MAT, Secondary (508)

College: Education and Human Development

Prepared by: Jodi Howell   **Date: 6/5/19**

Approved by: Katrina Jordan   **Date: 6/12/19**

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is a committed and diverse community of scholars, educators, students, and future leaders working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. The College produces graduates with the capabilities and confidence to be productive members of society equipped with the skill sets necessary to promote economic and social development thereby improving the overall quality of life in the region. The College offers a wide variety of exemplary undergraduate and graduate programs that prepare candidates for career success across the spectrum of professional roles and settings. These programs include teacher education, leadership, and counseling; health and human performance; psychology and addiction studies; social work; and military science. Candidates are taught to become adaptive critical thinkers and problem solvers in diverse scenarios capable of leveraging new technologies to enrich lifelong learning. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive role models in their communities and leaders in the nation's military.

Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling Mission. The Department of Teaching, Leadership, and Counseling 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: To prepare teacher candidates to become certified secondary teachers for grades 6-12. The mission underlying the initial certification of candidates in the MAT Secondary Program is to provide the knowledge and skills necessary to implement literacy- and standards based instructional strategies for increasing student content learning in each candidate's discipline of study. Candidates are guided by instructors to become reflective educators who differentiate for all students' needs, use assessment data to guide their teaching, and collaborate professionally with their peers to create a student-centered environment, suitable for

adolescent students.

Methodology: The assessment process for this program is as follows:

1.   Data from assessments tools are collected and returned to the department chair and program coordinator.

2.   The program coordinator will analyze data to determine student learning and whether students have met the measurable outcomes.

3.   Results from the assessment will be shared and discussed with program faculty.

4.   The program coordinator, in consultation with program faculty, will review data and based on the analysis, faculty collaborate to make any necessary changes to course instruction and/or assessments for program improvement purposes.

Additionally, each measure was developed as follows:

Artifact/ Assessment	How was the assessment developed?	How does the assessment provide evidence for meeting the identified standards?	How was the quality of the assessment/evidence determined or assured?	What criteria for success have been established or measured, and how?
Teacher Candidate Observation Form	The Teacher Candidate Observation Form is comprised of items extracted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument. The rating scale was adjusted to reflect course grading	Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity	A panel of 11 P-12 clinicians 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	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,

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

	requirements, but the criteria and indicators were not adjusted from the Framework.		Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.	and .6 is considered "good."
Lesson Planning	A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the lesson planning template to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based.	Alignment to InTASC standards and content 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."
P12 Student Learning Impact Assessment	A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the student learning impact	Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity	A panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous student learning impact work samples submitted by candidates in four	CVR mean = -.61 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 7 items (78%) meeting critical value of .75

	assessment to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The assessment requires candidates to plan for, create, administer, and analyze student learning. Candidates then reflect on and make instructional decisions based on their analyses.		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.	ICC = .954. ICC greater than .75 reflects "excellent" inter-rater reliability.
Dispositional Evaluation – Initial Programs	Faculty created the dispositional evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards.	Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity	Face validity 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,"	Rating = "Sufficient"

			"sufficient," or "above sufficient" ratings.	

Student Learning Objectives:

SLO 1
Course Map:
Completion of SLO 1 happens during the application process to the degree program when scores are submitted.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1, Praxis II)	Applicants pass Praxis II content exam prior to admission into the degree program: Secondary teacher candidates demonstrate depth and breadth of subject matter content knowledge in the subjects they teach.

Measure 1.1. (Direct – Knowledge)

SLO 1 is assessed through the PRAXIS II: Secondary Content Knowledge Exams. The assessment is evaluated using the State Licensure Test published by the ETS, and the target performance is the successful passing of PRAXIS II.

The tests are developed by educators for educators. Advisory committees of distinguished teachers, teacher educators, key administrators and professional organizations help determine test content and review, revise and approve all questions and exercises. The Praxis tests are grounded in current research, including a comprehensive analysis of the most important tasks and skills required of beginning teachers, as well as extensive surveys to confirm test validity (ets.org).

ETS uses a validation process consistent with the technical guidelines in the 2014 AERA Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. View the ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness (PDF).

The purposes of the ETS Standards for Quality and Fairness (henceforth the SQF) are to help Educational Testing Service design, develop, and deliver technically sound, fair, accessible, and useful products and services, and to help auditors evaluate those products and services. Additionally, the SQF is a publicly available document to help current and prospective clients, test takers, policymakers, score users, collaborating organizations, and others understand the requirements for the quality and fairness of ETS products and services. The SQF is designed to provide policy-level guidance to ETS staff. The individual standards within the document are put into practice through the use of detailed guidelines, standard operating procedures, work rules, checklists, and so forth (ets.org).

The reviews of items, tests, directions, and ancillary materials were performed by people who were familiar with the specifications and purpose of the tests, the subject-matter of the tests as necessary, and the characteristics of the tests' intended population. Important aspects of the review included:

- content accuracy;
- suitability of language;
- match of items or tasks to specifications;
- accessibility and fairness for population groups;
- editorial considerations;
- completeness and clarity of directions and sample items;
- completeness and appropriateness of scoring rubrics;
- appropriateness of presentation and response formats; and
- appropriateness of difficulty (ets.org).

Finding:

2017-2018: 100% met target

2018-2019: 100% met target

Social Studies 5086 (n=2)
Mean composite: 165
Cut score: 160
National median: 161
National range: 150-171

Biology 5235 (n=1)
Mean composite: 185
Cut score: 150
National median: 163
National range: 153-175

English 5039 (n=8)
Mean composite: 174
Cut score: 168
National median: 175
National range: 169-181

Math 5161 (n=1)
Mean composite: 160
Cut score: 160
National median: 159
National range: 137-169

Analysis: In 2017-2018, 100% of teacher candidates admitted to the program passed the Praxis II subject assessment. In 2018-2019, 100% of teacher candidates admitted to the program passed the Praxis II subject assessment. Mean composites exceeded the national median in social studies, biology, and math, but not in English; however, all mean composites fell within or exceeded the national ranges for each test. These results are concurrent with results from previous years because passing content licensure exams is an admission requirement. Praxis II Subject Assessments serve as an indicator of teacher candidates' content knowledge in the certification areas they pursue. Based on the analysis of 2017-2018 and to improve admissions of potential candidates in 2018-2019, candidates were provided with additional study materials ensuring a 100% success rate.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Given that all candidates' preparation for this assessment occurs prior to their association with the program, how prepared each candidate varies greatly. Although this test is an entrance requirement to the program and passage is required for admission, faculty have discussed that offering additional sessions in 2019-2020 to help prepare candidates for these tests could positively impact both the number of new candidates to the 508 program and improve their effectiveness within their teaching assignments. Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, opportunities to assist candidates who may be unsuccessful are limited to 1) providing study materials, 2) providing tutoring, and 3) recommending undergraduate content courses to take if results in a sub-test area are consistently low. Faculty and advisors will search for study materials for potential teacher candidates interested in taking Praxis II Subject Assessments for Secondary Education.

SLO 2
Course Map:
Completion of SLO 2 occurs during the internship course **EDUC 5430.**

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #4, Teacher Candidate Observation Form)	Candidates pass a teaching evaluation to assess content, pedagogical knowledge, and skills in professional practice

Measure 2.1. (Direct – Skills)
Teacher Candidate Observation Form

The Teacher Candidate Observation Form is comprised of items extracted from the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument. The rating scale was adjusted to reflect course grading requirements, but the criteria and indicators were not adjusted from the Framework.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity

A panel of 11 P-12 clinicians 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."

Finding:

2017-2018: target met. Cohort mean was 2.81, which met the target of 2.5.

2018-2019: target met. Cohort mean was 2.93, which met the target of 2.5.

Analysis: In 2017-2018, the cohort mean was 2.81 with a 2.5 target. After a formal program review conducted by an external evaluator, several changes were made to the COEHD evaluation processes and instrument. The evaluation instrument was revised to provide candidates more specific, actionable feedback on their instruction and how to improve. For each formal evaluation, university supervisors are now required to identify one area of reinforcement and one area of refinement with corroborating evidence from the lesson to support each area. Additionally, supervisors must document if candidates applied the feedback for improvement given by their evaluators to subsequent lessons.

These new evaluation requirements caused university supervisors to take a more critical look at the candidates' instruction and accompanying lesson plans. To ensure supervisors were prepared to implement these changes, more formalized training was provided than had been conducted in the past.

In 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 2.93 with a target of 2.5. For the clinical experience evaluation, candidates 1) plan and prepare lessons, 2) establish the classroom environment, and 3) instruct and assess students. These three domains are assessed with multiple evaluation criteria. University supervisors assess each evaluation criteria using a three-point rating scale with the following options: Ineffective = 1, Effective Emerging = 2, and Emerging Proficient = 3. The rating scale correlates with Louisiana's adoption and modification of the Framework for Teaching Evaluation Instrument available from the Danielson Group. Also, to improve candidates' scores, readings were added to EDUC 5840 targeting teachers' ability to question their students and facilitate class discussions. Evidence from 2018-2019 shows that candidates predominantly earned scores of Effective Emerging = 2 and Emerging Proficient = 3. However, the mean suggests that candidates are consistently planning, preparing, fostering a positive classroom environment, instructing, and assessing their students in a way to meet the needs of diverse students, including those planning for college or careers after graduation.

Based on the analysis of the results, evidence suggests that the implementation of the revised assessment in 2018-2019 was more stringent and rigorous.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, to improve candidates' scores in the 2019- 2020 academic year, supplemental materials need to be provided 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. Additional training and interrater reliability may need to be established for the revised instrument.

SLO 3
Course Map:
Completion of SLO 3 occurs during the internship course **EDUC 5430.**

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics. (Dispositional Evaluation)	Candidates pass a dispositions evaluation: Secondary teacher candidates 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. (Direct – Dispositions)
Dispositional Evaluation

SLO 3 is assessed through the Professional Dispositions and Characteristics (PDC) Scale. The assessment is evaluated using the PDC Likert scale evaluates dispositions and characteristics demonstrated by university faculty, supervisor, and cooperating principal over the course of the program; candidates are evaluated during their internship year, and the target performance is a score of 3.5-5.0.

Faculty created the dispositional evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity.
Face validity 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. Rating = "Sufficient".

Finding:

2017-2018: target met. Cohort mean was 4.80, which met the target of 3.

2018-2019: target met. Cohort mean was 4.95, which met the target of 3.

All the candidates earned ratings of 4 and 5 on each dispositional rubric item. All indicators (n=42) had mean scores between 4.0 and 5.0. Multiple indicators had mean scores of 5.0. The overall mean was 4.95. SLO 3 was met.

Analysis: In 2017-2018, the cohort mean was 4.80 with a target of 3. While the target was met, many changes occurred in the course and program. After a formal program review conducted by an external evaluator, several changes were made to the COEHD evaluation processes and instruments. The summary pages of the evaluation instruments were revised to provide candidates more specific, actionable feedback on

their instruction and how to improve.

To ensure supervisors were prepared to implement these changes, more formalized training was provided than had been conducted in the past. In 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 4.95 with a target of 3. Faculty have discussed that this instrument does not provide meaningful data because there is very little variance in scores. Areas for candidates' improvement include 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. While candidates' scores in these areas were acceptable, the department feels like improvements could be made. A proposed revision to how dispositions are evaluated and acted upon is being reviewed by a faculty committee.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, in the 2019-2020 academic year, candidates need to receive 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. This can be accomplished through focused online instruction and counseling throughout the internship year. Further revisions to the tool and/or process will result in more actionable, qualitative evaluations.

SLO 4
Course Map:
Completion of SLO 4 occurs during the internship year while candidates are enrolled in **EDUC 5430.**

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, Lesson Plan)	Secondary teacher candidates demonstrate the ability to select/create appropriate formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the learner.

Measure 4.1. (Direct – Knowledge)
Lesson Plan

A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the lesson planning template to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content 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."

Finding:

2017-2018: target not met. Cohort mean was 2.88, which did not meet the target of 3.

2018-2019: target met. Cohort mean was 3.72, which met the target of 3.

Analysis: In 2017-2018, the cohort mean was 2.88 with a target of 3. After a formal program review conducted by an external evaluator, several changes were made to the COEHD evaluation processes and instruments. For each formal evaluation, university supervisors are now required to identify one area of reinforcement and one area of refinement with corroborating evidence from the lesson to support each area. Additionally, supervisors must document if candidates applied the feedback for improvement given by their evaluators to subsequent lessons.

These new evaluation requirements caused university supervisors to take a more critical look at the candidates' instruction and accompanying lesson plans. As a result, in 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 3.72, with a target of 3. Evidence from 2018-2019 shows that candidates predominately earned scores of 3.25 to 4.0. Areas for candidates' improvement include 1) Setting Assessment Criteria, 2) Analysis of Formative Data, 3) Student Learning Targets, and 4) Reflective Practice.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, in the 2019-2020 academic year, candidates need to receive additional support in four areas: 1) Setting Assessment Criteria, 2) Analysis of Formative Data, 3) Student Learning Targets, and 4) Reflective Practice. The mean suggests that candidates are demonstrating the ability to select/create appropriate formative assessments and use the results to adjust and plan following instruction. While candidates' scores in these areas were acceptable, the department feels like improvements could be made. Course content and activities will be augmented to ensure that the four most deficient areas of the assessment are emphasized in the course.

SLO 5
Course Map:
Completion of SLO 5 occurs during the internship course **EDUC 5430.**

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate (SPA #5, Student Learning Target)	Candidates create a Student Learning Target Assessment

Measure 5.1. (Direct – Knowledge)
Student Learning Target Assessment

A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the student learning impact assessment to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The assessment requires candidates to plan for, create, administer, and analyze student learning. Candidates then reflect on and make instructional decisions based on their analyses.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity ensured.
A panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous student learning impact 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 = -.61 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 7 items (78%) meeting critical value of .75
ICC = .954. ICC greater than .75 reflects "excellent" inter-rater reliability.

Finding:

2017-2018: target not met. Cohort mean was 2.67, which did not meet the target of 3.

2018-2019: target met. Cohort mean was 3.73, which met the target of 3.

Analysis: In 2017-2018, the cohort mean was 2.67 with a target of 3. A new instructor was installed in this course, and, as a result, the course was tweaked. In 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 3.73 the target of 3. Candidates earned between 3.25-4.0, with a mean of 3.71 in the area related to interventions to maintain or improve student achievement. Candidates earned between 3.42-4.0 in two additional areas: 1)Ability to Analyze Student Data and 2) Aligning Student Assessment with Instructional Outcomes.

Action - Decision or Recommendation: Based on the analysis of the 2018-2019 results, a new data literacy and assessment course was added to the 2019-2020 curriculum. It focused specifically on middle/secondary teaching which improved student learning. The new planning course provided greater attention to data and assessment.

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Improvements Based on Analysis of Results:

- SLO 1: To improve admissions of potential candidates in 2018-2019, candidates were provided with study materials.

- SLO 2, SLO 3, SLO 4: After a formal program review conducted by an external evaluator in, several changes were made to the COEHD evaluation processes and instruments.

- The summary pages of the evaluation instruments were revised to provide candidates more specific, actionable feedback on their instruction and how to improve.

- For each formal evaluation, university supervisors are now required to identify one area of reinforcement and one area of refinement with corroborating evidence from the lesson to support each area. Additionally, supervisors must document if candidates applied the feedback for improvement given by their evaluators to subsequent lessons.

- These new evaluation requirements caused university supervisors to take a more critical look at the candidates' instruction and accompanying lesson plans.

- To ensure supervisors were prepared to implement these changes, more formalized training was provided than had been conducted in the past.

- SLO 5: A new instructor was installed in this course, and, as a result, the course was tweaked.

Plan of Action Moving Forward: Based on the evidence gathered and the analysis of the results, the program has decided to include the following actions to improve student learning and program quality:

Faculty have discussed that offering sessions in 2019-2020 to help prepare candidates for the PRAXIS tests could positively impact both the number of new candidates to the 508 program and improve their effectiveness within their teaching assignments. To that end, opportunities to assist candidates who may be unsuccessful are limited to 1) providing study materials, 2) providing tutoring, and 3) recommending undergraduate content courses to take if results in a particular sub-test area are consistently low. Faculty and advisors will search for study materials for potential teacher candidates interested in taking Praxis II Subject Assessments for Secondary Education.

Assessment Cycle 2018-2019

To improve candidates' scores for SLO 2 in the 2019-2020 academic year, supplemental materials need to be provided 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. Additional training and interrater reliability may need to be established for the revised instrument.

In the 2019-2020 academic year, candidates need to receive additional support and encouragement in four areas of the SLO 3 assessment: 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. This can be accomplished through focused online instruction and counseling throughout the internship year. Further revisions to the tool and/or process will result in more actionable, qualitative evaluations.

To increase candidates' scores for SLO 4 in the 2019-2020 school year, candidates need to receive additional support in four areas: 1) Setting Assessment Criteria, 2) Analysis of Formative Data, 3) Student Learning Targets, and 4) Reflective Practice. The mean suggests that candidates are demonstrating the ability to select/create appropriate formative assessments and use the results to adjust and plan following instruction. While candidates' scores in these areas were acceptable, the department feels like improvements could be made. Course content and activities will be augmented to ensure that the four most deficient areas of the assessment are emphasized in the course.

A new data literacy and assessment course was added to the 2019-2020 curriculum in response to the needs found in analysis of SLO 5 evidence. It focuses specifically on middle/secondary teaching which should improve student learning. The new planning course will provide greater attention to data and assessment.