

Indicators of Teaching Effectiveness

Teacher Evaluation System

During all academic years from 2015-2016 to 2017-2018, the state of South Carolina (SC) utilized a system for “Assisting, Developing, and Evaluating Professional Teaching” (ADEPT). As of 2018-2019, Advanced ADEPT is being instituted. This new system is based on the work of the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET) for teacher evaluation. Although the EPP has already aligned its clinically-based evaluations with the NIET expectations, complete performance data in this report are based on the ADEPT processes, as these are the only data available at this time (2019 results from Advanced ADEPT should be available by August 2019).

In 1998, the SC Board of Education approved ADEPT, a system designed to move teachers from preparation programs through induction to formal evaluation (typically in their second year of teaching). Although revised and assessed over time, the ADEPT evaluation system is built around [10 Performance Standards](#) (APS) that fall within one of four domains (Planning, Instruction, Environment and Professionalism). The key elements – or critical components of each APS – and corresponding examples are provided so that teachers, evaluators, and stakeholders are all cognizant of what constitutes meeting each standard. To [earn the professional teaching certificate](#), new teachers must meet expectations on Planning, Instruction, Environment, and Professionalism; no more than one key element can be unmet in each domain. In the context of this, the teacher is assigned a two member [team](#) for the [evaluation cycle](#) which includes two evaluations each. In addition to observations, the teacher is required to create [Long-Range Plans](#); a [unit work sample \(now referred to as a SLO\)](#) to demonstrate and document his/her effectiveness; [reflect on the results of his/her observation](#); and create a [self-assessment/growth plan](#). Finally, the building principal must complete a [professional review](#) of the teacher.

The *ADEPT System Guidelines* provide a discussion of validity through design and implementation- (https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/file/programs-services/50/documents/adept_guidelines.pdf). Descriptors, embedded within the ADEPT Performance Standards, were aligned with nationally recognized professional standards by a steering committee to substantiate claims of face-value validity. As another mechanism to maintain psychometric quality, those who assess teachers using ADEPT – members of the South Carolina Teaching Standards (SCTS) evaluation team, – undergo rigorous training in order to be certified evaluators. The SCTS evaluation team members conference with new teachers, observe their teaching using specific rubrics on multiple occasions to collect observational data, and confer with teachers regarding their establishment and enactment of the [Unit Work Sample](#).

As SC schools replace ADEPT with Advanced ADEPT, assessments of the new measures’ psychometric quality are contingent upon those conducted by its creator, NIET. In addition, SLOs will supplant the [Unit Work Sample](#). SLOs are “...teacher-driven, student-centered, data-informed, standards-based goals that measure an educator’s impact on student learning

growth within a given interval of instruction (page 4).”

(<https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/file/agency/ee/Educator-Evaluation-Effectiveness/documents/slo/SLOGuidebook.pdf>) Comp4.1_Evidence provides a detailed discussion of SLOs.

ADEPT Data

Results from three cycles of [ADEPT data](#) for the academic years 2016, 2017 and 2018, indicate that Winthrop University initial preparation program completers, of whom there were 108, 116 and 119 respectively, outperform their peers throughout the state. The skills, professional knowledge and dispositions evidenced by WU completers include their ability to effectively set long-term instructional goals; develop instructional objectives, units and plans; and analyze assessment data used to inform planning. WU completers also are able to set clear expectations for student achievement; use varied, appropriate and effective instructional strategies; and demonstrate a strong base of content knowledge. They do this within a positive, well-managed classroom as professionals who communicate well, advocate for students, continuously learn, and contribute to their organization.

In 2017, the same percentage of completers statewide and those from WU passed two categories within ADEPT (“Demeanor/Behavior” and “Instructional Time”). In all other categories assessed by ADEPT, the percentage of completers from WU who passed (typically ranging from 96 to 100%) was greater than state-wide percentages. Notably, relative to other categories within each of the four domains, “student behavior” appears to be an area with a lower percentage pass rate throughout SC. Winthrop completers have performed well in this area 97.5%, 98.3% and 95.3%, throughout 2016, 2017 and 2018, respectively. The data suggest that providers, using valid instrumentation and observational practices, believe that initial preparation program completers have effectively applied the requisite “knowledge, skills, and dispositions” that the preparation experiences were designed to cultivate.

Observational Data

The EPP plan for Winthrop Faculty in Residence (WFIR) to use a modified Internship II observational tool in order to assess recent completers’ knowledge, skills and dispositions. Specifically, these faculty will observe recent completers while they teach a normal lesson, prior to implementing a new pedagogical, curricular or classroom management strategy as part of their action research. Upon completion of the first observation, the faculty will observe the P-12 educator while s/he is implementing his/her procedure, again using the Internship II modified observational tool. This will enable WFIRs to assess completers’ impact on their students’ learning growth, while assessing the degree to which they demonstrate the professional competencies their training at WU was designed to achieve. This observational tool can then be used by School Liaisons, WFIRs, and Education Core faculty engaged with schools through early clinical coursework to broaden the scope of observations beyond completers’ action research efforts. Finally, the EPP will explore a process that allows

candidates to provide observational forms completed by induction mentors, school administrators, and/or peers on a voluntary basis.

Student Survey Exploration

The EPP has explored using a student survey to collect perception data examining completer instructional efficacy. To that end, it purchased Tripod, a nationally normed survey instrument, and endeavored to begin the collect of data from students related to perceptions of instruction. The process was quite confusing to our completers and the EPP received only minimal participation although completers had indicated a willingness to be involved in a pilot. Due to the fiscal cost of purchasing a proprietary measure and limited benefits of collecting data for 1-2 completers, the EPP abandoned this approach. Nonetheless, through work with our partners to collect student impact data for Components 4.1 and 4.2, we have discussed the possibility of assessing the quality of our completers' teaching as per their students' survey-based evaluations. Our partners have not precluded this as an option; however, they were hesitant to proceed, suggesting additional planning and collaboration will be necessary to implement such an approach. Their hesitation was likely to have been influenced by the recent implementation of a new teacher evaluation system, their concerns about relatively high teacher turnover rates (and explorations of the reasons), the districts' focus on meeting their students' mental health needs, and the changes in the student evaluation processes that were instituted over the past five years. Given this confluence of stressors and changes, the EPP is sensitive to the districts' concerns, and understands the importance of thoughtfully considering the implementation of additional assessment measures. Finally, until the EPP can identify the placement of its completers on an annual basis, the collection of student perception data will be problematic.

Consideration of 4.2 Overall

It is clear that data indicating recent completers' impact on student learning cannot be disentangled from assessing their teaching effectiveness, and that assessments of effectiveness through multiple data sources is connected to completer's self-appraisals of professional efficacy and satisfaction with their EPP training. In addition, connected to other appraisals of their effectiveness and impact, as per ADEPT scores, action research, MAP data, and SLO data are administrators' evaluations of recent completers' strengths and relative weaknesses compared to educators with comparable levels of in-service experience. Thus, the data presented for Standard 4, while presented by Components 4.1 – 4.4, is less of a set of four data-driven outcomes and more of a constellation illustrating the strengths and weaknesses of WU's initial preparation program as per metrics pertaining to what its recent completers know and are able to do. Embedded therein are consistent patterns, evidenced by completer and employer surveys and interview data.

Next Steps

Observational data on completers is an area designated for continued work. Using the state evaluation data, the EPP has strong evidence that our completers are prepared as well as, or

better than, other teachers with commensurate levels of in-service experience. Further, planning for the systematic implementation of an Action Research Protocol, which began in fall 2018 with projects underway in spring 2019, has significant potential to provide case study evidence of classroom practice and impact on P-12 learners. In addition, other areas under consideration include observing recent completers' teaching (whether tied to action research or not) within the PN schools (planned implementation by WFIRs in spring 2019 and expansion in 2019-2020), voluntary sharing of observational forms completed during induction programs, and collecting student perception data used to assess the quality of their teachers' performance in the classroom. The timeline below indicates a plan for further exploration of Component 4.2. The CAEP Coordinator, the College Assessment Coordinator, and Rex Institute Director are the primary university-based leads on the efforts described here.

2019-2020

- Engage in at least one action research project per Professional Development School under the guidance of the WFIR.
- Request administrator and/or mentor observation forms from the teacher evaluation process for further review.

2020-2021

- Assess the psychometric quality of the modified Internship II observation tool for both the Action Research process and additional observations of initial preparation program completers not engaged in Action Research; make changes to subsequent iterations of the measure to be piloted and train raters accordingly.
- Conduct formal assessments of content validity of a final iteration of the instrument and assess the internal reliability of the measure.
- Revisit the use/implementation of student surveys designed to evaluate their teachers' classroom performance through the Rex School-Community Counsel.
- Share Action Research Protocol beyond the confines of Professional Development Schools and WFIRs to increase the possibility for implementation at other schools where completers are teaching.

2021-2022

- Revisit efforts for Component 4.2 with EPP and partnership faculty to determine the reasonable continuation or expansion of efforts.

ADEPT Domains with Corresponding Performance Standards

https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/file/programs-services/50/documents/adept_guidelines.pdf

(page 3)

Domain 1: Planning

APS 1 Long-Range Planning

APS 2 Short-Range Planning of Instruction

APS 3 Planning Assessments and Using Data

Domain 2: Instruction

APS 4 Establishing and Maintaining High Expectations for Learners

APS 5 Using Instructional Strategies to Facilitate Learning

APS 6 Providing Content for Learners

APS 7 Monitoring, Assessing, and Enhancing Learning

Domain 3: Classroom Environment

APS 8 Maintaining an Environment That Promotes Learning

APS 9 Managing the Classroom

Domain 4: Professionalism

APS 10 Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities

ADEPT Formal Evaluation Requirements for Classroom-Based Teachers

https://ed.sc.gov/scdoe/assets/file/programs-services/50/documents/adept_guidelines.pdf (pages 27-37)

The following formal evaluation requirements apply to classroom-based teachers only. Formal evaluation requirements for special-area educators (i.e., library media specialists, school guidance counselors, and speech-language therapists) are delineated in a later section of this document.

EVALUATION TEAMS

- An ADEPT evaluation team must be appointed for each teacher who is scheduled for formal evaluation.
- All evaluation team members must have met all State Board of Education–approved ADEPT evaluator training requirements.
- Each ADEPT evaluation team must consist of a minimum of two members. One evaluator must be a school or district administrator or supervisor; the other evaluator must possess a knowledge of the content taught by the teacher who is being formally evaluated.
- A minimum of three evaluators is required for the two groups of teachers scheduled to undergo *highly consequential* formal evaluations (i.e., annual-contract teachers who are undergoing their second formal evaluations and annual-contract teachers who are returning to the field following ADEPT-related state sanctions and are undergoing their final required formal evaluations).
 - One of the three members of the evaluation team must be a teacher who has knowledge of the content taught by the teacher who is being formally evaluated.
 - Classroom observations made as part of the data-collection process must be conducted and documented by at least two of the three evaluators.
 - All three evaluators must review the teacher’s dossier, participate in the team consensus meetings, and collaborate in preparing the consensus reports.

ORIENTATION

- All teachers scheduled for formal evaluation must receive a comprehensive orientation to the process prior to beginning the evaluation.
- The orientation must include, at a minimum, written and oral explanations of the ADEPT Performance Standards, the evaluation process, the evaluation timeline, the criteria for successfully completing the evaluation, and the intended use of the evaluation results.

REQUIRED DATA SOURCES AND TIMELINES

- All ADEPT formal evaluation systems must include multiple sources of evidence that reflect the teacher’s typical performance relative to each of the ten ADEPT Performance Standards (APSs) and key elements.
- Evidence must be collected from the following six sources, at a minimum: the long-range plan, the unit work sample, classroom observations, reflections on the instruction and student learning, the professional review, and the professional reflection and development plan.

Long-Range Plan

- Each teacher undergoing formal evaluation must develop a long-range plan (LRP).
- Each teacher must submit the completed LRP to the evaluation team on or before the date established in the district’s ADEPT timeline. The LRP becomes part of the teacher’s dossier and provides the evidence related to APS 1.
- Each evaluator must review the teacher’s LRP during the first cycle of evaluation.
- If the consensus report at the end of the preliminary (first) evaluation cycle indicates that all key elements of APS 1 are *met*, the final (second) evaluation cycle review of the LRP may be waived at the discretion of the evaluation team. The evaluation team reserves the right to resume data collection for APS 1 at any time during the final evaluation cycle but, in order to do so, must provide the teacher with a two-weeks-prior written notice that includes the team’s rationale for resuming the process.
- If the preliminary evaluation consensus report indicates that any of the key elements of APS 1 are *not met*, the teacher must revise his or her LRP and submit it to the evaluation team for review during the final evaluation cycle.

Unit Work Sample (now the SLO)

The purpose of unit work sampling is to demonstrate and document the teacher's effectiveness in promoting student achievement. The unit work sample provides the evidence for the teacher's performance with regard to APSs 2 and 3.

The unit work sampling process consists of the following eight steps:

1. The teacher reviews his or her LRP and selects an instructional unit (as indicated in APS 1.C) that is scheduled to be begun and completed during the current (i.e., preliminary or final) evaluation cycle. In this context, a term *instructional unit* is defined as a set of integrated lessons designed to accomplish learning objectives related to a curricular theme, a particular area of knowledge, or a general skill or process.

All early childhood teachers must select a unit that relates to language or preliteracy *if* they are required to be "content competent" in either of those areas in accordance with their current teaching assignments. Integrated units that combine language or preliteracy with one or more other subjects (e.g., mathematics, science, social studies) are permitted.

All elementary teachers through grade three must select a unit that relates to English language arts or reading *if* they are required to be "content competent" in either of those areas in accordance with their current teaching assignments. Integrated units that combine English language arts or reading with one or more other subjects (e.g., mathematics, science, social studies) are permitted.

In order for the teacher's impact on student learning to be determined, the unit work sampling process must be conducted over a minimum two-week period. Typically, this requirement presents no difficulty since most instructional units require two or more weeks to complete. However, in rare instances, a teacher may be unable to design a unit that is two or more weeks in length. In such cases, the teacher must request approval from the evaluation team to select two instructional units to complete during the evaluation cycle. In this event, the entire (i.e., eight-step) work sample process must be followed for each unit of instruction.

2. The teacher determines the student characteristics (from APS 1.A) and other contextual factors that are likely to impact instruction and/or student learning with regard to the selected instructional unit.
3. The teacher develops a written unit plan that includes the learning objectives (APS 2.A); the necessary instructional activities and assignments, strategies, and resources (APS 2.B); and the formal and informal assessment methods and criteria (APS 3.A).
4. The teacher administers and/or obtains the results of one or more preassessments and analyzes the data to determine the learning status of the students prior to instruction (APS 3.B).
5. The teacher implements instruction, making adjustments to the unit plan as necessary. The entire instructional unit must be completed before the teacher moves to the next step.
6. The teacher administers one or more postassessments and analyzes, summarizes, and interprets the results in order to profile student learning (APS 3.B) and communicate information about student progress and achievement (APS 3.C).
7. The teacher reflects and self-evaluates on the completed unit (APS 3.B) and uses this information to determine the appropriate steps to take next (APS 2.C).
8. The teacher submits the unit work sample to the evaluation team. The unit work sample then becomes part of the teacher's dossier.

If the consensus report at the end of the preliminary (first) evaluation cycle indicates that *all* key elements of APS 2 and APS 3 are *met*, the final evaluation unit work sample requirements may be waived at the discretion of the evaluation team. The evaluation team reserves the right to resume data collection for APSs 2 and 3 at any time during the final evaluation cycle but, in order to do so, must provide the teacher with a two-weeks-prior written notice that includes the team's rationale for resuming the process.

If the preliminary evaluation consensus report indicates that any of the key elements in APS 2 or APS 3 are *not met*, the teacher must complete and submit another unit work sample, following steps 1–8 above, for review during the final evaluation cycle.

Classroom Observations

During the formal evaluation process, the primary purpose of classroom observations is to gather data pertaining to APSs 4–9.

- All data-collection observations must be *unannounced* and must be a minimum of 45 minutes in length.
- In addition to these data-collection observations, evaluators may conduct other types of observations (e.g., walk-through observations, announced observations) as often as needed. Although the results of these other observations are not admissible as ADEPT formal evaluation data, these findings may trigger the need for additional data-collection observations that can, in turn, generate admissible formal evaluation data.
- Two or more members of the ADEPT evaluation team must each conduct at least one data-collection observation during each of the two evaluation cycles (i.e., preliminary and final). In other words, a minimum of four data-collection observations (i.e., *two* per cycle) must be conducted during the year.
- Each evaluator must place a written summary of the observation in the dossier following each data-collection observation. All documentation must be well organized and must contain detailed descriptions and specific examples that relate to each of the key elements in APSs 4–9.
- A minimum of three evaluators is required for teachers undergoing *highly consequential* formal evaluations (i.e., annual-contract teachers who are undergoing their second formal evaluations and annual-contract teachers who are returning to the field following ADEPT-related state sanctions and are undergoing their final required formal evaluations).
 - The data-collection observations must be conducted and documented by at least two of the three evaluators. However, all three evaluators must review the dossier, including the documentation of all data-collection observations.

Reflections on Instruction and Student Learning

Following each required observation, the teacher must complete a written reflection on the impact his or her instruction has had on student learning. The purpose of these reflections is to gather additional data pertaining to APSs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and/or 9.

Each written reflection on the lesson must include, but need not be limited to, descriptions of

- the lesson objective(s), the relationship between the objective(s) and the academic/developmental standards, and the ways in which the lesson relates to students' prior and future learning;
- the formal and/or informal assessments and criteria that have been or will be used to measure student progress in terms of the lesson's objective(s), including a sample of the formal assessment(s);
- the feedback that the teacher has provided or will provide to the students regarding their performance;
- the degree to which the lesson accomplished or did not accomplish the intended results and why; and
- the implications for subsequent instruction.

All reflections are to be submitted to the evaluation team for inclusion in the dossier within seven calendar days of the observation, unless an extension is approved by the evaluation team.

Professional Review

- Near the end of each evaluation cycle, the building principal (and other school- or district- level administrators as appropriate) must complete a written professional review of the teacher's performance. The purpose of this review is to provide evidence pertaining to APS 10.A–D.
- Written professional reviews must be completed during both the preliminary and final evaluation cycles and must be included in the dossier.

Self-Assessment and Professional Growth and Development Plan

- Near the end of the preliminary evaluation cycle, the teacher must complete a written self-assessment. The purpose of the self-assessment is to provide evidence pertaining to APS
- 10.E and to serve as the basis for the teacher's professional growth and development plan.
- The self-assessment must include, but need not be limited to, the teacher's reflections on his or her impact on

student learning. Additionally, the teacher should include reflections on other professional areas such as advocating for his or her students, collaborating with his or her colleagues, and communicating effectively with others.

- The teacher’s self-assessment must be submitted to the evaluation team for inclusion in the dossier.
- Each evaluator must review the teacher’s self-assessment at the end of the preliminary evaluation cycle
- If the consensus report at that time indicates that the teacher has completed an appropriate self-assessment and that key element 10.E was *met*, the teacher need not complete another self-assessment during the final evaluation cycle at the discretion of the evaluation team.
- If the consensus report at the end of the preliminary evaluation cycle indicates that key element 10.E was *not met*, the teacher must revise his or her self-assessment and submit the revised document to the evaluation team for review during the final evaluation cycle.
- On the basis of the results of the preliminary and final evaluations, the evaluation team and/or designated supervisor(s) must collaborate with the teacher to develop an appropriate professional growth and development plan.
- The plan must include any areas of weakness (i.e., key elements that were *not met*) that were identified during the evaluation.
- If multiple areas of weakness were identified, the areas must be prioritized so that no more than three areas are to be addressed at any given time.
- If no areas of weakness were identified, the plan must support continued improvements in professional knowledge and skills.

DOCUMENTATION AND EVALUATION OF EVIDENCE

- The chair of the evaluation team must maintain a dossier for each teacher who is undergoing formal evaluation.
- A copy of the entire dossier, either as hard copy or in electronic format, must be made available to each member of the evaluation team.
- The contents of the dossier must include, but need not be limited to,
 - the teacher’s long-range plan,
 - the teacher’s unit work sample (now SLO),
 - the evaluators’ documentation from each data-collection observation,
 - the teacher’s post-observation reflections on each observed lesson,
 - the professional reviews completed by the administrator(s), and
 - the teacher’s self-assessment.
- All evaluators must use the same scoring rubrics to review all contents of the dossier that are required for each cycle of data collection. The rubrics must directly correlate with the ten ADEPT Performance Standards and related key elements.
- A minimum of three evaluators must review the dossiers of teachers undergoing *highly consequential* formal evaluations (i.e., annual-contract teachers who are undergoing their second formal evaluations and annual-contract teachers who are returning to the field following ADEPT-related state sanctions and are undergoing their final required formal evaluations).

TEAM CONSENSUS, PERFORMANCE CRITERIA, AND REPORTS

- At the conclusion of each evaluation cycle, each member of the evaluation team must independently review all data included in the dossier for that cycle and complete the scoring rubric for each ADEPT Performance Standard.
- The evaluators must then meet to discuss their independent ratings and reach consensus regarding their judgments. Each of the key elements within each ADEPT Performance Standard must be rated as either *met* (1 point) or *not met* (0 points). Each domain is passed if *no more than one* of its key elements receives a judgment of *not met*. The following table outlines the rating system:

Domain and Performance Standards	Number of Key Elements	Number of Key Elements to Pass the Domain
Domain 1: Planning		
APS 1: Long-Range Planning	5	≥ 10
APS 2: Short-Range Planning of Instruction	3	

Domain and Performance Standards	Number of Key Elements	Number of Key Elements to Pass the Domain
APS 3: Planning Assessments and Using Data	3	
DOMAIN TOTAL	11	
Domain 2: Instruction		
APS 4: High Expectations for Learners	3	≥ 11
APS 5: Using Instructional Strategies	3	
APS 6: Providing Content	3	
APS 7: Monitoring, Assessing, and Enhancing Learning	3	
DOMAIN TOTAL	12	
Domain 3: Environment		
APS 8: Maintaining a Learning Environment	3	≥ 5
APS 9: Managing the Classroom	3	
DOMAIN TOTAL	6	
Domain 4: Professionalism		
APS 10: Fulfilling Professional Responsibilities	5	≥ 4
DOMAIN TOTAL	5	

- To successfully complete the formal evaluation, the teacher must pass *all four* domains at the time of the final evaluation judgment.
- The evaluation team also must prepare the written consensus report. The consensus report must contain, at a minimum,
 - the team’s overall consensus judgment,
 - the rating for each of the ADEPT Performance Standard key elements,
 - the team’s rationale for giving each rating, and
 - the signature of each evaluator verifying the fidelity of implementation of the evaluation process and indicating agreement with all ratings.
- Key elements that were *not met* automatically become areas for improvement. These areas must be addressed in the educator’s professional growth and development plan.
- A minimum of three evaluators is required for teachers undergoing *highly consequential* formal evaluations (i.e., annual-contract teachers who are undergoing their second formal evaluations and annual-contract teachers who are returning to the field following ADEPT- related state sanctions and are undergoing their final required formal evaluations).
 - All three evaluators must review the teacher’s dossier, participate in the team consensus meetings, and collaborate in preparing the consensus reports.

CONFERENCES

- Following each consensus meeting, but prior to the end of each evaluation cycle, one or more of the members of the evaluation team must meet with the teacher to provide a detailed oral and written explanation of his or her performance with regard to each of the ADEPT Performance Standards as well as the overall results of the evaluation. The consensus report should serve as the basis for the discussion.
- The teacher must sign and date the consensus report at the conclusion of the meeting. The teacher’s signature serves as verification that he or she has reviewed the report, but it does *not* imply the teacher’s agreement with the findings.
- The teacher must be provided a copy of the consensus report.

PROGRAM FEEDBACK AND IMPROVEMENT

- School districts must obtain and analyze feedback on an annual basis from participating educators and evaluators regarding the ADEPT formal evaluation process.
- School districts must analyze their ADS (ADEPT data system) reports and evaluation summaries.
- School districts must use the results of these analyses to continuously improve the design and/or implementation of their ADEPT formal evaluation process.

Winthrop Initial Preparation Program ADEPT Evaluation Performance

		Winthrop University		State		Winthrop University		State		Winthrop University		State	
		2018 Number Passing	2018 Percent Passing	2018 Number Passing	2018 Percent Passing	2017 Number Passing	2017 Percent Passing	2017 Number Passing	2017 Percent Passing	2016 Number Passing	2016 Percent Passing	2016 Number Passing	2016 Percent Passing
Domain I: Planning													
APS 1.A	Using Student Information to Guide Plans	107	100.0	1,393	96.7	115	99.1	1,537	96.8	119	100.0	1,496	96.5
APS 1.B	Developing Long-Range Goals	107	100.0	1,396	96.9	115	99.1	1,543	97.2	119	100.0	1,498	96.6
APS 1.C	Developing Instructional Units	106	99.1	1,398	97.1	116	100.0	1,544	97.3	119	100.0	1,496	96.5
APS 1.D	Planning Assessments	106	99.1	1,391	96.6	115	99.1	1,540	97.0	119	100.0	1,497	96.6
APS 1.E	Planning Classroom Management	107	100.0	1,387	96.3	114	98.3	1,543	97.2	118	99.2	1,497	96.6
APS 2.A	Developing Unit Objectives	106	99.1	1,396	96.9	116	100.0	1,537	96.8	118	99.2	1,495	96.5
APS 2.B	Developing Unit Instructional Plans	105	98.1	1,385	96.2	116	100.0	1,535	96.7	118	99.2	1,485	95.8
APS 2.C	Using Assessment Data to Guide Planning	106	99.1	1,382	96.0	114	98.3	1,539	97.0	119	100.0	1,490	96.1
APS 3.A	Planning Unit Assessments	105	98.1	1,378	95.7	115	99.1	1,533	96.6	119	100.0	1,492	96.3
APS 3.B	Analyzing Student Performance Data	107	100.0	1,379	95.8	112	96.6	1,517	95.6	119	100.0	1,488	96.0
APS 3.C	Determining Student Performance	107	100.0	1,387	96.3	115	99.1	1,539	97.0	119	100.0	1,487	95.9
Domain II: Instruction													
APS 4.A	Achievement Expectations	105	98.1	1,374	95.4	114	98.3	1,531	96.5	118	99.2	1,489	96.1
APS 4.B	Participation Expectations	106	99.1	1,385	96.2	114	98.3	1,540	97.0	119	100.0	1,489	96.1
APS 4.C	Fostering Student Responsibility	107	100.0	1,377	95.6	116	100.0	1,532	96.5	118	99.2	1,492	96.3
APS 5.A	Appropriate Strategies	106	99.1	1,393	96.7	115	99.1	1,542	97.2	119	100.0	1,501	96.8

		Winthrop University		State		Winthrop University		State		Winthrop University		State	
		2018 Number Passing	2018 Percent Passing	2018 Number Passing	2018 Percent Passing	2017 Number Passing	2017 Percent Passing	2017 Number Passing	2017 Percent Passing	2016 Number Passing	2016 Percent Passing	2016 Number Passing	2016 Percent Passing
APS 5.B	Varied Strategies	105	98.1	1,388	96.4	113	97.4	1,540	97.0	118	99.2	1,493	96.3
APS 5.C	Effective Strategies	104	97.2	1,364	94.7	114	98.3	1,522	95.9	115	96.6	1,481	95.5
APS 6.A	Demonstrating Content Knowledge	107	100.0	1,391	96.6	116	100.0	1,545	97.4	119	100.0	1,496	96.5
APS 6.B	Provide Appropriate Content	107	100.0	1,399	97.2	116	100.0	1,549	97.6	119	100.0	1,502	96.9
APS 6.C	Organized Content	105	98.1	1,368	95.0	114	98.3	1,531	96.5	119	100.0	1,489	96.1
APS 7.A	Monitoring Learning	105	98.1	1,383	96.0	115	99.1	1,539	97.0	117	98.3	1,490	96.1
APS 7.B	Enhancing Learning	107	100.0	1,383	96.0	116	100.0	1,542	97.2	119	100.0	1,490	96.1
APS 7.C	Instructional Feedback	105	98.1	1,381	95.9	116	100.0	1,543	97.2	119	100.0	1,494	96.4
Domain III: Environment													
APS 8.A	Physical Environment	106	99.1	1,394	96.8	114	98.3	1,548	97.5	117	98.3	1,500	96.8
APS 8.B	Affective Environment	105	98.1	1,386	96.3	115	99.1	1,543	97.2	116	97.5	1,491	96.2
APS 8.C	Culture of Learning	106	99.1	1,380	95.8	115	99.1	1,543	97.2	118	99.2	1,488	96.0
APS 9.A	Student Behavior	102	95.3	1,355	94.1	114	98.3	1,517	95.6	116	97.5	1,471	94.9
APS 9.B	Instructional Time	104	97.2	1,359	94.4	111	95.7	1,518	95.7	115	96.6	1,472	95.0
APS 9.C	Non-instructional Routines	105	98.1	1,383	96.0	115	99.1	1,536	96.8	116	97.5	1,488	96.0
Domain IV: Professionalism													
APS 10.A	Student Advocate	107	100.0	1,401	97.3	115	99.1	1,542	97.2	117	98.3	1,499	96.7
APS 10.B	Contributes to Organization	107	100.0	1,399	97.2	115	99.1	1,545	97.4	119	100.0	1,507	97.2
APS 10.C	Communication	106	99.1	1,382	96.0	113	97.4	1,528	96.3	119	100.0	1,497	96.6
APS 10.D	Demeanor/Behavior	107	100.0	1,364	94.7	109	94.0	1,491	94.0	113	95.0	1,459	94.1
APS 10.E	Active Learner	106	99.1	1,391	96.6	115	99.1	1,543	97.2	118	99.2	1,497	96.6