instruction; Assessing Learning; and Culminating Teaching</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students will provide GPA information from their transcripts each academic semester; and</li> <li>Bard MAT faculty will provide disaggregated results of the Teacher Performance Assessment for each academic</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
			Experience) for each of the Teacher Performance Assessments collected end of each academic semester.	semester.
	④	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student recruitment records;</li> <li>• List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester;</li> <li>• Number of students earning a master’s degree one year after enrolling in the Bard MAT Residency Program; and</li> <li>• Number of students earning a master’s degree two years after enrollment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment records collected at the beginning of the each academic semester;</li> <li>• List of students attending Bard MAT collected at end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Graduation records collected every academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>• Bard Mat to provide lists of attending students; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT to provide lists of all students who graduate.</li> </ul>
	⑤	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores of beginning teachers who graduated from Bard MAT on their <i>California Subject Examinations for Teachers</i> (CSET).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSET scores and information will be collected after each CSET examination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The teachers will provide testing results to the Bard MAT Project Director as they receive results from their CSET.</li> </ul>
	⑥	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of teachers who apply for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; and</li> <li>• Number of teachers who successfully complete the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will be surveyed annually to determine if they have applied for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will be surveyed annually to determine if they have successfully completed the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT Residency graduates will complete the Alumni Annual Employment Survey;</li> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will provide National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification data; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
			certification process.	provide evidence of successful completion of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.
②	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of students completing the Bard MAT Residency Program as graduated teachers;</li> <li>• List of Bard MAT graduates and their initial job placement records (i.e., teacher of record information) including job description and job location information; and</li> <li>• Annual updates on each Bard MAT graduate’s job description and placement information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT completion and graduation information collected at the end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Graduate employment information collected at the end of each academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT will provide program completion and graduation information;</li> <li>• Partner high-need LEAs will provide employment information on Bard MAT graduates hired by the LEAs; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT Residency Program graduates will complete the Alumni Annual Employment Survey.</li> </ul>
	②	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of students completing the Bard MAT Residency Program as graduated teachers;</li> <li>• List of Bard MAT graduates and their initial job placement records (i.e., teacher of record information) including job description and job location information; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT completion and graduation information collected at the end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Graduate employment information collected at the end of each academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard Mat will provide program completion and graduation information;</li> <li>• Employment information will be received from the partnership high-need LEAs who employ any Bard MAT graduates; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT Residency</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annual updates on each Bard MAT graduate’s job description and placement information.</li> </ul>		graduates will complete the Alumni Annual Employment Survey.
③	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA data of secondary school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate;</li> <li>CST (California Standards Test) results of secondary school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate in the areas of English, Mathematics, Science, or History; and</li> <li>End-of-Course Tests results of high school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency program graduate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA data will be collected and reported at the end of each academic semester;</li> <li>CST test results will be reported annually; and</li> <li>End-of-Course Tests results will be reported annually.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GPA data will be collected and reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the teacher of record;</li> <li>CST test results will be reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the teacher of record; and</li> <li>End-of-Course Tests results will be reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the teacher of record</li> </ul>
④	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bard MAT Project and Program expenditure data;</li> <li>Number of teachers who graduated from the Bard MAT Residency Program that are retained at partnership high-need LEAs each academic semester will be collected; and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expenditure data will be collected continuously and reported after each academic semester;</li> <li>Number of graduate teachers retained at high- need LEAs will be collected after each</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expenditure data collected and reported by the Bard Mat Project Director;</li> <li>Retention information received from partnership high-need LEAs who employ Bard MAT</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determination of the calculated cost of a successful outcome relative to a Bard MAT Residency Program graduated teacher will be calculated.</li> </ul>	academic semester; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs calculations will be performed annually after the third year of Bard MAT.</li> </ul>	graduate teachers; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program Evaluator will perform the costs calculations.</li> <li></li> </ul>

**TABLE 3: BARD COLLEGE/MAT EVALUATION PLAN GOALS, OBJECTIVES, OUTPUTS, AND OUTCOMES**

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To increase the number of highly qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the number of beginning teachers graduating from the Bard MAT Residency Program who are members of underrepresented groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the number of beginning teachers, compared to Cohort 1, graduating from the Bard MAT Residency Program who are members of under-represented groups by 10%, 12%, and 15%, in Years 3, 4, and 5, respectively, as measured by the demographic data of the graduates.</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the number of students who persist in the Bard MAT Residency Program.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase the number of students, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, who persist in the Bard MAT Residency Program by 3%, 5%, 7%, and 10% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the number of Bard MAT Residency students who did not graduate in the previous year but did continue in the program in the following year.  <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA Short-Term Performance Measure 1: Persistence.]</i></li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
	<p>③ Increase the academic achievement of Bard MAT Residency Program students.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the academic achievement of Bard MAT Residency Program students, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, by 10%, 12%, 15%, and 18% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the Teacher Performance Assessment.</li> </ul>
	<p>④ Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who earn a master's degree within one year.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who earn a master's degree within one year, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, by at least 5% in Years 3, 4, and 5 as measured by official transcripts from Bard MAT. [NOTE: This is GPRA Performance Measure 1(i).]</li> </ul>
	<p>⑤ Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who document improved their scale scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the percentage of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates, compared to 2008-2009 baseline data, who document improved scale scores for initial state certification or licensure of teachers by 5%, 7%, 9%, and 11% in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the <i>California Subject Examinations for Teachers (CSET)</i>. [NOTE: This is GPRA Performance Measure 3: Improved Scores.]</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
	<p>⑥ Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who become highly accomplished educators.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who become highly accomplished educators by at least 5% more than the comparison group as measured by the number of Bard MAT Residency graduates that successfully complete the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.</li> </ul>
<p>② To increase the number of highly qualified teachers who remain in the teaching field at high-need LEAs.</p>	<p>① Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduate teachers who are retained in teaching at partnership high-need LEAs one year after initial employment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide at least one year of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 90 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., 25, 30, and 35 students in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3 who are retained in teaching at partnership high-need LEAs one year after initial employment by at least 10%, 12%, and 15% more than their comparison groups in Years 3, 4, and 5, respectively, as measured by the employment retention records of the LEAs. <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA Short-Term Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention.]</i></li> </ul>
	<p>② Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who remain teaching at a high-need LEA for at least three years.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the number of Bard MAT Residency Program graduates who remain teaching at partnership high-need LEAs for at least three years by at least 5% more than the comparison groups by the end of Grant Year 5 as measured by employment retention records of the LEAs. <i>[NOTE: This is GPRA</i></li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Outputs	Outcomes
			<i>Performance Measure 2: Employment Retention.]</i>
<p>③ To increase student academic achievement in the high-need LEAs by developing highly qualified teachers.</p>	<p>① Increase the academic achievement of secondary school students whose teachers are Bard MAT Residency Program graduates.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide Bard MAT Residency Program services to 130 students (25, 30, 35, and 40 students in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase the academic achievement of secondary school students whose teachers are Bard MAT Residency Program graduates, compared to comparison group data, by 10%, 12%, 15%, and 18%, in Years 1, 2, 3, and 4, respectively, as measured by the CST (California Standards Test, which includes the California Achievement Test), the secondary school students' GPA, and End-of-Course Tests for high school students.</li> </ul>
<p>④ To decrease the cost of retaining a highly qualified teacher at high-need LEAs.</p>	<p>① Decrease the costs of a successful outcome (i.e., teacher retained by partnership high-need LEAs three years after initial employment) for a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate teacher.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide three full years of <i>MAT Induction</i> services to 25 Bard MAT graduates (i.e., Cohort 1).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decrease the costs of a successful outcome by 10%, as calculated by dividing the cumulative total program expenditures by the number of Bard MAT Residency Program Cohort 1 graduates who are still teaching in partnership high-need LEAs three years after initial employment. <i>[NOTE: This is the GPRA Efficiency Measure: Employee Retention.]</i></li> </ul>

**Table 4** details the assessment measures, the schedule of assessments, and the person(s) responsible for collecting the data for each Bard MAT Project Goal and Objective. Each assessment measure was chosen because it provides objective performance measures that are clearly related to the desired Project Outputs and Outcomes. The assessment measures chosen will provide quantitative and qualitative data for analysis. [Note: To save space, the Project Goals and Objectives were not repeated; however, they are numbered identically to Table 3.]

**TABLE 4: BARD COLLEGE/MAT EVALUATION PLAN ASSESSMENT MEASURES BY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
①	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student recruitment records provided by TCOE;</li> <li>• List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester; and</li> <li>• From list of students attending the first day, identify those that are members of under-represented groups.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment records collected at beginning of each academic semester;</li> <li>• List of students attending BART MAT collected each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Demographic information of each student in the Bard MAT Residency Program will be collected each academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>• Bard MAT to provide lists of attending students; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT will provide demographic information for each student in the Residency program.</li> </ul>
	②	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student recruitment records provided by TCOE;</li> <li>• List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester;</li> <li>• List of students attending the last day of the MAT Residency each academic semester; and</li> <li>• List of students who did <i>not</i> graduate in the previous year but who <i>persisted</i> and did continue in the Residency program in the current year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment records collected semi- annually;</li> <li>• List of students attending Bart MAT collected semi-annually; and</li> <li>• Graduation records collected every academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>• Bard MAT to provide lists of attending students;</li> <li>• Bard MAT to provide lists of all students who graduate; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT will provide a list of all students who did not graduate in the previous year but who remain in the Residency program in the current year.</li> </ul>
	③	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GPA of students in the Bard MAT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GPA of each Bard MAT</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Students will provide GPA</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		Residency Program; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of the Teacher Performance Assessment for each Bard MAT Residency Program student.</li> </ul>	Residency Program student collected at the end of each academic semester; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disaggregated results by subscale (i.e., Pedagogy; Designing Instruction; Assessing Learning; and Culminating Teaching Experience) for each of the Teacher Performance Assessments collected end of each academic semester.</li> </ul>	information from their transcripts each academic semester; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT faculty will provide disaggregated results of the Teacher Performance Assessment for each academic semester.</li> </ul>
	<b>4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student recruitment records;</li> <li>• List of students attending the first day of the Bard MAT Residency Program each academic semester;</li> <li>• Number of students earning a master’s degree one year after enrolling in the Bard MAT Residency Program; and</li> <li>• Number of students earning a master’s degree two years after enrollment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recruitment records collected at the beginning of the each academic semester;</li> <li>• List of students attending Bard MAT collected at end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Graduation records collected every academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TCOE to provide recruitment list;</li> <li>• Bard Mat to provide lists of attending students; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT to provide lists of all students who graduate.</li> </ul>
	<b>5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Scores of beginning teachers who graduated from Bard MAT on their <i>California Subject Examinations for Teachers</i> (CSET).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CSET scores and information will be collected after each CSET examination.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The teachers will provide testing results to the Bard MAT Project Director as they receive results from their CSET.</li> </ul>
	<b>6</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of teachers who apply for certification by the National Board for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will be surveyed annually to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT Residency graduates will complete</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		Professional Teaching Standards; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of teachers who successfully complete the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• determine if they have applied for National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will be surveyed annually to determine if they have successfully completed the certification process.</li> </ul>	the Alumni Annual Employment Survey; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will provide National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification data; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT graduates will provide evidence of successful completion of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification process.</li> </ul>
②	①	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of students completing the Bard MAT Residency Program as graduated teachers;</li> <li>• List of Bard MAT graduates and their initial job placement records (i.e., teacher of record information) including job description and job location information; and</li> <li>• Annual updates on each Bard MAT graduate's job description and placement information.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT completion and graduation information collected at the end of each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Graduate employment information collected at the end of each academic semester.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT will provide program completion and graduation information;</li> <li>• Partner high-need LEAs will provide employment information on Bard MAT graduates hired by the LEAs; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT Residency Program graduates will complete the Alumni Annual Employment Survey.</li> </ul>
	②	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of students completing the Bard</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT completion and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard Mat will provide</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
		<p>MAT Residency Program as graduated teachers;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• List of Bard MAT graduates and their initial job placement records (i.e., teacher of record information) including job description and job location information; and</li> <li>• Annual updates on each Bard MAT graduate’s job description and placement information.</li> </ul>	<p>graduation information collected at the end of each academic semester; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate employment information collected at the end of each academic semester.</li> </ul>	<p>program completion and graduation information;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Employment information will be received from the partnership high-need LEAs who employ any Bard MAT graduates; and</li> <li>• Bard MAT Residency graduates will complete the Alumni Annual Employment Survey.</li> </ul>
<p>③</p>	<p>①</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GPA data of secondary school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate;</li> <li>• CST (California Standards Test) results of secondary school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency Program graduate in the areas of English, Mathematics, Science, or History; and</li> <li>• End-of-Course Tests of high school students whose teacher of record is a Bard MAT Residency program graduate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GPA data will be collected and reported at the end of each academic semester;</li> <li>• CST test results will be reported annually; and</li> <li>• End-of-Course Tests results will be reported annually.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GPA data will be collected and reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the teacher of record;</li> <li>• CST test results will be reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the teacher of record; and</li> <li>• End-of-Course Tests results will be reported by the participating, partnership high-need LEAs employing the</li> </ul>

Project Goals	Project Objectives	Assessment Measures	When Collected	Responsible Party
				teacher of record
4	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bard MAT Project and Program expenditure data;</li> <li>• Number of teachers who graduated from the Bard MAT Residency Program that are retained at partnership high-need LEAs each academic semester will be collected; and</li> <li>• Determination of the calculated cost of a successful outcome relative to a Bard MAT Residency Program graduated teacher will be calculated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expenditure data will be collected continuously and reported after each academic semester;</li> <li>• Number of graduate teachers retained at high- need LEAs will be collected after each academic semester; and</li> <li>• Costs calculations will be performed annually after the third year of Bard MAT.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expenditure data collected and reported by the Bard Mat Project Director;</li> <li>• Retention information received from partnership high-need LEAs who employ Bard MAT graduate teachers; and</li> <li>• Program Evaluator will perform the costs calculations.</li> </ul>

Based on the fact that the Bard College/MAT Project will collect data on a continuous basis for each Bard College/MAT Residency Program student, specific data elements can be dis-aggregated for more detailed analyses. For example, the Bard College/MAT Project will be able to quickly and efficiently determine the needed data, including: ❶ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership; ❷ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by a high-need LEA in the partnership who are members of underrepresented groups; ❸ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership who teach in high-need academic subject areas (e.g., reading, mathematics, science, foreign language, etc.); ❹ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership who teach in high-need areas (e.g., special education, language instruction educational programs for limited English proficient students, etc.); ❺ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership who teach in high-need schools, disaggregated by elementary and secondary school levels; ❻ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership who have been trained to integrate technology effectively into the curricula and instruction, including using the technology consistent with the principles of universal design for learning; and ❼ Percentage of highly-qualified teachers hired by high-need LEAs in the partnership who have been trained to use technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to improve teaching and learning for the purpose of improving student academic achievement.

*Periodic assessment of progress toward achieving the intended outcomes:* The Bard College/MAT Project's Evaluation Plan, as detailed above, addresses the use of objective performance measures that are clearly related to the intended outcomes. The Program Evaluator will use the data and information collected from all assessments and evaluation measures to produce both *quantitative* and *qualitative* data. Qualitative data collection techniques will be utilized to help assess the actual Bard College/MAT implementation and performance processes. By determining and assessing the factors that affect these processes, the Bard College/MAT Project expects to be able to assist other rural school districts that are attempting to implement similar programs. At the beginning of each month, the Program Evaluator will prepare a report summarizing all data collected to date, including during the previous month. The Program Evaluator will compile and analyze the information and present informally, on a monthly basis, the key findings to the Bard College/MAT Residency Management Team (MT). These monthly summaries, along with all other available data collected, will be compiled and formally presented as quarterly evaluation reports, during the quarterly meetings of the MT. These quarterly evaluation reports are important because the Bard College/MAT, the MT, and the Bard College/MAT partners understand that waiting for six (6) months to find-out about the program's progress is not acceptable.

Formal data analysis and summaries will be published **semi-annually** and used by the MT to make any needed modifications. All the Program Evaluator's analyses will include the results of both quantitative and qualitative data. To the maximum extent possible, the analyses will include dis-aggregation of sub-groups to permit a full assessment of the effects of the Bard College/MAT Project and Program. The semi-annual evaluation

reports will be completed by the end of the seventh (7) month of each operating year (i.e., if BardCollege/MAT starts on October 01, 2009, the first semi-annual report must be completed by April 30, 2010).

These reports (i.e., monthly, quarterly and semi-annual) will be used to provide the data necessary to determine if BardCollege/MAT program is being implemented effectively and efficiently. The Program Evaluator will review the data and make recommendations at the following MT monthly meeting so the MT can develop the objective plans for any needed changes.

Further, at the end of each operating year, all BardCollege/MAT staff and personnel will participate in a Project Review, led by the Program Evaluator, that will result in a summative assessment (i.e., Annual Project Evaluation Report) for that year. The Annual Project Evaluation Report will be essential in reviewing progress and planning for subsequent years of operation. Members of the Management Team will review the data summary and make any necessary adjustments to goals and objectives for future years.

The Annual Project Evaluation Report will be completed within forty-five (45) days of the end of each year and will bring both process and outcome/product data together in its analyses of progress toward all of the BardCollege/MAT Residency Project's Goals and Objectives. Process data will provide the context (i.e., how progress occurred) and the outcome/product measures will describe the magnitude of the progress and compare it to the initial benchmarks and targets set for each goal and objective. This report, which forms the basis of all planning for the next operating year, also will use trend data from year-to-year to examine the performance over the course of the five-year Bard College/MAT Project and beyond. The Program Evaluator, with assistance from all program stakeholders, will prepare the formal Annual Evaluation Report each year for the required submission to the U.S. Department of Education (ED).

Thus, in total, the Project will have a periodic assessment completed each month with its monthly data collection report, a quarterly evaluation report, a semi-annual evaluation report, and an annual evaluation report. Each of these reports will be prepared and presented in a manner that allows all key stakeholders to quickly determine the Project's strengths and needed improvements. This rigorous, extensive evaluation and reporting process is essential if the Bard College/ MAT Residency Project is to achieve the ambitious goals and objectives it has set for itself.

*Evaluation Methods:* All data analyses and interpretations in this research study will follow the principles prescribed in Educational Research: An Introduction by Gall, Gall & Borg (2003). Because the quantitative part of this study is looking at the differences between multiple groups, because the relationship between samples is independent, and because there are multiple independent variables, a factorial ANOVA was selected for this study. All statistical analyses will be performed using SPSS for Windows. The study sample will be described using measures of central tendency (mean and median) and dispersion (standard deviation and range) for continuous/ordinal scaled variables and frequency and percent for categorical scaled variables. All of the analyses

will be two-sided with a 5% alpha level. Hypotheses will be tested using 2-way ANOVA. There will be one 2-way ANOVA for each hypothesis. The dependent variables are listed in Table 1 and there will be three effects (i.e., independent variables): (a) the main effect due to year; (b) the main effect due to the teacher of record's participation in the Bard College/MAT Residency Project; and (c) the interaction effect between year and participation in the Bard College/MAT Residency Project.

Qualitative data will be gathered in personal interviews with school administrators and Residency students and will be analyzed using principles of interpretational analysis as described by Gall et al. (2005). Responses will be organized around the key survey questions and reported in narrative form. Constructs, patterns, and themes, will be used to describe and explain the information studied. Further, interview data transcription will be used so that participants in the qualitative study can verify the results and help to ensure the result's validity.

### **Program Assessment/Evaluation Plan**

The program assessment/evaluation looks more specifically at the internal workings of the program during the yearlong cycle of graduate studies and fields experiences. What is described below is the Quality Control System and Internal Audit process recently conducted for TEAC accreditation. Though the QCS and subsequent audit will undergo some revision based on TEAC feedback, it provides the current protocol for evaluating and assessing program quality as a measure of candidate progress through the program.

#### **Appendix A: Report of the Internal Audit of the Quality Control System**

In order to examine the efficacy of the Bard MAT Program and its Quality Control System (QCS), we conducted an internal audit. The audit plan was developed in Fall 2010, by faculty members Jaime Alves (Literature) and Mary Krembs (Mathematics), as well as program director and Dean of Education, Ric Campbell and Program Administrator, Cecilia Maple. The plan was refined at two (2) Fall 2010 retreats (one in September and one in November). The retreats were designed specifically for the faculty to collaborate on analyzing data and writing the Inquiry Brief and its component parts. The audit itself was conducted by Jaime Alves, Ric Campbell, and Mary Krembs, with the assistance of Cecilia Maple.

It is essential to make clear from the outset that the QCS described here represents an attempt to identify those program elements that seem critical to successful program outcomes. These elements are categorized below as either "components" or "check points", recognizing that components are aspects of the program that advance and support candidate learning and development and check points are evaluative dimensions of the program that serve as some measure of program outcomes, of program components and student effort, leading to remedial actions as indicated. Certainly, these evaluative dimensions also serve a component role as

formative assessments throughout most of the program, with the hope that such feedback will foster continuous learning and development leading to better results.

It is also important to note that the audit process is limited in what it can produce. At a first level, the audit acts as a simple checklist, confirming whether or not the various elements of the QCS are in place and active. And second, by documenting how the QCS has functioned across a sample of students, we are able to use this data as we assess program outcomes to determine how the QCS contributes to those outcomes. In the discussion of the audit process, below, we look at the limitations of the audit process to determine how it might be restructured to provide more information that would inform program improvements, especially changes to the QCS.

### **1. Description of the quality control system**

The QCS is comprised of ‘components’ and ‘check points’ built into the MAT Program itself; for example, student entrance into the program happens via a multi-part admissions process, and each step in that process is part of the QCS. Much of the Bard College/MAT Program QCS was developed collaboratively by the director, Ric Campbell, and the founding faculty members in the first year of the program, 2004-2005, building from the QCS as outlined in the original proposal for accreditation submitted to the New York State Board of Regents in June 2003. Some of the QCS components have been modified over the three-year period comprising the data used in this report (2007-2010), and those modifications have been made collaboratively by the entire program faculty.

In some cases, modifications were based on structural changes to the program. For example, in the earliest years of the program, the Bard College/MAT did not offer a two-year course of study; we began to do so in 2008. That alteration to the program, like most others, was designed collaboratively by all program’s faculty, in monthly faculty meetings, and in smaller committees. And in other cases, modifications responded to perceived needs for data that would lead to more reliable outcomes. Rubrics and grading systems for various courses and the clinical experience have undergone regular revisions. And probably the one program element that has been modified significantly in the last few years is the “Teaching Lab Class” (BI518, HI518, LI518, MA518). These courses, co-taught by a faculty member in one of the disciplines and a faculty member in education, is now structured developmentally as a sequence of activities and learning challenges designed to move the MAT candidate towards increasingly sophisticated ways of thinking about teaching and learning.

The ‘check points’ have developed both proactively as well as reactively. For example, proactively from the outset, the MAT program employed the use of written quarterly reports written by faculty for any student at risk. This is a standard part of the Bard College educational experience (in the undergraduate college they are called Criteria Sheets) and the program wanted to employ this powerful feedback artifact for students. Reactively, the program has recently standardized the number

of formal written evaluations per student teaching placement. This standardization of number occurred based upon a number of factors, including informal post-practicum discussions between faculty and students at the end of the student teaching placements. The Bard College/MAT program prides itself on being academically rigorous within the context of constant self-improvement of process and procedure.

The QCS at the Bard College/MAT Program is best described as a series of interactions between seven (7) primary program components that constitute the graduate educational experience:

1. Students
2. Student Support
3. Program and Courses
4. Evaluations and Monitoring
5. Faculty and administration,
6. Public School Mentor Teachers, students and Administration
7. Facilities, equipment and supplies

Looking at it chronologically, the QCS begins with student recruitment and admission, and follows individual, enrolled students through the program from beginning to completion, touching in at various check points where students interact with faculty and administrators, and with secondary school students and teachers during their field placements. Each of these interactions bears on the capacity of the program to offer high quality instruction and guidance as that student progresses from admission to the completion of the degree requirements; each interaction also bears on the MAT student's ability to meet the high standards of the program and to secure a professional position.

Below is a more complete description of each of the components and checkpoints assessed in the audit.

### **Students (questions 1-14)**

The bulk of the questions in this section assess the Program's procedures for admitting students and helping them meet the various requirements for completion (such as coursework and field experiences). The Program has an established and consistent procedure for admission. Program applicants must have received a bachelor's degree from an accredited liberal arts institution with a major (or its equivalent) in the discipline they intend to study at the Bard College/MAT Program. Students are accepted into the MAT Program on the basis of an assessment of various components: a record of academic achievement that shows a minimum cumulative average of B (3.0); evaluations in letters of reference; and a record and statement of their professional goals.

Applications to each discipline are evaluated against a rubric by teams of faculty members (for example, in Literature, each application is reviewed by two-three faculty in the discipline and in Education). Each evaluating faculty member assigns

the application a score from 1-12, based on the rubric; the scores are then used to rank applicants according to how well they meet criteria for admission (students must earn at least a 7 to meet the criteria for admission; those who earn scores of 11-12 are typically seen as most desirable, though we strive to accept a mix of students with a range of desirable qualities. Applicants with less-than-stellar academic records may nevertheless exhibit a deep and long-standing commitment to secondary education, and merit excellent references from previous employers and teachers who testify to their suitability for the teaching profession). When otherwise promising applicants fail to meet criteria in a key area (such as when students majoring in a related field do not have enough credit hours in the chosen discipline to qualify for admission), faculty members recommend ways for applicants to remedy that deficit (for example, by taking specific additional coursework in the discipline prior to enrolling in the Bard College/MAT program).

Questions in this section help examine the thoroughness of the process when applied to real students as well as an opportunity to reconsider ways of fine-tuning these processes for future growth and student success.

### **Student Support (Questions 15-27)**

Questions in this section explore the range of services available (and/or utilized) by students in support of their time in the Bard College/MAT program. Most of these questions revolve around services offered for students that are struggling with some aspect of student life. In addition these questions explore the procedures the program has put in place to assist students having academic difficulties.

### **Program and Courses (Questions 28-33)**

Questions in this section explore the way the Bard College/MAT program integrates the NYSED requirements and the program design.

### **Evaluating and Monitoring Students (Questions 34-40)**

Questions in this section explore the feedback mechanisms (design and implementation) for students as they progress through our program.

### **Faculty (Question 41a-h)**

Questions in this section are meant to assess the quality of the discipline and education faculty within the Bard College/MAT program. This includes hiring practices, qualifications and ongoing evaluation to ensure quality.

### **Mentor Teachers (Questions 42-43)**

Questions in this section are meant to assess the quality of the mentor teachers utilized by the Bard College/MAT program. This includes recruitment practices, experience and ongoing evaluation to ensure quality.

### **Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies (Questions 44-54)**

Questions in this section assess the quality and necessity of facilities, equipment and supplies.

### **Financial Supports (Questions 55-56)**

Questions in this section assess the forms of financial support and availability of funds to attract faculty and maintain professional productivity as well as forms of financial support to attract and support high-quality candidates.

## **2. Description of the procedure followed in conducting the internal audit**

Three (3) faculty members conducted the audit, using available data to answer a sequence of fifty-six (56) questions and some sub-questions, as described above. This trail of questions yielded a total of sixty-three (63) answers, or data points, in which there were three (3) possible answers – yes, no, or n/a. – with the exception of questions 55 and 56.

***The scope of the audit.*** All inquiries focused on the past three (3) years of the program, during which time various central program components have remained fairly stable (for example, the design of the ARP), while other variables (such as the growth and development of our NYC-based program and our 2-year program) have changed dramatically. Indeed, since the Bard College/MAT Program has undergone significant growth in the three (3) years covered by this audit---particularly in the development of a two-year program option and an alternative campus in New York City---we were most interested in conducting an audit that would let us evaluate the consistency with which we provide rigorous, high-quality instruction, with adequate support, to all of our students, through these changes, regardless of the option they take for completing the degree.

***The sample of candidates.*** During the past three (3) years, the MAT has graduated approximately 100 candidates. We have therefore selected 10 “probes” for a sample size of ten (10). Within the selection of the sample, several factors served as guides. As mentioned above, one primary interest was in examining how students experience the QCS across five (5) different possible pathways through the MAT program. The pathways are as follows: (1) one-year upstate; (2) one-year NYC; (3) two-year upstate; (4) alternate plan of study; and (5) students who were counseled out of the program.

(1 and 2): One-year upstate students and one-year NYC students complete the program within twelve (12) months of study, either at the Annandale-on-Hudson location of Bard College, or in our New York City location.

(3) We also offer a two-year program, which offers students the ability to take the same courses and number of credit hours as their one-year colleagues over an extended period of time. Students who select this pathway are typically unable or unwilling to give up their remunerative employment during their first year and a half in the program; these students stop working during their field placement, which takes place during the second half of their second year with the MAT.

(4) Students who come under the heading “alternate plan of study” are those who were flagged as being in danger of failing out of the program for a variety of reasons, and who opt to develop an alternate plan. This plan usually involves intensive one-on-one courses with individual faculty members and additional time for completion, for the purpose of improving their own performance in academic courses and better preparing for their field placement.

(5) In some cases, students taking an alternate plan still do not successfully complete the program. Each year, the MAT program has had at least one (1) student who has been counseled out because his/her performance in the program has failed to meet standards or requirements.

***N.B. The one exception to the sampling protocol***

**3. Presentation of the findings, the conclusions that faculty draws from the findings, and a discussion of the implications for the program**

Overall, this first audit provided some important information about the QCS. This simple set of targeted questions resulted in some insight into areas of weakness in the program, such as Support Services and Facilities for the NYC students. It also demonstrated that the QCS maps potentially critical dimensions of the program but that future audits might be constructed differently to provide further analysis of program design leading to improvements. For example, the cumulative data in the audit table does not tell demonstrate if the two (2) admitted students who did not meet undergraduate GPA requirements were the same two (2) students who did not meet requirements and were retained in the program. This would indicate that the audit raises useful questions that can only be answered by a second audit that returns to these particular questions for answers that are useful to the QCS and program design generally.

Audits in the manufacturing world (such as ISO) are often performed to determine how defects develop within the process and how to quickly remove defects so as to reduce wasted time and materials and, thus cost. This idea was translated to the MAT program to identify students at risk of failure sooner so additional support could be offered or they could be counseled-out sooner. The audit process will

continue to be developed for the purpose of refining the QCS in the hope of making progress with this challenging problem.

Conclusions: In discussing the QCS and the audit based in identified dimensions of the QCS, three questions need to be answered:

1. *How well is the QCS working for the program?*
2. *How well does the Audit serve as an assessment of the QCS? Are there ways in which the structures of the Audit format and process should be improved?*
3. *Is there evidence that the program was improved by institutional efforts and/or is there a plan to investigate whether the program was improved by the actions taken in the QCS?*

### ***How well is the QCS working for the program?***

Generally, the Audit reveals that the program's QCS is effective in addressing candidate learning and moving candidates to successful achievement of program outcomes. The Audit examined seven (7) program domains through a series of questions that directed faculty to examine particular data sources or indicators of program quality. In this discussion each area or domain, described above, will be reviewed in terms of the data collected. In some areas Audit questions prompted further questions by auditors that suggest possible changes to the QCS, and in other areas the data seems clear and useful as follows:

### **STUDENTS**

The audit reveals data consistent with program quality concerns from the perspective of candidate performance criteria from admissions through credit completion and final degree completion and recommendation for certification. In this domain, two (2) candidates were "counseled out" of, or failed the program, which is consistent with the Audit sampling strategy, and the data clearly shows two (2) responses of "no" to various questions in this domain that verify this. Though it is expected expect that some candidate will not graduate from the Bard College/MAT program, every failure raises questions about ways in which the incidences of failure or at least know that the failure is not based on program deficiencies in any area, from admissions through the clinical experience. Later domains of the audit are suggestive in this regard but it is impossible to construct a more useful and accurate narrative related to candidates who fail based on the simple data profile of the audit. This issue is discussed below in the analysis of the audit process itself.

Other related questions emerged as a result of the audit process. These questions need to be answered before moving ahead and have to do with candidates who do not complete the program. Was there a way to know sooner whether candidates who were ultimately counseled out *would* have been counseled out? If it's not obvious in the admissions process, when does it become obvious? Anecdotally, we

know a lot after the first grades are in (post summer quarter), but in actuality, many faculty members would agree that they can read signs of potential failure from the program much earlier (during summer quarter). Some faculty members issue early warning memos or grades, for example. Should a program-wide approach be instituted? Many of these questions should be explored in the context of the fourth domain of the QCS – Evaluating and Monitoring Students.

And finally, a question emerged as a result of data from the audit about consistency of information in the recruitment process and how this might be addressed during admissions. Specifically, applications for admission to the program routinely refer to applicants' desire to take the program as advertised: for example, a number of students are drawn to the teaching lab, especially because we say it is co-taught by an education faculty and a discipline faculty member. This is not consistently true due to faculty schedules and capacity. How the program is described need to be re-assessed so that it matches what actually happens, and/or to realign the program with the ideals that the program advertises and which attract so many prospective candidates, and/or ensure that the program consistently makes good on what is promised.

## **STUDENT SUPPORT**

In this area, the audit reveals that students consistently received or had access to the forms of support that would ensure their continual progress and development towards meeting graduation and certification requirements. However, further analysis of these areas of support as they relate to particular students would offer a better understanding of how well different supports actually function. Based on this initial audit, possibly a secondary analyses is needed to answer questions beyond simply determining if support systems were used. What is needed is to know if and which of these support elements are instrumental in advancing candidate learning.

Faculty are continually aware that this intensive one-year program challenges students in the area of time management as they balance a large and relentless workload. In the course of completing this audit, discussions prompted questions about possible structural changes that might address this particular issue of student support.

Is a week break between winter and spring quarters needed to allow (1) supervisors to complete write-ups from winter before launching into spring, (2) struggling students to have some down time and set fresh, manageable goals for the coming placement, and (3) administrators to meet with borderline students who need counseling about their status in the program?

## **PROGRAM AND COURSES**

Audit clearly demonstrates that the program structures and curriculum are in place and that there is a course evaluation component. What is not revealed in this first

audit is how courses are developed, vetted, and finally approved by the program and further questions should be added to the audit to allow the program to audit its course development and approval process.

## **EVALUATING AND MONITORING STUDENTS**

Audit reveals that the QCS is functioning effectively. That is, candidates receive grades and evaluations for all program components and are clearly informed of course and program expectations. However, in retrospect, some questions need to be added to the audit that get at other monitoring/feedback processes in ways that help to determine if these processes are consistent in form and intent across the program. For example: Are grading criteria clear and unequivocal in courses using an A-F grading scale? Do students receive a graded rubric or narrative that offers more particular feedback in courses that are graded as pass/fail? Were students falling below a GPA of 3.0 notified of their probationary status and received appropriate counseling/feedback? There is available documentation that could answer all these questions with the exception of providing counseling/feedback for probationary status.

In completing this audit, faculty members came to recognize that unofficial channels are available by which faculty members discuss with one another students who are in danger of failing or are not performing well in various ways. This prompted a series of questions that indicate possible next steps.

Is there a need to create more official channels or protocols? What might these look like? Should faculty be less tolerant of certain kinds of behaviors (i.e. regularly not completing readings or assignments for class) since faculty knows that almost no one overcomes those behaviors? What are the faculty's conclusions for further action? What modifications, for example, will the faculty make in QCS and program as a result of these findings and conclusions? What investigations will be taken to determine if those modifications are enhancing the quality of the program and the quality of student learning?

## **FACULTY**

The audit confirms that the program satisfies expectations of faculty preparation and evaluation processes. Again, there are questions that should be added to the next audit, as follows. Are faculty members given support for their scholarly/professional work? Are the majority of courses taught by dedicated full-time faculty members?

## **MENTOR TEACHERS**

Audit evidence clearly demonstrates that mentors are screened and meet basic requirements/standards as mentors. Since part of the QCS in this domain includes workshops and training for mentors, questions related to this aspect of mentor

recruitment/hiring should be added. Also, the selection process for mentors could be broken-out into more particular questions that would determine more about selection criteria and practices in terms of consistency across the program. For example, NYC mentor classrooms were visited and faculty watched mentors teach as part of the screening process. A more detailed breakout of the screening process should be reflected in audit questions but this will require additional documentation in the QCS.

## **FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLIES**

Generally, the audit provided confirmation that this dimension of the program is functioning as intended within the criteria and/or domains set by the QCS. One piece of information did emerge that merits further exploration. Student housing issues: NYC-based students are informed from the outset that they will not have access to Bard College housing during their time in NYC. Assistance is not offered to finding housing, and students are frequently surprised to find that they need to locate housing on their own, or at a loss to know how to do so. They also usually have limited time to find housing, as the upstate summer quarter ends shortly before the fall quarter begins in NYC. In addition, the program is unable to give the students adequate information about the location of both field placements so that they can secure housing that is nearby. In some cases, NYC-based students end up commuting quite far from their temporary homes to their placements.

## **FINANCIAL SUPPORT**

There are only two (2) questions that need to be considered as financial dimensions of the quality control system. Does the program consistently provide funding support to student candidates to ensure that the best candidates enroll in the program? And are faculty provided with professional support to stay active as scholars in their respective fields? In both instances, the answer is yes. Ninety percent of applicants receive fellowships/scholarships representing an average gift of 30% of tuition per student or approximately \$10,900 per student. Faculty not only receive support from the development office for grant applications, including research of available funding sources and grant writing support but also receive an annual discretionary research fund of \$1500 for professional memberships, subscriptions, purchase of research materials, conference fees, and travel. This fund was reduced by 10% in 2009-2010 as part of a campus wide budget reduction due to economic factors but it is expected to return to the original rate no later than 2012-2013. (Information for the coming fiscal year has not yet been released.)

***How well does the audit serve as an assessment of the QCS? Are there ways in which the structures of the Audit format and process should be improved?***

Each of the fifty-six (56) questions, with the exception of questions 55 and 56, is structured so that a response of “yes, no, or n/a” suffices as an evaluation of that quality. Generally, this structure seemed to have worked well though some

responses have raised further questions. The QCS audit reveals that program structures and procedures are generally consistent with program goals but raises questions in three (3) domains that merit further discussion:

1. The audit did reveal some areas of the QCS that need further exploration and may require program revisions.
2. The organization or structure of audit responses reveals some need for revision that would be helpful to data analysis.
3. The structure of some audit questions needs to be revisited to reduce ambiguity in audit data.

These three (3) areas are addressed in the paragraphs that follow.

The audit results reveal that the QCS is working for the program generally while raising a few questions. These questions have been included in the summary of audit results and reflections, organized according to the seven (7) QCS domains. The major questions raised have to do with that population of candidates who leave or are “counseled out” of the program and how systems of evaluation and monitoring, as well as student support, might be restructured to achieve a reduction in candidate failure through changes in the admissions process, earlier exits by candidates who may be predicted to fail through better monitoring, or – most optimistically – a system of feedback and support that would ensure all candidates admitted successfully complete the program. These and other QCS questions regarding faculty scholarship, housing, and consistency across recruitment information and program delivery suggest that further questions should be added to the audit process and the QCS to ensure that these issues are addressed and continually audited.

The audit was designed as a series of questions in which answers of “yes” to any question indicated that the program had satisfied its stated goals in the case of the selected student being used to assess various program dimensions and, with few exceptions, answers of “no” indicated some aspect of the program that merited further attention. The exceptional questions in the Audit were questions # 35, 54, 56, 57, and 71 and it may be worth revisiting the wording of these four (4) questions so that a simple scan of “yes/no” responses can serve as a general indication of compliance/consistency between program goals and the various dimensions of the program that support students in reaching these goals. For example questions #54-56 have to do with students seeking help or filing complaints that would indicate a possible problem in program functions. Each of these questions is framed as a question of whether students sought help in some form or filed complaints and a negative answer in each case suggest a positive outcome. Reversing the wording of such questions would allow the audit to quickly see that an answer of “no” deserves attention. As currently structured, an answer of “yes” would flag an area of concern for further consideration and a simple restructuring of these questions would provide for a quick and straightforward appraisal of the results of the Audit so that affirmative answers are consistently tied to positive results and negative answers to

results that raise questions. This is a minor factor in the Audit process but a suggested revision.

### **Closing Reflection**

The QCS and audit procedure need further work. Clearly, this audit process has already yielded useful insights, suggested changes, and helped program designers to think further about existing programs and how to monitor their effects on candidate learning. Next steps beyond what has already been discussed include further development of quality controls, especially as they relate to the clinical experience. The MAT program has recently developed full-year residency programs designed to offer a clinically rich experience that maximizes guided experiences in public school classrooms in the very contexts hopefully that graduates will choose to teach. Candidates connect graduate studies directly to classroom experiences, engaging pre-service teachers in the critical work of moving between theory and practice in ways that develop critical capacities.

Yet, the most critical 'audit' is assessing MAT program outcomes in terms of teacher success in public school classrooms and linking the work of in-service teaching to the effects of the MAT educational experience. To this end, Bard college has hired a faculty researcher – Karen Hammerness – and have contracted with an outside evaluation firm – Zajonc Corporation – to study the Bard College Urban Teacher Residency Program in New York City in ways that follow program graduates in their initial years of teaching. A recent FIPSE grant of \$774,000 is dedicated to funding this research and it the desire to disseminate initial analysis of first-year data by the fall of 2011. Without this measure the QCS and audit remain limited, unable to inform how well the program structures succeed within the scope of yearlong graduate achievement data. Knowing how this somewhat insular measure of program efficacy connects to teacher performance in classrooms is the question that teacher education has a responsibility to answer. It is known, after decades of research, only that it is not know what form of teacher preparation is most reliable in producing highly effective teachers. It is the hope that as the QCS and audit results connect to postgraduate performance that the MAT program can construct a pathway to teaching that answers to the needs of the nation's public schools.

***(The results of the audit are presented in the table below. All sixty-three [63] questions and answers are clearly shown based on a sampling of ten (10) Bard MAT candidates, selected according to the criteria described above.)***

**AUDIT TABLE: Showing results of the audit, based on a sample of ten (10) students.**

yes	no	n/a	Audit Questions	Comments
			<b>STUDENTS</b>	
			<b>I. Did student meet the Pre-application requirements?</b>	
8	2		a. Undergraduate major or equivalent in discipline	
2		8	b. additional coursework (if needed)	students are advised to take additional coursework in their chosen field if they did not major in that field or if their undergraduate degree is from a relatively weak undergraduate college. In this case it appears that both students who did not major in an equivalent discipline were advised to take additional courses before entering the MAT.
			<b>2. Did student meet admission requirements?</b>	
8	2		a. Undergraduate GPA of 3.0 or higher	How were these students admitted if they did not meet requirements? Do these numbers need to change? Were the students whose GPAs did not satisfy ALSO the students who did not make it through the program? In other words, could initial GPA actually be a flag against admission?
10			b. Undergraduate major/ concentration in approved field	
10			c. Application form	
10			d. Resume	
10			e. Personal Statement	
10			f. Positive Letters of Recommendation	
10			g. Official transcripts	
10			h. FAFSA forms for financial aid consideration	

2	1	7	I. additional statement and letters of recommendation for fellowships (if applicable)	students who apply for Petrie fellowships are supposed to submit an additional letter of recommendation and an additional statement. We need another set of questions indicating (1) whether a student applied for a Petrie, (2) whether they submitted adequate additional info. (I know that some students did not submit additional info though they were nevertheless granted Petrie fellowships.)
2		8	J. Interview (if required)	We often require interviews with students who are borderline for admission, or about whose materials we have significant questions, though we find them compelling enough to consider admission.
2		8	k. additional writing sample (if required)	Students with weak grades or who have majored in a different subject from their chosen field will sometimes be asked to submit writing samples from their chosen field in order to demonstrate their abilities in this area.
			<b>3. Application Review</b>	
10			a. Admission committee made up of discipline and education faculty members	
10			b. Rubric and applicant scorecard to review applicant	
10			c. Admission Committee review and ranking of applicant	
9		1	d. Fellowship award recommendation from admission committee	Did we actually recommend fellowships for 9 of these 10 students?
9		1	e. Financial Aid and fellowship award determinations by Dean and Director of Admission	
10			f. Acceptance/ denial/ waitlist and award letters sent to student	

			<b>4. Did student reflect program efforts to admit and retain-</b>	
9	1		a. Diverse students with demonstrated potential as teachers	
6	2	2	b. Teachers for high demand areas	WHY WOULD ANY BE n/a?
6	2	2	c. teachers for high need schools	WHY WOULD ANY BE n/a?
	5	5	<b>5. Did student change program areas after admission?</b>	WHY n/a?
		10	<b>6. Did any student transfer credit</b>	Program does not accept transfer credits toward MAT degree.
		10	<b>7. Did student take courses on-line?</b>	Program does not offer or accept online courses.
10			<b>8. Did student have plan of study that reflected program/degree requirements?</b>	Program has set curriculum.
8	2		<b>9. Did student meet requirements for program retention?</b>	
10			<b>10. Did student have adequate options for Fieldwork?</b>	
10			<b>11. Did student meet requirements for admission to practicum?</b>	Practicum occurs in stages in the Bard MAT. Students enter public schools in September and then again in January for NYC students and Feb for upstate students. All of the student probes included here met the requirements to enter practicum in September. Those two who were ultimately counseled out left the program during the second half of the year.
			<b>12. Did student complete program and degree requirements?</b>	
8	2		a. Required coursework	
8	2		b. graduate with GPA of 3.0 or higher	
8	2		c. Successfully completed all field e1perience requirements	

8	2		d. successfully completed and presented research projects	
8	2		<b>13. Was student recommended for certification in the area of study?</b>	
8	2		<b>14. Did student complete the degree in an appropriate timeframe?</b>	Student was given an additional quarter to complete required coursework.
			<b>STUDENT SUPPORT</b>	
10			<b>15. Was student assigned an advisor?</b>	
4	6		<b>16. Did student seek assistance from administration?</b>	
		10	<b>17. Did student receive any GATA support from the Program or campus?</b>	
3	7		<b>18. Did student use any of the campus support services?</b>	CECILIA, what were you referring to when you said Y/N here? We can't know if students took advantage of counseling etc. We will want to clarify that somewhere here, either in modifying the question or in the comments.
	10		<b>19. Did student file any complaints with the division of education or school of education and human development?</b>	
10			<b>20. Was student advised on proper dress and etiquette for the field placements?</b>	
10			<b>21. Was student advised of program and individual course requirements including requirements for student teaching and research projects?</b>	
10			<b>22. Was student made aware of the procedures regarding expulsion and or probation?</b>	

3		7	<b>23. Was student advised of his/her danger of probation or expulsion?</b>	Students are advised by the program administrators of their endangerment of probation or expulsion once GPAs are calculated for each academic quarter, or in instances where their performance in the field placement is egregiously poor.
4		6	<b>23. Was student advised of alternate plans for program completion?</b>	Students can be advised of alternate plans of study for a couple of reasons. If students are in danger of probation or expulsion, they may be advised to take an alternate path through the program in order to increase their chances of successful completion. Students may also be advised of alternate plans if they encounter a major change in their lives--such as pregnancy or loss of employment--and they request advisement. [does this explanation cover the situation of NU?]
10			<b>24. Did student receive their grades in a timely manner?</b>	
9		1	<b>25. Did student receive their quarterly reviews in a timely manner?</b>	Only students for which additional feedback was required would have received quarterly reviews. The numbers here reflect the fact that one student probe did not merit a QR.
10			<b>25. Did student receive feedback from their faculty and mentor teachers in a timely manner?</b>	
10			<b>26. Did student receive course syllabi and book lists prior to the start of each quarter?</b>	
8		2	<b>27. Did student receive help with preparing cover letters, resumes and practice interviews in preparation for applying for teaching jobs?</b>	The two students for whom this is n/a were counseled out of the program or left the program before this stage.
			<b>PROGRAM AND COURSES</b>	
10			<b>28. Were all course offerings approved by the program?</b>	Program has a set curriculum.

	10		<b>29. Did student have the option to choose which courses they would take during the program?</b>	Program has a set curriculum.
10			<b>30. Were all NYSED required courses offered to students?</b>	
10			<b>31. Were syllabi and booklists for all courses provided to student?</b>	
10			<b>32. Was student required to fill out course evaluations for all courses taken in the program?</b>	
8		2	<b>33. Did student receive placements in both middle and high school classrooms?</b>	The two students for whom this is n/a were counseled out of the program or left the program before this stage.
			<b>EVALUATING AND MONITORING STUDENTS</b>	
10			<b>34. Did student receive grades for their courses?</b>	
9	1		<b>35. Did student merit a quarterly review from faculty?</b>	
9	1		<b>35. Did student receive quarterly reviews from faculty?</b>	
10			<b>36. Was student made aware of the academic standards of the Program?</b>	
10			<b>37. Was student made aware of the program and individual course requirements?</b>	
10			<b>38. Did student receive scheduled visits from faculty to their student teaching placements?</b>	
10			<b>39. Did student receive formal evaluations of their student teaching from faculty?</b>	
10			<b>40. Did student receive formal evaluations and feedback on their student teaching from their Mentor Teachers?</b>	
			<b>FACULTY</b>	
10			<b>41. Were all or most courses taught by full time Program faculty members?</b>	
10			a. Was the faculty member hired pursuant to a national search?	

10			b. Did he/she have a doctorate in a field related to the course content?	
10			c. Was he/she reviewed periodically by faculty and administration prior to contract renewal?	
		10	d. Was he/she promoted and tenured within seven years of being hired?	There is no tenure-track for graduate faculty at Bard College. Faculty is reviewed in years 3, 5 and 10.
10			e. Was he/she reviewed periodically by faculty and administrators after contract renewal?	
10			f. Was he/she reviewed periodically by faculty and administration prior to promotion and or tenure?	There is no tenure-track for graduate faculty at Bard College. Faculty is reviewed in years 3, 5 and 10.
10			f. Were other courses taught by adjunct faculty members with an Ed. D or PhD. degree and relevant experience?	
10			g. Were courses evaluated by student using general or instructor-designed instruments?	
10			h. Did faculty use student feedback to improve courses?	
			<b>MENTOR TEACHERS</b>	
10			<b>42. Were mentor teachers interviewed or otherwise reviewed before being selected to mentor students?</b>	
10			<b>43. Were selected mentor teachers all current teachers, in good standing, with MA degrees or higher with at least three years of teaching experience?</b>	
			<b>FACILITIES, EQUIPMENT, AND SUPPLIES</b>	
10			<b>44. Were courses in classrooms of appropriate size with adequate seating for class?</b>	
10			<b>45. Were courses held in classrooms with suitable equipment and supplies?</b>	
10			<b>46. Were courses held in classrooms with adequate lighting, heat, and ventilation?</b>	

10			<b>47. Did student have access to Bard College library facilities?</b>	
5		5	<b>47. If Bard College Library is not accessible, did student have access to local public library facilities?</b>	Bard College library would not be accessible to students based in NYC. These students have access to local public library facilities.
10			<b>48. Did student have access to computer facilities?</b>	
10			<b>49. Did student have access to a separate student space or lounge?</b>	
2		8	<b>50. Did student have access to science lab space (if applicable)?</b>	
10			<b>51. was student given school placements in reliable and secure institutions supported by the Program and populated with mentor teachers approved by the Program?</b>	
4		6	<b>52. Did student have access to graduate dorms?</b>	All students have access to graduate dorms over the summer quarter, when the entire program's course offerings are held upstate. From the fall quarter forward, students designated as NYC-based do not have access to graduate dorms. Additionally, some students who have housing in the vicinity of the Annandale campus obviously choose to live at home.
10			<b>53. Did student have access to campus dining facilities?</b>	
10			<b>54. Did student have access to a campus gymnasium?</b>	

Data below is not based on questions but is as presented.				
			<b>FINANCIAL SUPPORT</b>	
90% @ 30%			<b>55. Are students offered fellowships/scholarships?</b>	Ninety percent of applicants receive some form of scholarship/fellowship at an average rate of 30% of the full tuition cost.
100% @ \$1500+			<b>56. Do faculty receive professional funding support?</b>	All faculty receive an annual research fund of \$1500.00 for discretionary use, though the fund was cut by 10% in fiscal year 2009-10 and 2010-11 as part of college wide budget reductions. Fund is expected to return to prior rate no later than 2012-13. Faculty also receive full support in obtaining research grants, including research of funding opportunities and grant writing services from the Bard College Development Office. There is one grants officer dedicated to MAT faculty support.



## References: Standards 1 and 2

- AACTE (2010, June 16-17). Reforming teacher preparation: The critical clinical component. Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- AACTE. (2010, March 11). *The clinical preparation of teachers—A policy brief*. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Abdallah, J. (2009, February 18). Lowering teacher attrition rates through collegiality. *Academics Leadership: The Online Journal*, 8(2). As retrieved from [http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical\\_research/531.shtml](http://www.academicleadership.org/emprical_research/531.shtml) in July 2010.
- Alter, J., & Coggshall, J. (2009). *Teaching as a clinical practice profession: Implications for teacher preparation and state policy* (Issue Brief). New York: New York Comprehensive Center; & Washington DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2007, September 30). Who leaves? Teacher attrition and student achievement. Working paper as found at <http://www.teacherpolicyresearch.org/portals/1/pdfs/Do%20Effective%20Teachers%20Leave.pdf> in July 2010.
- Boyd, D., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., Rockoff, J., & Wyckoff, J. (2007, September). The narrowing gap in New York City teacher qualifications and its implications for student-achievement in high-poverty schools. Working paper as found at [http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001103\\_Narrowing\\_Gap.pdf](http://www.caldercenter.org/PDF/1001103_Narrowing_Gap.pdf) in July 2010.
- Castle, S., Fox, R., & Souder, K. (2006). Do professional development schools (PDSs) make a difference? A comparative study of PDS and non-PDS teacher candidates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 57(1), 65-80.
- Croasmun, J., Hampton, D., & Herrmann, S. (1997). Teacher attrition: Is time running out? [Electronic Resource] Working Paper, School of Education, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Available electronically from <http://horizon.unc.edu/projects/issues/papers/Hampton.asp>. Retrieved July 2010.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2003). Wanted: A National Teach Supply Policy for Education: The Right Way to Meet the “Highly Qualified Teacher” Challenge. Stanford University, Volume 11, Number 33, Education Policy Analysis Archives.
- Education Week (2004), *Teacher Quality: Research shows that good teaching matters*. September 21, 2004.
- Education Week (2003), [\*Quality Counts 2003: ‘If I Can’t Learn from You...’\*](#) January 9, 2003.
- Fleener, C. E. (1998). A comparison of attrition rates of elementary teachers prepared through traditional undergraduate campus-based programs and elementary teachers prepared through centers for professional development and technology field-based programs by gender, ethnicity, and academic performance. Commerce: Texas A&M University.
- Goldhaber, D.D. & Brewer, D. J. (1996). Why don’t schools and teachers seem to matter? Assessing the impact of un-observables on educational productivity. *Journal of Human Resources*, 32(3), 505-520.
- Goodnough, A. (2004). Ms. Moffett’s first year. New York: Public Affairs.

- Hinds, M. (2002). *Teaching as a clinical practice: A new challenge for education*. Carnegie Challenge 2002. Carnegie Corporation of New York: New York.
- Ingersoll, R. (2003) Relationship between teacher preparation and beginning teacher attrition in the U.S. Analysis of national schools and staffing data. As found at <http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/SBECOnline/reprtdatarsch/tchrattremploy/Relationship%20Between%20Teacher%20Preparation%20and%20Beginning%20Teacher%20Attrition%20in%20the%20U.S.pdf> in July 2010.
- Kane, T., Rockoff, J., & Staiger, D. (2006) "What Does Certification Tell Us About Teacher Effectiveness? Evidence from New York City" NBER Working Paper 12155, April 2006.
- Kenreich, T., Hartzler-Miller, C., Neopolitan, J. E., & Wiltz, N. W. (2004, April). Impact of teacher preparation on teacher retention and quality. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Latham, N., & Vogt, W. (2007). Do professional development schools reduce teacher attrition? Evidence from a longitudinal study of 1,000 graduates. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 58.
- McKinney, S.E., Berry, R.Q., Dickerson, D.L., & Campbell-Whately, G. (2007) Addressing urban high-poverty school teacher attrition by addressing urban high-poverty teacher retention: Why effective teachers persevere. *Educational Research and Review*, 3, 1-9
- Mertens, S. B., Flowers, N., & Mulhall, P. (2002). The relationship between middle-grades teacher certification and teaching practices. In V. A. Anfara, Jr., & S. L. Stacki (Eds.), *Middle school curriculum, instruction, and assessment* (pp. 119-138). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Miller, G.M. (2004). Teacher attrition and retention. A staff report of the New York City Council Investigation Division. Retrieved from <http://www.nyc.gov/html/records/pdf/govpub/1024teachersal.pdf> in July 2010.
- Monk, D.H. (1994). Subject area preparation of secondary mathematics and science teachers and student achievement. *Economics of Education Review*, 13(2), 125-145.
- National Center for Education Statistics (2009). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09\\_108.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_108.asp) in July 2010.
- National Research Council. (2010). *Preparing teachers: Building evidence for sound policy*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- New York City Department of Education (2009). *High school graduation rate rises About 60 percent, marking the seventh consecutive year of gains*. Retrieved from <http://schools.nyc.gov/Offices/mediarelations/NewsandSpeeches/2008-2009/20090622> in July 2010.
- O'Donnell, P. (2010). Is 'highly qualified' really highly qualified? An examination of teacher quality measures and their impacts on student achievement. Georgetown University.
- Rice, J.K. (2003). Teacher quality: Understanding the effectiveness of teacher attributes. EPI Book
- Sanders, W.L. & Horn, S.P. (1998). Research findings from the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) Database: Implications for Educational Evaluation and Research. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*, 12(3), 247-256.

Sanders, W.L. & Rivers, J.C. (1996). "Cumulative and Residual Effects of Teachers on Future Student Academic Achievement," Knoxville, University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

Useem, E., Offenber, R., & Farley, E. (2007). *Closing the Teacher Quality Gap in Philadelphia: New Hope and Old Hurdles*. Philadelphia, PA.

### **Standard 3: Resources**

*The institution provides the unit with the necessary budget, qualified personnel, adequate facilities and other resources to prepare candidates effectively to meet the state-adopted standards for educator preparation. Sufficient resources are consistently allocated for effective operation of each credential or certificate program for coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Sufficient information resources and related personnel are available to meet program and candidate needs. A process that is inclusive of all programs is in place to determine resource needs.*

Bard College has the necessary office and classroom space, library resources, and funding to realize the goals of this program. Bard College currently offers graduate programs of comparable size and scope in Annandale-on-Hudson, NY; Bronx, NY; and Abu Dis, East Jerusalem. In all sites, including Delano, CA, the necessary infrastructure is in place to accommodate this program. In Delano, CA, start-up funding covers the cost of purchasing necessary and sufficient access to local university libraries in Bakersfield (CSUB) and Fresno (Fresno State) to allow all graduate students the necessary academic resources to fulfill requirements and expanding facilities as required to serve students and faculty at the Delano campus.

It is worth noting that the Bard College/MAT program is in the second year of an \$8.1 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education Teacher Quality Partnership program. This grant provides a living stipend to students who meet TQP criteria for the Bard College Rural Residency program, including a commitment to teach for at least three (3) years in a designated high-need school in the Central Valley of California. This grant also provides for research and evaluation that monitors the success of the Bard College MAT program in preparing highly effective teachers as well as supplementary support for program recruitment and development. Bard College is also the recipient of an ongoing grant from the Resnick Family Foundation, which supports program development through tuition fellowships to eligible students.

Bard College provides sufficient resources for effective operation of the single subject program which includes advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field based supervision, as well as full support for satisfaction of CCTC requirements related to obtaining the Single Subject Credential.

In addition to the roles of full-time and part-time teaching faculty, the following paid positions in the Bard College program in Delano, CA support the program goals and ensure that students satisfy core program requirements and successfully meet all CCTC requirements:

**Program Director:** the Bard College Dean of Teacher Education currently holds this position. This position provides administrative oversight with core responsibility for the

hiring and evaluation of faculty and the coordination of non-teaching personnel in the administration of the various dimensions of the educational program related to credentialing requirements.

**TPA Coordinator/Program Administrator:** The occupant of this position oversees all aspects of student progress and records and ensuring that students: have completed initial applications materials, have satisfied all CDE tests (CSET, CBEST, etc.) and provisions (for example, fingerprint and TB clearance) necessary to the completion of program, and have satisfactorily completed all requirements related to this credentialing program (CTAP, TPA tasks, etc.).

**Director of Classroom Practice:** This person is responsible for the integration of the MAT program and clinical experiences (ED517, 527, 537) at the core residency site – Paramount Bard Academy – as well as coordinating the selection, training, and follow-up with mentor teachers in regional partner schools for the fourth quarter clinical experience or apprenticeship cycle (ED547). The Director of Classroom Practice works closely with MAT field supervisors, classroom teacher mentors, and the TPA Coordinator/Program Administrator to track and support the progress of MAT candidates as it relates to CCTC requirements.

**Director of Graduate Studies:** This faculty member is directly responsible for the day-to-day quality of graduate courses, working closely with the Program Director in all aspects of hiring and evaluation of graduate faculty and working with the Program Administrator to monitor MAT student progress in the context of established academic expectations and policies. The Director of Graduate Studies also oversees the integration of graduate coursework in education and the disciplines, ensuring that curriculum and instruction satisfy program expectations and CCTC requirements.

The Bard College/MAT Program has been careful to allocate sufficient resources to ensure that this single-subject credentialing program is effectively addressing the critical dimensions of candidate development in each subject area from start to finish of the program. The college has committed resources to all dimensions of the program: coordination, admission, advisement, curriculum and professional development, instruction, field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences, and assessment management. Briefly, each of these components is supported in the following manner. Each dimension represents a significant commitment of human resources and capital.

**Coordination.** The program's current administrative team consists of the Dean of Teacher Education, Director of Classroom Practice, Director of Graduate Studies, Program Administrator, Director of Admissions, and Director of Recruitment. This administrative group guarantees coordination of all elements of the program through the yearlong course of study and field experiences. The Dean has primary responsibility for oversight and program quality with each of the other members of the administrative team working collaboratively while focusing on the continual improvement of a particular dimension of the program. These administrative roles are elaborated in the descriptions of resource dedication in the specific program areas described below.

**Admissions.** Resource allocation at the point of entry to the program means funding broad and effective recruitment strategies, a well articulated selection process, a thorough admissions process, and the ability to offer the best candidates levels of financial support that will allow them to devote their fullest energy to their studies and experiences during this one-year intensive program. The Bard College/MAT program supports one full-time Director of Recruitment and a second part-time recruiter devoted entirely to recruitment efforts in California for the Delano program. The recruitment budget is generous and supports a multimedia approach to promoting the program – print materials, radio, video, billboards – as well as an eight (8) month cycle of open houses, job and graduate fairs, and online information sessions. Once applications are received, a full-time faculty member dedicated to admissions follows applicants through the online application process, providing support and assistance as needed. A faculty admissions committee reviews all completed applications and all applications are scored by at least three (3) readers using a rubric. Accepted students are analyzed on the basis of economic need and qualifications and awarded appropriate and available financial support. The MAT Program is currently the recipient of a 5-year \$8.1 million federal Teacher Quality Partnership grant and a Resnick Family Foundation grant, which means the program is able to offer a \$30,000 living stipend and a \$20,000 tuition grant to eligible applicants.

**Advisement.** All graduate students are assigned a faculty advisor as a primary resource for guidance and support during the program. But it is worth recognizing that this program is committed to a cohort approach in which class sizes in any particular subject area are limited to fifteen (15) students. Additionally, with a current faculty-to-student ratio of 1:3, students receive a very individualized approach to their educational program and development. The Director of Classroom Practice and Director of Graduate Studies are committed to tracking the progress of each student through his/her clinical education and graduate studies, respectively. Faculty meet regularly to discuss student progress and grades and student performance are assessed on a regular basis and individual student needs addressed as indicated. At the midpoint through the end of the yearlong program, students receive group and individual advisement and support related to preparing for job placement, searching for positions, and attending appropriate job fairs.

**Curriculum and Professional Development:** There are two (2) dimensions of curriculum and professional development in the MAT program as it relates to graduate studies and to the clinical experience. The former domain falls within the scope of the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS) job description. The DGS advises all faculty on their professional/scholarly work, reviews and supports development of syllabi and instruction, evaluates faculty performance and recommends areas of growth, and makes sure that faculty members have the necessary scaffolds to support their continued growth and development. Each faculty member receives an annual research fund to cover costs of subscriptions, research materials, professional memberships, conference registration, and travel. Additional research support can be made available through an application process, including release time to pursue research and publication work.

**Instruction:** The quality of instruction also falls within the purview of the Director of Graduate Studies and is monitored and developed through a process of student evaluations, peer observations of teaching, and a model of co-teaching that requires all faculty to teach a course together, thereby ensuring an exchange of ideas and an implicit and continual process of thinking, observation, reflection, and critique of instructional quality. This co-teaching model is considerable commitment of resources but models a professional learning community at the graduate level that is instructive to the candidates as future teachers.

**Field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences:** The Director of Classroom Practice (DCP) oversees the field-based supervision and/or clinical experiences. The DCP recruits mentor teachers and coordinates partnerships between the program and partner schools. All mentor teachers are required to attend a weeklong Institute for Writing and Thinking workshop prior to serving as mentors and also attend half-day workshop sessions throughout the academic year. Mentors receive a stipend for their work. MAT faculty receives training in approaches to field supervision and are required to make site visits every other week throughout the clinical experience to ensure that candidates receive regular ongoing feedback.

**Assessment management:** The program administrator serves as the primary coordinator of assessment management, from the registration of course grades through the completion of TPAs and CDE required tests to the narrative evaluations of clinical work in the field. The program has invested in TaskStream software as one means of documenting candidate work and the assessment of that work over time. Candidates work with the program administrator and their faculty advisors to build a portfolio of their work over the year as a record of learning, development, and achievements. The program administrator maintains professional dossiers for all candidates with all assessment records on file, samples of candidate work, and electronic copies of the two (2) capstone research projects completed by each candidate as a requirement for degree completion. The program administrator monitors progress throughout the academic year and ensures that standards and the implementation of policies related to academic performance are met in a timely manner.

#### **Standard 4: Faculty and Instructional Personnel**

***Qualified persons are employed and assigned to teach all courses, to provide professional development, and to supervise field-based and/or clinical experiences in each credential and certificate program. Instructional personnel and faculty have current knowledge in the content they teach, understand the context of public schooling, and model best professional practices in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service. They are reflective of a diverse society and knowledgeable about diverse abilities, cultural, language, ethnic and gender diversity. They have a thorough grasp of the academic standards, frameworks, and accountability systems that drive the curriculum of public schools. They collaborate regularly and systematically with colleagues in P-12 settings/college/university units and members of the broader, professional community to improve teaching, candidate learning, and educator preparation. The institution provides support for faculty development. The unit regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors and field supervisors, recognizes excellence, and retains only those who are consistently effective.***

The Bard College/MAT program faculty consists of a distinguished full-time core group faculty supplemented by affiliated instructors who also have appointments in the Bard College undergraduate program. Faculty members helped create the MAT program and are committed to teaching courses in their disciplines at the graduate level.

Bard College-Delano Campus has employed qualified persons to teach all courses and will continue to maintain the highest academic standards when selecting future employees. Beginning June 2010, the campus is staffed by five (5) full-time graduate faculty, three (3) visiting faculty, three (3) administrative positions (TPA Coordinator/Program Administrator, Director of Classroom Practice, Director of Graduate Studies), the teaching faculty and administration of the Paramount Bard Academy (which provides the basis for the residency experience from August through March), and the regular presence of the Dean of Teacher Education as Program Director.

The full-time faculty is comprised of three (3) PhDs in relevant areas of education, one (1) PhD in English literature, a Director of Classroom Practice who oversees and guides the clinical dimensions of the program, and the TPA Coordinator/Program Administrator, responsible for coordinating TPA completion and other organizational aspects of the CCTC requirements. Part-time faculty, teaching courses in the disciplines, include two (2) PhDs in history and a PhD in English literature. All visiting faculty are expected to teach across three (3) semesters, creating continuity of instruction and sustained and supportive relationships with students in an instructional and advisory capacity. Supplemental faculty are selected from the main campus in New York and from the teaching community in Kern enhances program quality by bringing employees knowledgeable about issues facing California schools to the MAT program's instructional setting.

Bard College will continue to recruit faculty and students from "groups historically underrepresented in such programs." Faculty recruitment is advertised in broad postings

of job listings and student recruitment includes focused outreach to colleges and universities that consistently demonstrate high levels of representation from these groups. Every effort is made to hire faculty with experience and expertise in addressing the problems of “high-need” schools. Faculty will be recruited and hired from applicants who possess experience working with such schools as well as a research background in issues related to urban education, English Language Learners, and students from low-income backgrounds. Bard College-Delano continues to approach school districts in the south central valley as partner schools for the program that fit the “high-needs” profile.

A combination of full and part-time faculty teach the credit-bearing education courses and supervise student teachers. The maximum teaching load for education faculty will be three (3) graduate courses in a given quarter or one (1) graduate course and the supervision of five (5) student teachers (equivalent to one course). Additionally, faculty will have shared responsibility for one (1) advisory group of no more than fifteen (15) students with at least one (1) other faculty member. Faculty will be expected to teach for three (3) of the four (4) academic quarters, with each quarter ten (10) weeks in length.

NOTE: On the chart that follows, the projected number of faculty to be hired is dependent on enrollment and sufficient tuition revenue. For example, in the first year of the program there were insufficient numbers of eligible applicants in math and biology and the hiring of faculty in these content areas was not necessary or possible. Similarly, the first cohort of students is made up of twenty (20) students so the budget allowed for four (4) full-time faculty hires and three (3) other part-time hires as visiting faculty. However, to ensure that the goal of having sustained faculty-student relationships and support is enhanced, visiting faculty were hired to teach during the first three (3) of the four (4) quarters. Thus, this chart is a projection of faculty configurations once the program has reached initial capacity.

**Full-Time Faculty**

Name	Tenure Status	% of time to program	No. of Program courses taught annually	All earned Degrees, with Specific Title/Areas of Specialization	K-12 Teaching Experience/Certification
<b>Faculty #1, #2, #3, #4</b>	TT	100%	6	Ed.D or Ph.D. in Education in the areas of: Cognitive/Developmental Psychology, Curriculum Theory and Design, Technology in Education, Reading/Writing/Literacy, Assessment, Special Learning Needs, and/or Diversity Issues	All faculty teaching courses in education must have public school teaching experiences with certification in the subjects they taught and one (1) faculty member should hold a Certificate for Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities. A portion of the faculty should have experience in urban education or “high-need” schools
<b>Faculty #5 and #6</b>	TT	100%	6	Ph.D Math or Ph.D. Math Education, M.S. Math or Math Education, B.S. Math	At least one (1) faculty member must have public school teaching experience and hold a valid certificate for teaching Math (7-12)
<b>Faculty #7 and #8</b>	TT	100%	6	Ph.D Physics or Ph.D. Physics Education, M.S. Physics or Physics Education, B.S. Physics	At least one (1) faculty member must have public school teaching experience and hold a valid certificate for teaching Physics (7-12)
<b>Faculty #9 and #10</b>	TT	100%	6	Ph.D English or Ph.D. English Education, M.S. English or English Education, B.S. English	At least one (1) faculty member must have public school teaching experience and hold a valid certificate for teaching English (7-12)
<b>Faculty #11 and 12</b>	TT	100%	6	Ph.D History or Ph.D. History Education, M.S. History or History Education, B.S. History	At least one (1) faculty member must have public school teaching experience and hold a valid certificate for teaching History (7-12)

Please note that faculty information is to show that the instructor of every pedagogical course has expertise in that pedagogical area.

The Bard College/MAT program is structured to support close collaboration between faculty and candidates that serves program goals and reflects the organizational structures that are desirable for any institution concerned with improving education. Bard College is currently actively involved in various exemplary educational initiatives, such as:

- 1 Math for America --- a funded partnership to recruit, educate, and retain highly educated and effective math teachers in “high-need” schools.
- 2 Paramount Bard Academy in Delano, CA --- a public school established by the Bard College/MAT program and Paramount Farming Company, with funding from the Resnick Foundation (as a charter in 2009) to serve as a model educational program, an early college high school option for students in the region, and the campus and site for residency experiences for the Bard College/MAT program.
- 3 The Teacher Quality Partnership Program --- an \$8.1M grant to support student recruitment, three (3) years of mentoring support to graduates during their induction cycle, and professional development outreach to regional schools through the Bard College/MAT Rural Residency Program in Delano, CA.
- 4 Bard High School Early College in Manhattan and Queens, NY--- providing and exemplary model of public high school and college education in which all students graduate with a two-year Bard College degree.
- 5 The Institute of Writing and Thinking --- offering nationally recognized workshops for teachers at all levels and consulting work with public and private secondary schools. Many of the Institute’s associates are Bard College faculty from a variety of disciplines.
- 6 Carroll and Milton Petrie Foundation --- funded support for inception and advancement of the Bard College/MAT Urban Teacher Residency Program housed at the International Community High School, a New York City high-need public school in the Bronx, NY.
- 7 Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) grant --- to support research and development that will inform revision and expansion of the Bard College MAT teacher residency programs.

Bard College is experienced in engaging in dialogue and cooperation necessary for any project that attempts to foster broad changes in education. English, history, math, and physics faculty have worked closely with the Associate Director of the Institute for Writing and Thinking and the Associate Dean of Academic Affairs to develop graduate courses in the disciplines for this proposal that address the issues of secondary teaching. Each course promotes expertise in a discipline while challenging MAT candidates to think differently about teaching and learning in their respective disciplines. A laboratory strand that highlights “teaching practice” creates a bridge between courses in education and the major disciplines while providing a counterpoint to what occurs in the college classroom that provides for further reflections.

Education faculty and faculty in the arts and sciences share primary responsibility for the development of the MAT program. Full-time faculty in the major disciplines are hired

for the education graduate program with the primary responsibility for working with education faculty in designing and implementing the program. Two (2) faculty members will facilitate the advisory component with each candidate cohort within a major discipline; one (1) faculty member from education and one (1) from the pertinent discipline. Similarly, faculty from across the college collaborates to support projects in the public schools connected with the MAT program. Such work reflects a now common idea/ideal. Researchers from the Middle-School Mathematics Application Project, for example, argue “we have evolved educational institutions that have obscured the relation between what has to be learned by children and what they need to know as adults.” (Greeno, McDermott et al. 1999) Their answer to this problem and to the improvement of education in general is that teachers, researchers, and mathematicians (physicists, historians, etc.) need to work together in classrooms to build curricula and pedagogy with close attention to students who are the focus of this work. It is this recognition that guides the structure of the Bard College/MAT program and the institution’s continuing commitment to collaboration across the college and with the public schools.

Faculty and other personnel are selected with regard to their understanding of the issues facing public schooling in California – including the broad economic issues stemming from years of deficit spending, ballot initiatives that all impact the student and the teacher in the classroom. Also facing schools in California is the broad diversity of the more than six (6) million children attending public school include the achievement gap between minority groups, as well as the divide between the socio-economic groups who attend rural, urban and suburban school.

California developed an accountability system that requires a rigorous adherence to the state adopted content standards and curriculum frameworks. Instruction at the Bard College/MAT program is intended to provide each candidate with a clear understanding of how the accountability system drives public education in California. All courses and fieldwork experience provide candidates the opportunity to move from theory and the study of the accountability system to actually working within the system.

It is important to note that all faculty members are also involved in the daily life of the MAT operated public charter school, the Paramount Bard Academy (PBA). They work on an ongoing basis to support teacher development and, by necessity, are fully acquainted with the California Curriculum Standards and the state tests that are administered to assess student competencies in all subject areas. Almost all faculty serve as BTSA providers to new teachers at PBA and have received the full course of BTSA training from the Kern County Superintendent of Schools. Thus, they are well acquainted with the critical connections between mandated teacher competencies and their integration with California Standards.

## **Standard 5: Admission**

*In each professional preparation program, applicants are admitted on the basis of well-defined admission criteria and procedures, including all Commission-adopted requirements. Multiple measures are used in an admission process that encourages and supports applicants from diverse populations. The unit determines that admitted candidates have appropriate pre-professional experiences and personal characteristics, including sensitivity to California's diverse population, effective communication skills, basic academic skills, and prior experiences that suggest a strong potential for professional effectiveness.*

The Bard College/MAT program is defined by characteristics of active inquiry and mutual respect that support learning and professional growth. Creating a collaborative educational community begins with the selection of a talented, energetic and diverse cohort of candidates during the admission process.

Program applicants must have received a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution in the liberal arts with a major (or equivalent) in the discipline they intend to study in the MAT program. Applicants are accepted into the program on the basis of an assessment of various components: records of academic achievement that show a minimum cumulative GPA average of at least 3.0; evaluation statements included in the letters of reference and professional goals.

Applicants must provide a personal statement that explains the applicant's commitment to teaching and interest in the unique educational needs of public school students in the southern Central Valley. Applicants also need an additional letter of recommendation from an individual who can describe the applicant's interests, strengths, experiences, and/or motivations for applying to a teaching program structured for public education in the southern Central Valley. All applicants participate in an interview with the MAT Program admissions committee. This committee is comprised of the program director, program faculty and administrators from local participating school districts.

Applicants are required to complete an application found on line at [www.bard.edu/mat/admission-and-financial.aid](http://www.bard.edu/mat/admission-and-financial.aid). Included with the application the applicant must submit the following materials:

1. Completed online application form
2. \$65 application fee
3. Personal statement explaining why the applicants has chosen to pursue a career in teaching through the Bard College/MAT program
4. Resume
5. Official transcripts from all undergraduate and graduate schools attended for at least one (1) academic year, regardless of whether credits were transferred to another institution or a degree was received
6. Three (3) letters of recommendation
7. California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST)
8. Tuberculosis clearance

9. California Commission on Teaching Credentialing certificate of Clearance or other CCTC credentials
10. Subject matter competence through either a California Subject Matter Waiver Program or passage of the appropriate CSET examination prior to the beginning of the student teaching or apprenticeship cycle.

## **Standard 6: Advice and Assistance**

*Qualified members of the unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist each candidate's professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The institution and/or unit provide support and assistance to candidates and only retain candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession. Evidence regarding candidate progress and performance is consistently utilized to guide advisement and assistance efforts*

Bard College/MAT candidates are assessed on an ongoing basis with critical cycles of evaluation carried out at the end of each of the four (4) quarters by the graduate faculty and teacher mentors. The administrative team of the Program Administrator, Director of Classroom Practice, and Director of Graduate studies monitor this process and intervene as needed to provide the necessary counseling and support to help promising candidates succeed and to counsel those out of the program who are not meeting program criteria or seem otherwise unsuited to the teaching profession as determined by consistent and successive assessments.

The Bard College/MAT program subscribes to a cohort model, limiting class size to fifteen (15) candidates per academic discipline and ensuring that all faculty members are effectively full-time, able to build constructive relationships and advise students on an ongoing and continual basis. Simple indicators, such as class attendance and punctuality, regular and timely submission of assignments, active and responsive participation in graduate and public school classrooms, are monitored regularly by faculty and communicated to the administrative team as necessary. Therefore, candidates are well known to the faculty and each other so that progress or lack thereof is consistently visible to all. Candidates are encouraged to form study groups, seek out faculty for assistance as necessary, and are provided with clear guidelines to monitor their own progress in the form of elaborated syllabi, regular faculty feedback, and a clearly articulated set of expectations laid out in the graduate student handbook.

Academic progress is monitored through conventional measures of assessment associated with coursework and expectations set out in courses syllabi. Students must maintain a GPA of 3.0 or better and, unlike most graduate programs, the Bard College/MAT program adheres to a grading policy that reflects more nuanced feedback in terms of student performance. Criteria for a grade span of A-F are associated with all courses, rather than the more common practice in graduate schools of awarding grades of A or B. In this way, the program remains consistent with an idea that the increased challenges of graduate school offer opportunities for broad levels of achievement and ensure that faculty grading policies can communicate a range of competency within course expectations.

Additionally, a review is completed by faculty on "as indicated" basis at the end of each academic quarter. This quarterly review provides an opportunity for faculty to address concerns that they believe will be helpful and critical to a student's success in the

program. Because the quarterly review is not part of the student's permanent academic folder, rather focuses on those aspects of a student's work that affect their performance, it is a safe but important way to address and highlight challenges and make suggestions that should reflect and remind students of feedback throughout the quarter that is important to address in the context of continued improvement.

Professional or clinical performance is monitored by advising faculty, the field supervisor, the mentor teacher, and the Director of Classroom Practice with each of these parties assuming slightly different roles and responsibilities through the cycle of residency or apprentice experiences throughout the yearlong program. These parties communicate regularly with each other and with the apprentice to address apprentice performance and development. The Tracking of Progress (TOP) form is the primary instrument for assessment and evaluation and guides formal and informal classrooms observations, quarterly evaluations, the final evaluation, and instructional interactions and feedback sessions between the apprentice and his/her advisors/mentors/field supervisors. Field supervisors work closely with mentors. MAT faculty trains mentors, and on-site supervision visits are scheduled at a minimum of every other week.

Attached below is the Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form used by both college supervisors and mentors to evaluate each candidate's performance. It is directly aligned with the Teaching Performance Expectations.

Name of apprentice: \_\_\_\_\_  
Mentor: \_\_\_\_\_  
School Site: \_\_\_\_\_

**Grading Scale:**

**NA – not applicable; not yet evaluated**

**1 – not present: The apprentice has not demonstrated these skills or aptitudes.**

**2 – minimal: The apprentice has demonstrated these skills or aptitudes minimally and sporadically.**

**3 – emerging: The apprentice’s skills/aptitudes in this area are early in their development but are regularly present.**

**4 – developing: The apprentice’s skills/aptitudes in this area are average to above average, are continuing to grow, and are regularly present.**

**5 – thoroughly: The apprentice has mastered these skills/aptitudes.**

## Tracking of Progress (TOP) Form

### Planning and Preparation

\_\_\_\_\_ a) **Effective planning:**

**TPE 4: Candidates for a teaching Credential incorporate specific strategies, teaching/instructional activities, procedures and experiences that address state-adopted academic content standards for students in order to provide a balanced and comprehensive curriculum.**

**TPE 6: Candidates for a Single Subject Teaching Credential establish intellectually challenging academic expectations and provide opportunities for students to develop advanced thinking and problem-solving skills.**

**TPE 7: Candidates for a Single Subject Teaching Credential know and can apply pedagogical theories, principles and instructional practices for comprehensive instruction of English learners.**

**TPE 8: Candidates for a Teaching Credential draw upon an understanding of patterns of child and adolescent development to understand their students.**

**TPE 9: Candidates for a teaching Credential plan instruction that is comprehensive in relation to the subject matter to be taught and in accordance with state-adopted academic content standard for students.**

The apprentice...

\_\_\_\_ Creates objectives that are clear and realistic.

\_\_\_\_ Anticipates different learner needs in planning

\_\_\_\_ Ensures that each lesson fits within a sequence of unit plans and yearlong goals

\_\_\_\_ Plans activities that are appropriate to desired learning outcomes

\_\_\_\_ Plans activities that are authentic to disciplinary practice

\_\_\_\_ Is thorough but flexible in her/his planning

\_\_\_\_ Submits lesson plans to mentor in advance, according to the schedule preferred by the mentor

\_\_\_\_ Provides clear instruction for ELL students

\_\_\_\_\_ b) **Assessments and feedback:**

**TPE 3: Candidates for a teaching Credential understand and use a variety of informal and formal, as well as formative and summative assessments, to determine students' progress and plan instruction.**

The apprentice...

- Provides explicit, transparent, and useful feedback on a regular basis
- Designs assessments that are appropriate for age and ability levels of students
- Uses a variety of evaluative tools and data sources to assess learning
- Modifies plans in light of ongoing assessment

#### **The Discipline**

**TPE 1: Candidates for a Single Subject Credential demonstrate the ability to teach the state-adopted academic content standards for students in grades 7-12.**

a) The apprentice's plans and instruction are based on a firm grasp of the subject matter

b) The apprentice communicates passion for and mastery of the discipline while satisfying national and state learning standards

c) The apprentice links subject matter to other areas of knowledge within and beyond the discipline

#### **Instruction**

a) **Role of teacher in classroom:**

**TPE 4**

**TPE 6**

**TPE 10: Candidates for a teaching Credential allocate instructional time to maximize student achievement in relation to state-adopted academic content standards for students, instructional goals and scheduled academic tasks.**

The apprentice...

- Demonstrates effective pacing and clear communication.
- Adjusts plans to the needs and (when appropriate) interests of the students
- Draws on a variety of appropriately chosen instructional resources

b) **Role of students in classroom:**

**TPE 7**

**TPE 5: Candidates for a teaching Credential clearly communicate instructional objectives to students.**

The apprentice...

- Attempts to engage all students in classroom activity
- Addresses needs of ELL students.

#### **Learning Environment**

a) **Classroom procedures:**

**TPE 2: Candidates for a teaching Credential use progress monitoring at key points during instruction to determine whether students are progressing adequately toward achieving the frameworks and state-adopted academic content standards for students.**

The apprentice...

- Establishes effective classroom routines that support student learning
- Creates opportunities for students to take responsibility for their own learning
- Manages technological resources efficiently

\_\_\_\_ Anticipates logistics of a classroom: materials are ready; appointments with other personnel, such as librarians or AV specialists, have been arranged in advance; student movements in the room have been anticipated and planned for.

\_\_\_\_ **b) Management of student behavior:**

**TPE 8**

**TPE 11: Candidates for Teaching Credential develop and maintain clear expectations for academic and social behavior.**

\_\_\_\_ The apprentice monitors and appropriately addresses disruptive behaviors

\_\_\_\_ **c) Classroom climate:**

**TPE 11**

\_\_\_\_ The apprentice establishes a climate of fairness and respect

### Professional Responsibilities

\_\_\_\_ **a) Record-keeping:** The apprentice...

\_\_\_\_ Maintains an accurate grade book

\_\_\_\_ Makes a practice of recording student behavior and parent/guardian contacts

\_\_\_\_ Returns papers to students promptly

\_\_\_\_ **b) Professionalism:**

**TPE 12: Candidates for a Teaching Credential take responsibility for student academic learning outcomes.**

The apprentice...

\_\_\_\_ Meets deadlines, is punctual, has regular attendance, and is positive.

\_\_\_\_ Recognizes need for support and seeks expertise from others as needed

\_\_\_\_ Dresses professionally in a manner acceptable to the culture of the school

\_\_\_\_ Enforces policies of the school, follows procedures established by the school's administration

\_\_\_\_ Keeps deadlines and appointments set by mentor teacher

\_\_\_\_ Communicates with parents/guardians\* <sup>2</sup>

\_\_\_\_ Is aware of legal responsibilities as mandated by the state

\_\_\_\_ **c) Collegiality:**

**TPE 13: Candidates for a Teaching Credential evaluate their own teaching practices and subject matter knowledge in light of information about the state-adopted academic content standards for students and student learning.**

The apprentice...

\_\_\_\_ Establishes connections with other professionals in the department and the school

\_\_\_\_ Collaborates with fellow teachers as needed to foster student learning

### **Standard 7: Field Experience and Clinical Practice**

*The unit and its partner's design, implement, and regularly evaluate a planned sequence of field-based and clinical experiences in order for candidates to develop and demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support all students effectively so that P-12 students meet state-adopted academic standards. For each credential and certificate program, the unit collaborates with its partners regarding the criteria for selection of school sites, effective clinical personnel, and site-based supervising personnel. Field-based work and/or clinical experiences provide candidates opportunities to understand and address issues of diversity that affect school climate, teaching, and learning, and to help candidates develop research-based strategies for improving student learning.*

The field-based clinical experience is structured to maximize learning and preparation over the course of a year-long residency that integrates graduate coursework with guided developmental experiences in public school classrooms. The purpose is to develop graduates who demonstrate the necessary skills and knowledge to become highly effective teachers who help all students satisfy or exceed state-adopted academic expectations for high school completion and success in college. Field experiences are carefully structured and monitored by graduate faculty and experienced teachers, acting as researchers and practitioners, respectfully, who observe, assess, and provide feedback to MAT apprentices as they learn the craft of teaching populations of students typical of the students they will teach as aspiring professionals in regional schools

One critical dimension of the field or clinical experience is the field placement. A process for the recruitment and training of mentor teachers has been carefully constructed to ensure that mentors provide the clinical guidance, instructional expertise and modeling necessary to develop highly effective teachers who are exemplary and reflect program values that are aligned with CCTC expectations. Mentors are recruited through two (2) activities: through direct outreach to regional school districts and through professional development programs offered by the Bard College/MAT program and its partner Institute for Writing and Thinking (IWT). Teachers are advised of program expectations and may apply to be mentors.

Mentors must satisfy certain criteria and sign contracts that set expectations for their work as mentors and their collaboration with the MAT program. Mentors must possess a Clear Credential in the Single Subject area that is the focus of their apprentice, have at least five (5) years experience of teaching, and be recommended by their building principal and at least one (1) colleague. Mentors must agree to engage in professional development activities provided by the MAT program prior to and during the course of the academic year, must assess the MAT apprentice using the Tracking of Progress (TOP) form, must meet for a minimum of one (1) instructional period per week for the sole and explicit purpose of providing the MAT apprentice with specific evidence-based feedback on his/her progress using the framework of the TOP form and CCTC standards, must conduct formal observations of apprentice teaching as specified by the MAT program expectations, must communicate regularly with the MAT field supervisor, must complete a final written evaluation of the MAT apprentice work at the end of a cycle,

must attend the end-of-the-year Classroom Research Project colloquium, and must write a letter of recommendation for the MAT candidate if asked to do so.

The field experience is a year-long residency designed as a developmental sequence that moves the MAT candidate from classroom observer through cycles of tutoring that emphasize the development of diagnostic skills and instruction that addresses individual learning needs through increasing collaboration with the mentor teacher and finishes with the apprentice taking primary responsibility for all aspects of classroom instruction, student learning, assessment, recordkeeping, and all other dimensions of managing a classroom as a rich and successful learning environment. An emphasis on addressing the needs of diverse learners and issues of English language acquisition in inclusive classrooms is acknowledged in preparatory coursework – ED514, ED524, ED522, ED526-527, ED532-542 – and is put into practice during the yearlong cycle of practice in public school classrooms.

MAT candidates receive ample training in research and apply this learning in the field experience context to implementing strategies for teaching and learning that emerge from the most reliable research base. Specifically, MAT candidates are expected to engage in assessment that informs teaching decisions and student learning, using student work and interactions as the basis for making key instructional decisions. These expectations are well served and monitored by TPA tasks but also by the Classroom Research Project, ED518, that represents a cumulative application of what the apprentice has learned throughout the year in a research effort that follows the model of the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards process for meeting the standards of National Board Certification.

**Standard 8: District-Employed Supervisors**

*District-employed supervisors are certified and experienced in either teaching the specified content or performing the services authorized by the credential. A process for selecting supervisors who are knowledgeable and supportive of the academic content standards for students is based on identified criteria. Supervisors are trained in supervision, oriented to the supervisory role, evaluated and recognized in a systematic manner.*

As described above, the selection and training of mentors is a carefully constructed process. Mentors are recruited through two (2) activities; through direct outreach to regional school districts and through professional development programs offered by the Bard College/MAT program and its partner Institute for Writing and Thinking. Teachers are advised of program expectations and may apply to be mentors.

Mentors must satisfy certain criteria and sign contracts that set expectations for their work as mentors and their collaboration with the MAT program. Mentors must possess a Clear Credential in the Single Subject area that is the focus of their apprentice, have at least five (5) years experience of teaching, and be recommended by their building principal and at least one (1) colleague. Mentors must agree to engage in professional development activities provided by the MAT program prior to and during the course of the academic year, must assess the MAT apprentice using the Tracking of Progress (TOP) form, must meet for a minimum of one (1) instructional period per week for the sole and explicit purpose of providing the MAT apprentice with specific evidence-based feedback on his/her progress using the framework of the TOP form and CCTC standards, must conduct formal observations of apprentice teaching as specified by the MAT program expectations, must communicate regularly with the MAT field supervisor, must complete a final written evaluation of the MAT apprentice work at the end of a cycle, must attend the end-of-the-year Classroom Research Project colloquium, and must write a letter of recommendation for the MAT candidate if asked to do so.

Mentors are trained in their first year and continue to attend professional development workshops and graduate courses provided by the Bard College/MAT program throughout the span of their mentoring service. The goal of the MAT program is not only to develop experienced and effective mentors but also to contribute to the continued improvement of public schools by supporting continued teacher development. Mentors receive stipends for their work and free access to professional development activities. They are granted status as adjunct faculty to the Bard College program with corresponding expectations of professionalism, collaboration, and community participation. Mentors are regularly evaluated by MAT faculty through observations and common participation in the mentoring process as well as by MAT candidates through MAT candidate course evaluations.

## An Explanation of the College Partnership with Classroom Teachers

The Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) Program at Bard College is uniquely configured, requiring pre-service teachers to engage in advanced study in their elective discipline and graduate study in key areas of education. This course of study is integrated with a sequence of classroom experiences that constitute an extended apprenticeship.

At the center of the apprenticeship experience is the public school teacher who serves as a mentor to the pre-service teacher. In an effort to support effective mentoring and contribute to continued improvement of teaching and learning, the MAT Program has structured partnerships with public school teachers that advance central principles of this teacher education program.

Mentor teachers become, in effect, adjunct faculty to the program and certain expectations are integral to the program's collaborative work as a professional educational community. There are three (3) dimensions to the mentor work and, presently, teachers may elect to participate in various dimensions of the work. Some teachers may elect to participate in only option #1 or option #2, as described below. Some may elect to work through all three (3) options, though it should be understood that option #3 is only an option if it is taken in tandem with option #2, which is a necessary prerequisite to the graduate-level research. The program's long-term intention is that teachers will regularly participate fully, engaging in all three aspects of the work in a given academic year.

### **The three dimensions of the work are as follows:**

- 1) **Mentoring** –A MAT graduate student apprentice will be in the classroom for eleven (11) weeks. Mentors are required to attend a series of workshops at Bard College. The purpose of these workshops is to build a learning community across school districts and advance a different idea of what it means to mentor. These efforts are directed at helping create effective “teachers of teachers” and these workshops are informed by current research in teacher education, trends and issues facing California public schools, alignment of curriculum with the State Adopted Content Standards and Curriculum Frameworks along with the California Standards for the Teaching Profession and the Teacher Performance Expectations. There is no additional stipend for this summer workshop sequence. All teachers receive a mentoring stipend of \$1000 for their work with an apprentice.
- 2) **Professional Development** – Because the MAT Program places a first emphasis on disciplinary practice as the basis for teaching and learning, a workshop sequence is offered during the school year that engages mentors in the study of history, literature, mathematics, or biology that also includes linking the content to the California State Adopted Academic Content Standards. This workshop sequence is developed and implemented by a composite of faculty from education

and the disciplines. By the end of the workshop cycle, mentor teachers are expected to have engaged with their disciplines, refreshing/maintaining their interests and broadening their knowledge and understanding, while simultaneously considering how their learning provides a practical model for teaching and learning in their own classrooms. These workshops meet in the evenings throughout the school year and for one (1) full day of course immersion during the school year. School districts have been generous in supporting this one-day experience by providing professional release time. The cost of the workshops themselves is borne by the MAT Program.

- 3) **Graduate Coursework** – Teachers who wish to advance their classroom practice, as an extension of their own learning, may elect to carryout a graduate-level research project with advisement from MAT faculty. Typically, this research project addresses two (2) dimensions of their teaching. First, it requires teachers to advance their own learning in a subject area by carrying out research in an area that has practical implications for their work in the classroom. Second, it requires teachers to examine their work as educators in the context of a classroom research project that answers some question about the quality of student learning with the goal of improving teaching through revisions of curriculum and pedagogy. Teachers are awarded graduate credit for this work and school districts have supported this aspect of the teacher work by allowing it to satisfy annual professional development requirements as applicable. The cost of administering this coursework is borne in full by the MAT Program at this time.

These descriptions of the dimensions of mentor participation in the MAT Program are offered here to clarify questions that may arise as teachers seek prior approval from school administration for a release day for the professional development workshop and/or graduate credit for the research project. It is for this purpose that this brief overview answers most of the questions that have emerged in the beginning years of the partnerships with local public schools.

As the dimensions of this work begin to demonstrate measurable results and as the MAT Program continues to grow, it is desired that this collaboration can continue. The Bard College/Mat program looks forward to the day when this model of college/public school partnership begins to achieve a common goal of improving student learning while educating teachers who can help lead schools forward in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The support and cooperation of the public schools and the mentor teacher is more than valued; it is essential to the best hopes for the advancement of public education.

PLEASE NOTE:

A few sample syllabi and/or course descriptions are attached that serve as examples of Professional Development and/or Graduate Coursework offered to teachers. These examples have been highly successful with teachers in New York state and will be

adopted in forms that also account for California standards appropriate for Delano, California.

**LI 556 Blood on the Page: Writing about Violence in the Transatlantic 19<sup>th</sup> Century**  
Instructors: Jaime Alves, Julia Emig, and Derek Furr

This course will have two, interlocking components: a study of literature and a study of literacy pedagogy—specifically, of teaching how to write *about* literature. We will read literature and write about it in a variety of ways, reflect on how the writing affected our understanding of the literature, and consider how to teach these kinds of writing in the secondary English classroom.

The literary focus will be transatlantic 19<sup>th</sup> century representations of physical and psychological violence. In a range of imaginative works from the U.S. and Great Britain, 1780-1918, we will confront such gruesome topics as war and murder, illness and maiming, the troubling deaths of children, animals, and beautiful women, the wreckage of ships, trains, towns, and marriages. We will seek to answer the following questions:

- In what ways is literature from the long 19<sup>th</sup> century (1780-1918) violent?
- Is there anything unique about how 19<sup>th</sup> century lit represents violence?
- What purpose does imaginative violence serve in 19<sup>th</sup> century culture?
- How do we evaluate this kind of writing as “successful” or “gratuitous,” “realistic” or too “sentimental,” “silly” or “painful”? Put differently, what are the differences between reacting to violent literature then and now?

In the literacy portion of the course, we will study ways to write about literature creatively and analytically. For each class, we will write in a different mode in response to the literature; we will also read what theory and research have to say about how to teach these modes of writing in the secondary classroom. We will seek to answer such questions as:

- What are the strengths and limitations of analytical writing about literature?
- Besides the analytical essay, what kinds of writing can be used to demonstrate literary understanding? What are the strengths and limitations of these?
- How do we choose, teach, and assess these kinds of writing in the secondary school classroom?

This three-credit-hour graduate course will meet on Wednesdays, 4:30-7:30, once per month from September through May, on the following dates at Bard College, room TBA: Sept. 17, Oct. 15, Nov. 12, Dec. 10, Jan. 14, Feb. 11, Mar. 18, Apr. 22, and May 20. Students will also be expected to participate in the literature research presentations during the Bard College/MAT’s annual Academic Research Colloquium at the end of May. These presentations mimic the form of professional conferences in which participants have opportunities to showcase select aspects of their work.

## Course Requirements

Aside from the assigned readings, there will be seven writing assignments, as indicated on the calendar below. Specifics for each assignment will be distributed in the class prior to the due date. Students will maintain a portfolio of writing and will workshop/revise two pieces. At the May research presentation, everyone will present one of his/her revised pieces.

## Enrollment and Fees

The course, supported by a grant from the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation, is offered free of charge to Bard mentors who are hosting at least one MAT apprentice during the 2008-2009 academic year. For MAT graduates and for mentors who are not hosting an MAT student during the 08-09 academic year, the cost is \$200, payable to Bard College. For others, the cost is \$500 per credit--\$1500 total. Enroll by emailing Cecilia Maple ([cmapple@bard.edu](mailto:cmapple@bard.edu)) by July 18. Checks, made out to Bard College, should also be mailed care of Cecilia Maple, Bard College MAT Program, PO Box 5000, Annandale on Hudson, NY, 12504.

Enrollment will be capped at 20.

## Texts

### Literature

Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Ed. Elizabeth Ammons. New York: Norton, 1994. [http://www.amazon.com/Uncle-Cabin-Norton-Critical-Editions/dp/0393963039/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213707842&sr=8-1](http://www.amazon.com/Uncle-Cabin-Norton-Critical-Editions/dp/0393963039/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213707842&sr=8-1)

Dickens, Charles. *Oliver Twist*. Ed. Kathleen Tillotson and Stephen Gill. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996. [http://www.amazon.com/Oliver-Twist-Oxford-Worlds-Classics/dp/0192833391/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708407&sr=1-1](http://www.amazon.com/Oliver-Twist-Oxford-Worlds-Classics/dp/0192833391/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708407&sr=1-1)

Sedgwick, Catharine Maria. *Hope Leslie, or Early Times in the Massachusetts*. Ed. Mary Kelley. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1995. [http://www.amazon.com/Leslie-Early-Massachusetts-American-Writers/dp/0813512220/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708453&sr=1-1](http://www.amazon.com/Leslie-Early-Massachusetts-American-Writers/dp/0813512220/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708453&sr=1-1)

Stevenson, Robert Louis. *The Strange Case of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*. Ed. Katherine B. Linehan. New York: Norton, 2002. [http://www.amazon.com/Strange-Jekyll-Norton-Critical-Editions/dp/0393974650/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708489&sr=1-1](http://www.amazon.com/Strange-Jekyll-Norton-Critical-Editions/dp/0393974650/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1213708489&sr=1-1)

| In addition, there will be short fiction, essays, and poetry on Reserve Web.

## Writing

*Excerpts from the following texts will be provided on Reserve Web—see instructions below for access—or handed out in class. You do not need to purchase any of these readings. They are included here to provide a “taste” of the kinds of texts that we will be exploring about the teaching of writing.*

- Bartholomae, David. “The Study of Error.” In *The Braddock Essays 1975-1998*, edited by Lisa Ede. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s Press, 1999.
- Bomer, Randy. *Time for Meaning: Crafting Literate Lives in Middle & High School*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1999.
- Brooks, Sarah. “Why I Detest Nancie Atwell.” *English Journal* 95, 3 (2006): 92-95.
- Clover, Carol J. *Men, Women, and Chainsaws: Gender in the Modern Horror Film*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Dillard, Annie. *Teaching a Stone to Talk*. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.
- Forche, Carolyn, ed. *Against Forgetting: Twentieth Century Poetry of Witness*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1993.
- Gallagher, Kelly. *Teaching Adolescent Writers*. Portland: Stenhouse, 2006.
- Hillocks, George. “Fighting Back: Assessing the Assessments.” *English Journal* 92, 4 (2003): 63-70.
- Newkirk, Thomas & Kent, Richard, eds. *Teaching the Neglected “R”*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2007.
- Goldberg, Natalie. *Writing Down the Bones: Freeing the Writer Within*. Boston: Shambhala Publications, 1986
- King, Stephen. *On Writing: A Memoir of the Craft*. New York: Scribner, 2000.
- Oates, Joyce Carol, ed. *Telling Stories: An Anthology for Writers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998.
- Prose, Francine. *Reading Like a Writer*. New York: HarperCollins, 2007.
- Rowe Michaels, Judith. *Risking Intensity: Reading and Writing Poetry with High School Students*. Urbana: NCTE, 1999.
- Ruggles Gere, Anne, Christenbury, Leilak, & Sassi, Kelly. *Writing on Demand*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 2005.
- South, James B., ed. *Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Philosophy: Fear and Trembling in Sunnydale*. Chicago: Open Court, 2003.

As noted above, many of the course texts will be held as PDF files on Reserve Web, which you can access by doing the following:

1. Go to the Stevenson library homepage: <http://www.bard.edu/library/>
2. Click on the Reserve Web button.
3. Select the Reserve Web link.
4. Enter the password, which is nine ones (“111111111”)
5. Select Browse by Instructor
6. Select Alves et. al. and our course title.

### **Assignments and Due Dates**

Enrolled students will receive the Sept. 17 assignment via email in July. A detailed schedule of readings and assignments will be distributed during the first class meeting.

### **Course Policies**

The course will be graded pass/fail and carry three graduate credits. Students must enroll for credit; there is no option to audit.

Attendance: Students are allowed one excused absence without loss of credit for the course. *Credit cannot be awarded to students carrying more than one absence.*

Late Work: All work is due at the beginning of the class as per the schedule below. To earn credit for the course, students are expected to hand in all work on time.

Inclement Weather: In general, courses at Bard College are held as scheduled regardless of weather. In case of extreme conditions, you will receive email from the instructors about changes of plan.

Academic Research Presentations: This event, May 28 from 4-8, counts as one of the course meetings. Participation is mandatory. Specifics about your presentation will be outlined in class.

**Readings and Assignments—Draft (to be finalized by in early March, 2009)**

September 17	<p><b>Topic:</b> Native Americans and violence</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Catherine Maria Sedgwick, <i>Hope Leslie</i></li> <li>2. Francine Prose, “Close Reading” from <i>Reading Like a Writer</i> (on ReserveWeb [RW])</li> <li>3. Stephen King, “What Writing Is” from <i>On Writing</i> (RW)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Free writing due</p>
October 15	<p><b>Topic:</b> Murder and the gothic</p> <p><b>Readings</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thomas De Quincey, “On Murder Considered as One of the Fine Arts” and “Postscript”</li> <li>2. Annie Dillard, “Lenses” from <i>Teaching a Stone to Talk</i> (RW)</li> <li>3. Angela Carter, “The Werewolf” from <i>Telling Stories</i> (RW)</li> <li>4. Randy Bomer, “A Place in the Conversation: Writing Literature in Response to Literature” from <i>Time for Meaning</i> (RW)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Re-visions and reappropriations due</p>
November 12	<p><b>Topic:</b> Psychological violence</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Robert Louis Stevenson, <i>Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde</i></li> <li>2. Henry James, “In the Cage”</li> <li>3. Tracy Little, “High School Is Hell: Metaphor Made Literal” from <i>Buffy the Vampire Slayer and Philosophy</i> (RW)</li> <li>4. Kelly Gallagher, “Elevating Student Writing: Using Real-World Models” from <i>Teaching Adolescent Writers</i> (RW)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Media review due</p>
December 10	<p><b>Topic:</b> Slavery</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harriet Beecher Stowe, <i>Uncle Tom’s Cabin</i></li> <li>2. Randy Bomer, “Transactional Heat and Light: More Explicit Literary Learning” from <i>Language Arts</i> (RW)</li> <li>5. Judith Rowe Michaels, “The Start: Writing Your Own Poem” from <i>Risking Intensity</i> (RW)</li> <li>3. Stephen Dunning &amp; William Stafford, “Found and Headline Poems” from <i>Getting the Knack</i> (RW)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Found poetry due</p>
January 14	<p><b>Topic:</b> Blood, sweat, and theater in the writing workshop</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sarah Brooks, “Why I Detest Nancie Atwell” from NCTE’s <i>English Journal</i> (RW)</li> <li>2. Marcy M. Taylor, “Nancie Atwell’s <i>In the Middle</i> and the Ongoing Transformation of the Writing Workshop” from NCTE’s <i>English Journal</i> (RW)</li> <li>3. Kelly Gallagher, “Beyond the Grecian Urn: The Teacher</li> </ol>

	<p>As Writing Model” from <i>Teaching Adolescent Writer</i> (RW)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephen King, “On Revision” &amp; “And Furthermore, Part I: Door Shut, Door Open” from <i>On Writing</i> (RW)</li> <li>Joyce Carol Oates, “The Art and Craft of Revision” from <i>Telling Stories</i> (RW)</li> <li>James Joyce, “The Sisters” from <i>Telling Stories</i> (RW)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Process writing due; also, bring to class one of your Sept.-Dec. pieces to be workshopped</p>
February 11	<p><b>Topic:</b> Writing with a gun to your head (and other enabling constraints)</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>George Hillocks, “Fighting Back: Assessing the Assessments” from <i>English Journal</i></li> <li>Anne Ruggles Gere, Leila Christenbury, &amp; Kelly Sassi, “Thinking Backward” &amp; “Contexts: What to Expect When You’re Expecting to Write” from <i>Writing on Demand</i></li> <li>Selections from <i>The World’s Shortest Stories of Love and Death</i>, ed. by Steve Moss &amp; John M. Daniel</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Miniature narrative or “microfiction” due</p>
March 18	<p><b>Topic:</b> Mean streets</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Charles Dickens, <i>Oliver Twist</i></li> <li>Sara Kajder, “Plugging in to Twenty-First Century Writers” from <i>Teaching the Neglected “R”</i> (Newkirk &amp; Kent, eds.)</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Hypertext links due</p>
April 22	<p><b>Topic:</b> Violence reported and poeticized: Disaster and war</p> <p><b>Readings:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Felicia Hemans, “Casabianca”; Gerard Manley Hopkins, “The Wreck of the Deutschland”; Thomas Hardy, “Convergence of the Twain”; Walt Whitman, “The Artilleryman’s Vision”, “Ashes of Soldiers”; “The Would-Dresser”</li> <li>Francine Prose, “Reading with Courage” from <i>Reading Like a Writer</i></li> <li>Annie Dillard, “Living Like Weasels” from <i>Teaching a Stone to Talk</i></li> <li>Selections from <i>Against Forgetting</i>, ed. by Carolyn Forché</li> </ol> <p><b>Writing:</b> Writing as witness due: Prose poetry</p>
May 20	<p><b>Topic:</b> Portfolio presentations</p>

Professional Development Offerings in Literature and  
History  
Winter/Spring 2010

Gothic Fiction: Examples from Three Centuries  
Time: Tuesdays, 4:30 PM to 7:30 PM (March 9, April 13, May  
4)  
Dates: March, April, May 2010  
Location: On campus at Bard College (Room TBD)  
Credits: 15 in-service hours

“...when I had first begun it, I could not lay down again;--I remember finishing it in two days—my hair standing on end the whole time.” Sensational and shocking, gothic fiction has made many a reader’s hair stand on end, as it did Henry Tilney’s in Austen’s classic gothic parody, *Northanger Abbey*. What makes a work of fiction “gothic”? What makes terror appealing, and what can gothic fiction’s popularity tell us about the tastes and secret desires of readers?

In this three-part seminar, we will address these questions by reading fiction from three distinct periods, for three very different audiences: the English 1790’s, the U.S. 1890’s, and the popular culture of the present. As in our previous offerings, the seminars will combine in-depth study of literature and criticism with reflections on implications for teaching in the middle and secondary classroom.

Session I: She Saw Dead People: Turn-of-the-Century Ghosts in Wharton and Gilman, taught by Jaime Alves

Session II: Matthew Lewis’ *The Monk*, Then and Now, taught by Derek Furr (April 13)

Session III: *Our Vampires, Our Selves*: The Lore of the Vampire in Contemporary Young Adult Fiction, taught by Julia Emig (May 4)

Epidemics and Pandemics: Some Historical Perspectives on Infectious Disease

Time: Tuesdays, 4:30 PM to 7:30 PM (February 9, March 9, April 13)

Dates: February, March, April 2010

Location: On campus at Bard College (Room TBD)

Credits: 15 in-service hours

Current concerns with the spread of swine flu and the H1NI virus--its availability, whether to take it--invite historical reflection on similar widespread infections among human populations in the past. What conditions fostered the spread of such diseases? How did the public understand such diseases? How were such diseases treated? What lessons did society learn from such outbreaks?

By studying three, chronologically distinct cases, we will investigate popular and emerging scientific notions of illness, methods employed to staunch the spread of disease, and the demographic and social impact of widespread illnesses on society.

Readings will consist of a combination of secondary and primary sources, with an emphasis on the latter. Teachers will have varying opportunities to discuss ways of incorporating this material into secondary school lesson plans.

Session I. - Cholera in the Nineteenth Century United States, taught by Dr. Myra Young Armstead (February 9)

Session II. - The 1918 Influenza Pandemic of 1918 in World History, taught by Dr. Wendy Urban-Mead (March 9)

Session III. - Historical Analogy and the 1976 Swine Flu Misdiagnosis, taught by Dr. Stephen Mucher (April 13)

For further information about cost, credit, and enrollment, contact Cecilia Maple ([cmaple@bard.edu](mailto:cmaple@bard.edu) or 845.758.7145). Note: Participants will be expected to enroll in and attend all three sessions.

# **Making History in NYC Classrooms**

## **Teaching Students to Think Critically about the Past**

**A Topic Oriented History Course for Secondary Teachers**  
**Feb. 18, March 11, March 25, April 22, April 29 (Wednesdays)**  
**Symphony Space**

### **Broadway at 95th**

**Stephen Mucher, Ph.D.**  
**Assistant Professor of History Education**  
**Bard College**

**Workshop Topics:** *Classes meet for three hours.*

Each workshop is designed as an opportunity for teachers to: 1) find instructional inspiration looking closely and creatively at a specific period in U.S. history; 2) investigate primary sources as historians; 3) consider ways to bring such investigations into the secondary classroom.

Working in small groups we will model how students read and use historical primary sources like photographs, maps, newspapers, and correspondences. Each topic is framed around a provocative essential question:

- *Was Jim Crow Inevitable?* Teaching Reconstruction
- *Did Progressives Have Good Intentions?* Teaching Industrialization
- *Did the Advertising Help or Hinder Women's Freedom?* Teaching the 1920s
- *Did Art Make Us Better Citizens?* Teaching the Great Depression
- *Did America Respond Predictably to German Fascism?* Teaching WWII
- *When did the Counterculture Begin?* Teaching the "Sixties"
- Other Participant-Driven Topic

These are small, hands-on workshops designed for all teachers, regardless of whether or not you teach these topics (or even if you are not currently teaching history). As seminar or workshop-style collegial gatherings, our topic chronology and content are driven by you as participants. Our purpose is to feed interest in great historical questions and to think about how you can teach historical thinking in your classroom regardless of the topic.

Each participant will leave the course with lesson plan ideas and classroom-ready primary sources (often edited and developed in the workshop). Each teacher will receive letters from Bard College that appropriately describe your participation in the number of workshops you attend for professional development.



## Workshop Rationale:

- Students often find history dull and uninspiring
- The demands and expectations placed on student performance continue to expand.
- Our teaching work is more interesting and rewarding when we help students *think* historically.

These statements are simplistic. But each is supported by decades of research suggesting that history has long been surveyed as the least-liked core content course in secondary schools and that even the best teacher faces enormous challenges teaching about a past that is dynamic, meaningful, familiar yet strange, intriguing, and exciting.

Yet helping our students think historically has never been more important. Thoughtful citizenship educators and even state standards are demanding that students go far beyond a simple understanding of discrete facts. Students are expected to evaluate, corroborate, and interpret evidence, detect authorial bias, assess the meaning and validity of primary source types, and create their own informed written accounts of the past.

## Historical Thinking

These hands-on, collaborative workshops are designed to help teachers guide their student toward increasingly sophisticated modes of historical thinking. Activities are designed around four key principles:

### **Encouraging Adolescents to Think Historically**

The NY Regent’s exam requires that students “use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their knowledge” of an increasingly large body of information. Yet few schools or teachers have undertaken the difficult task of exploring exactly what constitutes “historical thinking.” The workshops offer a direct, hands-on approach to using primary sources, synthesizing secondary sources, and constructing informed, warranted claims about the past.

### **Promoting Teaching as a Creative Scholarly Endeavor**

A growing body of research suggests that collaborative work connecting teachers, disciplinary scholars, and educational experts, organized around specific instructional problems, and focused on the real lives and academic work of students can profoundly reshape beliefs about what students are capable of achieving.

### **Viewing History as Tool for Questioning, Evaluating, and Organizing Ideas**

How do historians learn and retain a vast quantity of names, dates, and facts? This professional development model encourages teachers to see history as a “way of knowing” and as structure for organizing knowledge. As such, instructional time spent on developing thinking skills and time spent learning factual details are not in conflict but rather mutually reinforcing each other.

## **Leveraging the Rich Contexts of the Urban School**

Teachers in diverse urban schools face unique challenges. This course encourages a careful attentiveness to these challenges and the opportunities they afford. Indeed, the kind of disciplined historical inquiry encouraged here demands that teachers “convert obstacles to resources” and begin all inquiry by probing what students bring to the classroom.

## **Building an Historical Pedagogy through Case Studies**

The professional development model described here operates around the belief that teachers learn in and through explorations of their daily work. As such, considerable time is spent exploring and re-evaluating student work, reflecting on current curriculum and past instructional decisions, and discussing ways to construct historical inquiry lessons around disciplinary problems using primary source text and images.

Workshop Content: Each of the workshops is organized to focus on a specific, commonly taught history topic. These experiences are designed to illustrate many of the pedagogical principles behind disciplined historical inquiry and also provide useful take-away lessons.

Historical Thinking Themes: Threaded throughout the workshops are five important historical thinking skills usefully incorporated into lesson planning and instruction (evidence and warrant, authorial bias, corroboration, narrative construction, historiographical debate). As such, the workshop illustrates how thinking practices are infused into the various topics.

## **About the Instructor**

Stephen S. Mucher, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor of History Education in the M.A.T. program at Bard College. A former high school and middle school teacher and a published historian, he has spent over a decade working closely with school districts in Michigan, California, New York, and abroad to create curriculum and professional development experiences that encourage historical thinking. In addition to organizing extensive curriculum redesign efforts and collaborating with museums and web portals to extend primary source use to students, Dr. Mucher has helped direct three USDE Teaching American History Grants and has consulted on grant projects funded by the National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment of the Humanities, and USAID.

**Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence**

*Candidates preparing to serve as professional school personnel know and demonstrate the professional knowledge and skills necessary to educate and support effectively all students in meeting the state-adopted academic standards. Assessments indicate that candidates meet the Commission-adopted competency requirements, as specified in the program standards.*

The competence of Bard College/MAT candidates to serve as professional school personnel is assessed through two (2) assessment systems that require the demonstration of competent professional knowledge and the application of pedagogical skills necessary to provide all students with the learning experiences to achieve state-adopted academic standards. There is first, of course, an internal system of assessments that evaluates performance in various areas, both theoretical and practical. This first system of assessment constitutes all the measures of competency that constitute the Bard College/MAT program standards. The second system of assessments is that composite of tests and tasks approved by the California Department of Education and implemented and monitored by the CCTC that ensures that the Bard program candidates are held accountable to an external set of standards before assuming responsibility for student learning as California credentialed teachers.

The latter system of assessment is well defined by the requirements of the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. The satisfaction of these requirements is built into program expectations and monitored by Bard College/MAT faculty, as follows:

<b>CCTC Requirements for the Single Subject Credential in the Bard College MAT program:</b>		
<b>Tasks to be completed:</b>	<b>Completion context in the Bard program:</b>	<b>Personnel responsible for administration and/or monitoring:</b>
<b>Certificate of Clearance</b>	Required completion for program matriculation.	TPA Coordinator / Program Administrator
<b>CBEST</b>	Passing grade required for program matriculation	TPA Coordinator / Program Administrator
<b>CSET</b>	Passing grade required prior to full-time apprenticeship cycle (ED547)	TPA Coordinator / Program Administrator
<b>CTAP</b>	Satisfactory completion of CTAP training module during fall quarter	Kern County Superintendent of Schools trainer/consultant and TPA Coordinator / Program

		Administrator
<b>TPA Task 1</b>	Completion supported during Bard course ED522, fall quarter	TPA Coordinator
<b>TPA Task 2</b>	Completion supported during Bard course ED524, winter quarter	TPA Coordinator
<b>TPA Task 3</b>	Completion supported during apprenticeship cycle, ED547	TPA Coordinator
<b>TPA Task 4</b>	Completion supported during apprenticeship cycle, ED547	TPA Coordinator

The first assessment system is constituted by the set of program expectations and requirements of the Bard College Master of Arts in Teaching Program. Successful completion of the degree requirements for the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and subsequent conferral of the degree confirms that the candidate has demonstrated the professional knowledge and skills necessary to support student learning leading to successful achievement of California Department of Education (CDE) approved academic standards in the areas of English/Language Arts and Social Science. Measures associated with the successful performances of knowledge, understanding, skills associated with appropriate expectations of professional knowledge and skills for successful teaching are outlined in the chart below.

<b>Assessment of Professional Knowledge and Skills in the Context of the Bard College MAT Program</b>		
<b>Knowledge/Skills Set</b>	<b>Assessment Context</b>	<b>Criteria</b>
<b>Content/Subject Area Knowledge: English/Language Arts Social Sciences</b>	Undergraduate major or equivalent in the subject area	GPA of 3.0 or better
	Completion of 18 credit hours of prescribed graduate study in the subject area	GPA of 3.0 or better
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge/Skills in the Academic/Practical Context</b>	Completion of 27 credit hours of prescribed graduate study in educational topics*	GPA of 3.0 or better
<b>Pedagogical Knowledge/Skills in the Practical Context</b>	Completion of a guided one-year residency in a California public school	Satisfactory reviews and evaluation by at least two (2) Bard faculty and two (2)

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>English/Language Arts Social Sciences</b></p>		<p>mentor teachers based on formal and informal observations according to criteria set out in the Tracking of Progress (TOP) form and as further documented by written evaluations by the parties named above.</p>
---	--	--

\*This is the total number of credit hours of study in educational topics for specific content areas to be credentialed - English/Language Arts and Social Science. This designation of education courses as academic/practical highlights the fact that students meet for these courses in graduate classroom settings. But, in all cases and with increasing emphasis, as the residency experience requires deeper engagements in classroom teaching, these courses are structured as professional learning communities that focus on learning related to clinical experiences. In the later permutations of these courses, research-based knowledge is applied to practical questions that emerge from classroom experiences and additional personnel are added to the graduate classroom to support coursework related to practice. In the latter context, the courses identified as ED515, ED525, ED535, ED545 are sites for making practical sense of critical public school dimensions such as special education, school discipline policies, parent/community relations, the function of school boards and teacher unions, and more. To this end, the Bard College/MAT courses named above include sessions with experienced practitioners. Classroom teachers participate in graduate classes devoted to questions of classroom management or formative assessment. School principals offer grounded expertise on issues of school policies, teacher evaluation, and parent/community relations. Special education teachers provide critical information on mandated requirements under IDEA legislation, referral processes, the creation and function of IEPs, and practical guidance on how classroom and special education teachers can best collaborate to create inclusive classrooms that effectively support student learning for all.