Middle School Masters of Art in Teaching (MS MAT) (507)

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development

Department: School of Education

Prepared by: Amy Craig and Wendi O'Halloran   **Date: June 7, 2022**

Approved by: Kimberly McAlister   **Date: June 20, 2022**

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution committed to acquiring, creating, and disseminating knowledge through innovative teaching, research, and service. With its certificate, undergraduate, and graduate programs, Northwestern State University prepares its increasingly diverse student population to contribute to an inclusive global community with a steadfast dedication to improving our region, state, and nation.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is committed to working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge to Northwestern students through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. Through the School of Education and Departments of Health and Human Performance, Military Science, Psychology, and Social Work, the College produces knowledgeable, inspired, and innovative graduates ready for lifelong learning who contribute to the communities in which they reside and professions they serve. Additionally, the GCEHD is dedicated to the communities served by the Marie Shaw Dunn Child Development Center, NSU Elementary Laboratory School, NSU Middle Laboratory School, and the NSU Child and Family Network to assist children and their families related to learning and development.

School of Education Mission. The School of Education offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and professional endeavors.

Program Mission Statement. The MAT Middle Level Program faculty provide highly effective coursework, fully online, to meet the needs of candidates who are seeking their initial certification as middle level educators. Program candidates gain the knowledge and skills necessary to implement literacy- and standards-based instructional strategies for increasing student content learning in each candidate's academic area of study; candidates also develop effective management expertise critical to the establishment of responsive student-centered learning environments.

During the course of their program, candidates become reflective educators who also develop the pedagogical skills necessary to differentiate instruction, to meet the widely diverse needs of young adolescent students, to apply assessment data for instructional

planning, and to collaborate professionally with their peers and administrators within a school setting. The development of the program and courses is based on standards set by the American Middle Level Education (AMLE), InTasc, and the State of Louisiana. The overarching goal is to educate and credential highly effective teachers for employment in Louisiana schools where they will have positive impact on student learning.

Methodology.

(1)   Program assessment begins as part of the application process for each potential candidate. Entry into the program depends upon passage of, Praxis II, the core knowledge standardized assessment required by the State of Louisiana for each subject area(s) of certification.

(2)   As candidates matriculate through the program, they complete signature assignments for each course; additionally, an end-of-program portfolio is completed to showcase program learning. These assessments are evaluated by program faculty and inform adjustments to courses.

(3)   Upon completion of coursework, candidates complete a two-semester internship during which they are evaluated regularly by faculty supervisors and school administrators for mastered subject area knowledge and for effective application of their teaching and management skills.

(4)   Program faculty and stakeholders regularly review and analyze data on selected assessments. Data analyses guide any needed curricular or program adjustments.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1.

Course Map: Candidates take the Praxis PLT in their second year of coursework prior to their residency/internship (EDUC 5420).

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1)	Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of developmentally appropriate practices relating to Middle School Education.

Measure 1.1. (Direct – knowledge)

SLO 1 is assessed through the ***Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT);*** grades 5-9 (#5623) exam, which is nationally normed. The assessment is a standardized test published by ETS, and a target performance is the successful passing of the PLT according to the minimum qualifying score set forth by the state of Louisiana for certification as a middle- school teacher.

Quality of the assessment/evidence is assured because (1) the state of Louisiana requires this test, and (2) the test is nationally normed.

For candidates to be successful, they must achieve a qualifying score that is at least as high as the state minimum requirement of at least 160. The target is for 100% of candidates to achieve the minimum requirement of 160.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2021-2022: 100% of candidates met target.
- AC 2020-2021: 100% of candidates met target.
- AC 2019-2020: 100% of candidates met target.
- AC 2018-2019: 100% of candidates met target.

Analysis:

Based on the analysis of the 2020-2021 results in 2021-2022 the following changes were implemented. To drive continuous improvement, maximize student learning, and continue to improve the program, the department partnered with the Natchitoches Parish library and other libraries within the region to offer access to Learning Express and identify and implement alternative ways to support candidates in their course to help them be successful on the licensure tests, specifically the PRAXIS II PLT exam. Students were offered a discount on the software Tutoring 240, an online program that guarantees success with lesson completion, or students receive their money back.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2021-22, 100% of candidates met the target. The qualifying score for the PLT Grades 5-9 is 160. Candidates' scores ranged from 164-to 185, with a mean score of 176.7 and a standard deviation of 6.9. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate developmentally appropriate pedogeological knowledge.

Decision, Action, or Recommendation:

In AC 2020-2021, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty implemented the

4

above changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2022-2023, the faculty will offer PRAXIS seminars, advise students to use 240 Tutoring, and partner with the Natchitoches Parish Library to offer access to Learning Express, a source for PRAXIS test preparation to supporting candidate learning and their ability.

These changes will improve the student's ability to demonstrate knowledge of Developmentally Appropriate Practices relating to elementary education, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward. Moving forward SLO 1 will be modified to state that 80% of the students who attempt the PLT Middle-School Principals of Learning and Teaching for the first time will pass to more accurately measure the success of instructional impact.

SLO 2.
Course Map:
EDUC 5420 & 5421 Middle School Internship in Teaching – 2 semesters**.**

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #2)	Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of developmentally appropriate practices relating to Middle-School curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Measure 2.1. (Direct – Knowledge, Skills)

The *Teacher Candidate Observation Form* is based on effective teaching behaviors listed on the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument. Domains of assessment include (1) planning/preparing lessons to include alignment among standards, activities, and assessments and the implementation of engaging activities through literacy enhancement of the content subject (2) instructing/assessing students to include questioning techniques, differentiating strategies for varied student needs, and establishing an ongoing form of informal assessment on which to base instructional adjustments as well as more formal assessments of subject matter (3) establishing positive classroom environment to include procedures and motivational techniques that support content learning.

University field supervisors and cooperating principals evaluate each criterion using a three-point rating scale with the following options: Ineffective = 1, Effective Emerging = 2, and Emerging Proficient = 3; the scale is based on the Louisiana Compass Teaching Evaluation. Items on the instrument are evaluated multiple times during the two internship semesters.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity are supported by a panel of 11 P- 12 clinicians who viewed two 20-minute teaching vignettes and conducted independent evaluations of the teaching performance using this tool. Analyses were conducted using the Lawshe Content Validity Ration (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

CVR mean = -.03 with CVR (Critical, 11) = .59 and no single item meeting critical value of .59 ICC = .59. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects "fair" inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered "good."

The target for this assessment is for 85% of candidates to attain a minimum of 2.0 (proficiency) on the evaluation instrument.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2020-2021: 100% of interns met target.

- AC 2019-2020: 88% of interns met target.

- AC 2018-2019 (baseline): 100% of interns met target.Analysis:

In AC 2019-2020 the target was met. The cohort mean for all subject areas was 2.523 on a 3.00 scale (n=22). Data showed that interns scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment.

Scores were consistent in each content area, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom.

The scores ranged from 2.485 to 2.853. Data showed that most interns scored in the two highest categories across all items—Exemplary or Proficient. Areas of excellence included effective communication with students (2.794) and strong content knowledge (2.853).

Lower scores were in the areas of using assessment to drive instruction (2.485) and questioning and discussion techniques (2.559). Data collected for EPP purposes likely exceed those relevant for CAEP accreditation.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2019-2020 results the following changes were implemented in AC 2020-2021 to drive improvement: Faculty provided annual training for field supervisors for the meaningful evaluation of this somewhat complicated assessment. Supervisors were asked to be more diligent when considering the rubric language and ratings and in giving specific feedback for categories.

These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2020-2021 the target was met.

Analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data included a composite of the scores in each of the three areas from the Danielson Framework--. Data showed that candidates scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment. Scores were consistent in each degree program, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom.

The cohort mean for all subject areas was 2.708 on a 3.00 scale (n=9). Data showed that interns scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment.

Scores were consistent in each degree program, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom. The scores ranged from 2.543 to 2.891. Data showed that most interns scored in the two highest categories across all items—Exemplary or Proficient. Areas of excellence included Creating an environment of respect and rapport (2.870) and strong content knowledge (2.891). Lower scores were in the areas of demonstrating knowledge of students (2.50) and engaging students in learning (2.457). Data collected for EPP purposes likely exceed those relevant for CAEP accreditation.

In AC 2021-22, the target was met. Based on analysis results from AC 2021-2022, faculty assessed candidates using this instrument to measure candidate performance. Candidate scores on the form provided evidence for meeting state-identified standards aligned with artifacts tied to InTASC and content standards. To maximize student learning and to continue to improve the program, faculty examined data gleaned from candidates' observation scores and oral reflections to determine necessary changes and find more ways to support candidates in their internship to help them be successful educators.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 results students' mean observation score was 2.555. The faculty further studied the observation results and the instrument used. Candidate scores on the form during the initial iteration in AC 2021-2022 provide evidence for meeting state-identified standards aligned with artifacts tied to InTASC and content standards. Teacher candidates scores exhibited strengths in demonstrating content knowledge and pedagogy (mean 2.788) and develops standards-based lesson plans with well-aligned goals and objectives that account for and build on learners' prior skills, knowledge, and understandings (mean 2.61)

Based on the analysis of the results in AC 2021 – 2022, the following actions were taken to continue to assess candidates' knowledge and skills relating to Middle-School learning environments, curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Teacher Candidate Observation Form in EDUC 5420 and EDUC 5421 was used to assess candidate performance during the two-semester internship during the final two semesters of the program. University supervisors, mentors, and principals were encouraged to provide formative feedback on learning environments and instruction during post-observation conferences.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2021-22, the target was met.

The areas of need shifted from the 2020-2021 year when candidates needed to focus on questioning and discussion, designing student assessment, paring, and grouping students,

and differentiating instruction and learning tasks to the areas of needs based on the AC 2021-2022 data showing that candidates need assistance in the areas of demonstrating knowledge of students (mean 2.87), demonstrates a high level of competence in the use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language, and child development (mean 2.67), and designs lessons that integrate language, literacy, and thinking skill development throughout instruction and across content areas (2.8).

The data show that the students need to increase their ability to apply literacy when developing and teaching lessons in all content areas and to varied ways of demonstrating the knowledge of the students.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2021-2022 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2022-2023, faculty will embed videos and direct instruction into their courses in the areas of demonstrating knowledge of students, demonstrating a high level of competence in the use research based best practices, instructional strategies, implementation of culturally responsive teaching practices and effective use of assessment. These changes will improve the student's ability to demonstrate knowledge of Developmentally Appropriate Practices relating to Middle-School curriculum, instruction, and assessment, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 3.
Course Map:
EDUC 5420 & 5421 Middle School Internship in Teaching – 2 semesters

Departmental Student Learning	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics (SPA #6)	Middle-level teacher candidates/interns demonstrate the professional dispositions and characteristics of effective educators in their interactions with students, administrators, co-workers, parents, and university faculty throughout the program.

Measure 3.1 (Indirect/Dispositions)

SLO 3 outcomes are assessed using the ***Professional Dispositions and Characteristics (PDC) Likert Scale***, which is scored by university faculty, NSU field supervisors, cooperating principals, and candidates themselves in key courses throughout the program. The criteria checklist was revised in 2016 to better assess strengths and weaknesses of middle school teacher candidates as outlined in the Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE) standards. These revisions have added specificity to the categories, making assessment items more relevant to the MAT MS candidates/interns and the data more valid to faculty in this online program. The disposition tool is used to score interns each semester by at least two field

supervisors.

Steps were taken to assure the Quality of the assessment/evidence. Face validity was established by 1) aligning items to constructs, 2) avoiding bias and ambiguous language, and 3) stating items in actionable terms. Analysis was conducted using the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments, resulting in "below sufficient," "sufficient," or "above sufficient" ratings.

Target for this assessment was for 90% of candidates to score a 4.00/5.00.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2021-2022: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.
- AC 2020-2021: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.
- AC 2019-2020: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.
- AC 2018-2019: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.

Analysis: In AC 2021-2022, the target was met. In AC 2021-2022, candidates' mean score was 4.506 (n=6).

Based on the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 data, the areas that needed improvement were managing time effectively, analyzes problems critically and attempts to resolve them independently (as appropriate), and responds to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary. Faculty focused instructional strategies on these areas and as a result, the target was met. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 results, in AC 2022-2023, faculty will assess candidates' professionalism and motivation for teaching to support student learning and to maintain a pattern of continuous improvement.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2021-2022, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from the analysis of the AC 2021-2022 data, the faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2022-2023 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2022-2023, faculty will drive improvement by implementing added resources relating to the areas that need improvement which includes consistently responding to the needs of all learners, analyzing problems critically, and attempting to resolve them independently (as appropriate), going beyond what is expected, and evaluating and reflects on his/her own experience and work. The faculty will provide feedback and identify specific strategies to support teacher candidates as they reflect and analyze student data submitted in course assignments.

These changes will improve the student's ability to model behaviors and characteristics that are

9

professional and ethical, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 4
Course Map:
EDUC 5621 Internship

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3)	Middle-level teacher interns create a lesson plan to demonstrate their ability to select/create appropriate instructional practices to deliver/assess the content of their discipline, specifically to engage student learners and increase achievement.

Measure 4.1. (Direct – Knowledge, Skills)

The ***Lesson Plan Assessment*** addresses the Louisiana State Standards and is aligned to InTASC standards for content validity. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which MAT Middle teacher evaluations were based for AY 2019-20. Interns were measured on a wide variety of knowledge and skills needed to teach effectively in accordance with the Louisiana Compass rubric, the Louisiana State Standards, and the AMLE; each lesson plan was scored for its application of specific content in an engaging and meaningful design and delivery format. Scores for the lesson planning expertise of interns were entered in the Middle MAT Portfolio on TaskStream under the heading of Aggregate Planning. To establish validity, a panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous lesson plan work samples submitted by candidates in four different initial teacher preparation programs. Analyses were conducted using the

Lawshe Content Validity Ration (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

CVR mean = -.58 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 13 items (62%) meeting critical value of .75 ICC = .573. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects "fair" inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered "good."

Target for this assessment is that 85% of the candidates score a 3.00/4/00 (or 75%) mean.

Finding: Target was met.

- AC 2021-2022: 100% of interns met target.
- AC 2020-2021: 100% of interns met target.
- AC 2019-2020: 88% of interns met target.

- AC 2018-2019 (baseline): 90% of interns met target.

Analysis:

Based on analysis of the AC 2019-2020 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty provided modified instructional design and strategies in four areas: 1) Setting Assessment Criteria, 2) Analysis of Formative Data, 3) Student Learning Targets, and 4) Reflective Practice. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2020-2021 the target was met. As a result of the AC 2020-2021 data, Faculty added additional instructional materials and resources in AC 2021-2022 to support contextual factors and student learning adaptations and higher order thinking. These changes resulted in target attainment for AC 2021-2022.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2020-2021, the target was met. Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data, faculty continued to implement the above changes in AC 2021- 2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. For AC 2022 – 2023, Faculty will continue to add additional instructional materials and resources to support contextual factors and student learning adaptations. Additionally, in AC 2022-2023 the course map for this measure will be changed to EDUC 5600 which will provide a more accurate basis for assessing the lesson plan assignment.

These changes will improve the student's ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

SLO 5 is assessed in *EDUC 5840, Using Research to Improve Instructional Practice,*

through a paper-in-lieu-of-thesis.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate	Candidates applied the educational research process through a review of literature, analysis of data, and plans to improve instructional practice with empirically supported decisions

Measure 5.1. (Indirect – Applied Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

Assessment: Paper-in-lieu-of-thesis

The Graduate School required each master's level candidate to complete a paper-in-lieu-of-thesis prior to graduation. Guidelines were specified by the Graduate Council and followed a traditional format with a paper introduction section, review of related literature subsections for each variable, analyses of data, and plans for improving instructional practices.

Candidates were asked to engage in reflective teaching by evaluating their instructional practices in the areas of 1) assessment, 2) instructional planning, and 3) instructional strategies. These variables aligned with standards 6, 7, and 8 from the InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards for Teachers. For each variable, candidates evaluated their essential knowledge, performances (skills), and critical dispositions using itemized lists published for each standard.

The assessment allowed candidates to self-evaluate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions while using data, along with findings from published academic studies, to inform their future instructional practices. Candidates developed specific action plans by problem-solving and making decisions about how to improve their knowledge, skills, and dispositions in the areas of assessment, instructional planning, and instructional strategies.

The paper-in-lieu-of-thesis was graded using a holistic evaluation checklist with seven evaluative criteria and a seven-point, rating scale. The evaluative criteria aligned with the Graduate School's requirements and included the following parts of the paper: 1) preface, 2) introduction, 3) section on assessment, 4) section on instructional planning, 5) section on instructional strategies, 6) conclusion with implications for future teaching, and 7) references.

The rating scale included the following rating levels: 0-Missing (not present), 1-Unsatisfactory (too underdeveloped to award credit), 2-Significant Development Needed (needed a significant amount of development), 3-More Editing Needed (needed more explanation, details, or correction), 4-Minor Polishing Needed (few errors were present in APA guidelines, mechanics, and/or grammar), 5-Target (achieved what was asked for in the directions), and 6-Beyond Expectations (exceeded expectations asked in the directions in both scope and depth with exemplary writing). The benchmark score of 3 indicated that an evaluative criterion was minimally acceptable with the required elements from the directions present in the subsection of the paper, but more editing was needed in terms of explanation, details, or corrections. Additionally, candidates had to earn an overall letter grade of C or higher (175 out of 250 points) on the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis before it was submitted to the Graduate School to meet the graduation requirement.

Finding: *78% (38 out of 49) of candidates met the target*

Analysis:

For the 2021-22 academic year, the following changes were made in EDUC 5840 to improve the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis assessment. First, a new scoring level was added to the rubric to provide students with more detailed feedback. Specifically, the new scoring level was called *More Editing Needed*. It was an evaluation level that followed *Minor Polishing Needed* and preceded *Significant Development Needed*. The goal of this change was to better assess students' performance on specific areas of the paper by providing an additional data point to determine students who passed the paper with a C or higher grade. Second, a zero-point scoring level was added to reflect evaluative criteria missing from the paper. Third, plagiarism was addressed by altering the topic of the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis with different research variables. The overall topic of the paper still aligned with the course by using research to improve instructional practice. However, candidates evaluated

their instructional practices in the new areas of 1) assessment, 2) instructional planning, and 3) instructional strategies.

Summer 2021: Nineteen teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 5840 in the Summer 2021 semester. Sixteen of these candidates passed the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis with a grade of C or higher. Three did not earn a passing grade and needed to retake the course.

Fall 2021: Thirteen teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 5840 in the Fall 2021 semester. Nine of these candidates passed the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis with a grade of C or higher. Four did not earn a passing grade and needed to retake the course.

Spring 2022: Seventeen teacher candidates enrolled in EDUC 5840 in the Spring 2022 semester. Thirteen of these candidates passed the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis with a grade of C or higher. Two received a grade of In Progress (IP) and will continue the course. Two did not earn a passing grade and needed to retake the course.

Beginning in Fall 2021, a Graduate Student Success coach was hired in the department to assist and coach students struggling with the writing and research process. Additionally, APA workshops were held, and students were provided extra resources to support them in the writing process.

Thirty-eight of the 49 teacher education candidates enrolled in the MAT programs met the SLO because they successfully applied the educational research process through a review of literature, analysis of data, and plans to improve instructional practice with empirically supported decisions. The student learning outcome (SLO) was met at 78%, which is an improvement from the previous assessment cycle.

For the papers-in-lieu-of-thesis that received a passing grade of C or higher on their first submission attempt during the assessment cycle, ratings on evaluative criteria ranged from 2 to 6 on a scale from 0 to 6. This means that all of the students who passed did not have a rating of 0-Missing or 1-Unsatisfactory. This range improved compared to the distribution of ratings from the previous assessment cycle; however, two new additional rating levels were added to the holistic evaluation checklist, which makes the comparison a little skewed. Overall points on the papers ranged from 248 points to 175 total points out of 250 possible points.

For 22% (n = 11) of teacher education candidates enrolled in the MAT programs who did not meet the SLO, one failed to submit a paper-in-lieu-of-thesis and appears to have discontinued the program. Other candidates submitted incomplete papers. Follow-up emails with students revealed the lack of motivation and time management as the main hurdles in the course. These students will be following a remediation plan when they retake the course to address these hurdles.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

For the 2022-23 academic year, the following changes will be made in EDUC 5840 to improve the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis course. First, comprehensive exam video assignments will be updated and added to the course to help students reflect on their instructional practices prior to and after writing the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis. This might encourage students with time management concerns to stay engaged with the course content. Second, self-evaluation checklists will be added to the course to guide students with proofreading and editing their papers prior to submitting the final version for grading. The goal of the self-evaluation checklists is to help students identify and correct common problems that typically reoccur each semester as new students learn APA guidelines and navigate the process of writing the paper. Third, additional quantitative indicators will be added to the holistic

evaluation checklist to let students know how much each evaluative criterion is worth in relation to the whole paper. This will help the assessment process become more objective and give students a clearer indication of where they earned points.

The next assessment cycle report for SLO 5 will include a validity analysis of the holistic evaluation checklist compared to the directions for the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis assessment and other indicators of validity. Data will be included from the 2022 calendar year to assess several types of validity, including construct-related validity (face validity and content validity) and criterion-related validity (predictive validity). The validity analysis will help programs gather, analyze, and reflect on additional data points for the next accreditation review.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results: **Program faculty made several decisions after examining results of data analysis from AC 2020-2021 which resulted in improved student learning and program improvement in AC 2021-2022.**

SLO 1: Faculty supported candidates who were not on track to achieve passing standard by providing study materials, providing tutoring, and recommending the 240 tutoring program. Faculty and advisors provided study materials for potential teacher candidates who needed extra support in preparing for the Praxis PLT.

SLO 2: Faculty provided supplemental materials to candidates for the rubric criteria of 1) Uses an effective lesson design including motivation, introduction and closure and 2) Encourages student participation through questioning and discussion techniques.

SLO3: Faculty provided additional support and encouragement in four areas: 1) manages time effectively, 2) goes beyond which is expected, 3) evaluates and reflects on his/her own experience and work, and 4) continues to seek knowledge and professional development through focused online instruction and counseling throughout the internship.

SLO 4: Faculty provided modified instructional design and strategies in four areas: 1) Setting Assessment Criteria, 2) Analysis of Formative Data, 3) Student Learning Targets, and 4) Reflective Practice. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline.

SLO 5: For the papers-in-lieu-of-thesis that received a passing grade of C or higher on their first submission attempt during the assessment cycle, ratings on evaluative criteria ranged from 2 to 6 on a scale from 0 to 6. This means that all of the students who passed did not have a rating of 0-Missing or 1-Unsatisfactory. This range improved compared to the distribution of ratings from the previous assessment cycle; however, two new additional rating levels were added to the holistic evaluation checklist, which makes the comparison a little skewed. Overall points on the papers ranged from 248 points to 175 total points out of 250 possible points.

Plan of Action for Moving Forward: Program faculty examined the evidence and results of data analysis from AC 2020-2021 and will take steps to continue to improve student learning in AC 2021-2022:

SLO 1. Faculty will actively communicate and promote the use of 240 Tutoring (offered at a discounted rate) to help ensure a first time passing of the Praxis PLT.

SLO 2. Field supervisors will specifically address two areas in need of improvement: The development of effective methods of inquiry and how to lead students to higher order thinking through these questioning techniques. These areas will be placed on the remediation plans for interns who need further support.

SLO 3. Faculty will continue to add instructional materials and resources that strengthen professional dispositions of candidates. Faculty will focus on ensuring that candidates are able to demonstrate modification of plans when necessary to support student learning and strengthen candidate readiness to demonstrate content and pedagogical mastery in this domain.

SLO 4. Students will receive comprehensive lesson plan design and instruction in EDUC 5600. Students will participate in peer lesson plan feedback as well as instructor feedback using the NSU Lesson Plan Template (with hyperlinks) and rubric.

SLO 5. The next assessment cycle report for SLO 5 will include a validity analysis of the holistic evaluation checklist compared to the directions for the paper-in-lieu-of-thesis assessment and other indicators of validity. Data will be included from the 2022 calendar year to assess several types of validity, including construct-related validity (face validity and content validity) and criterion-related validity (predictive validity). The validity analysis will help programs gather, analyze, and reflect on additional data points for the next accreditation review.