AC 2019-2020 Assessment

MAT, Secondary (508)

Division: Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development

Department: School of Education

Prepared by: Susan Kahn **Date: June 19, 2020**
Confirmed Susan Kahn, GCEHD Assessment Coordinator

Approved by: Kimberly McAlister **Date: July 19, 2020**

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 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: 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,

	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: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met. 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Met. 100% of candidates met target.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Met. 100% of candidates met target.

Social Studies 5086 (n=5)
Mean composite: 161.4 (-)
Cut score: 153
National median: 161
National range: 150-170

Biology 5235 (n=7)
Mean composite: 159. 1 (-)
Cut score: 150
National median: 163
National range: 153-175

English 5039 (n=9)
Mean composite: 175.6 (+)
Cut score: 168
National median: 175
National range: 169-181

Math 5161 (n=4)
Mean composite: 163.8 (+)
Cut score: 160
National median: 159
National range: 137-169

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 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 AC 2017-2018 and to improve admissions of potential candidates in AC 2018-2019, candidates were provided with additional study materials ensuring a 100% success rate.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Based on the analysis of AC 2018-2019 data and to improve admissions of potential candidates in AC 2019-2020, faculty provided candidates with additional study materials to support a 100% success rate. 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 offered additional test preparation sessions in AC 019-2020 to help prepare candidates for these tests to 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 AC 2018-2019 results, faculty supported candidates who were not on track to achieve passing standard by providing study materials, providing tutoring, and recommending undergraduate content courses to take if results in a sub-test area are consistently low. Faculty and advisors provided study materials for potential teacher candidates interested in taking Praxis II Subject Assessments for Secondary Education. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, 100% of teacher candidates admittedto the program passed the Praxis II subject assessment. Mean composites exceeded the national median in social studies, English, and math, but not in biology; 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. Mean composites were highest in English and lowest in biology. Moreover, mean composite gains were evidenced in English and mathematics, while mean composite losses were noted for social studies and biology.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will modify instructional design and strategies in biology and social studies to support student learning in these content areas and strengthen candidate preparedness for this nationally normed standardized assessment.

These changes will improve the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

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: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target met. Cohort mean was 2.68, which met the target of 2.5.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target met. Cohort mean was 2.93, which met the target of 2.5.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target met. Cohort mean was 2.81, which met the target of 2.5.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 2.93, exceeding the 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, instructional resources were added to EDUC 5840 targeting teachers' ability to question their students and facilitate class discussions. Evidence from AC 2018-2019 showed that candidates predominantly earned scores of Effective Emerging = 2 and Emerging Proficient = 3. However, the mean suggested that candidates were 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 analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. 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. 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 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met. In AC 2019-2020, the cohort mean was 2.68 which is a decline from the previous assessment cycle, but still exceeding the target of 2.5. Data included in analysis is representative of Fall 2019 only, as in Spring 2020, no data were available due to campus and school closures according to federal and state stay-at-home orders due to the coronavirus pandemic. Evidence from AC 2019-2020 showed 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.

Highlighted areas of candidate strengths in performance included organizing physical space (composite mean=2.90), demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy (composite mean=2.85), creating an environment of respect and rapport (composite mean=2.74), and communicating with students (composite mean=2.74). Highlighted areas of candidate weaknesses in performance included using assessment in instruction (composite mean=2.49), designing student assessment (composite mean=2.53), and using questioning and discussion techniques (composite mean=2.56).

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will add instructional materials and resources in using assessment in instruction and designing student assessment to support student learning and strengthen candidate readiness to demonstrate content and pedagogical mastery in this domain.

These changes will improve the student's ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

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: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 4.90 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 4.95 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Met**.** Cohort mean was 4.80, which met the target of 3.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 4.95 significantly exceeding the target of 3. Areas for candidates’ improvement included 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. In AC 2018-2019, 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.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. 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. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, the cohort mean was 4.90 which is a slight decline from last assessment cycle, but still significantly exceeding the target of 3. Areas for candidates' improvement included 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.

In AC 2018-2019, all candidates earned ratings of at least 4 on each dispositional rubric item. All indicator had mean scores between 4.0 and 5.0. Multiple indicators had mean scores of 5.0. The overall mean was 4.90.

Highlighted areas of candidate strengths in performance included respects children and adults of various cultural backgrounds, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, social classes, abilities, political beliefs (cumulative mean=5), ensures accuracy of information for which he/she is responsible (cumulative mean=5), and consistently responds to the needs of all learners (cumulative mean=5). Highlighted areas of candidate weaknesses in performance included analyzes problems critically and attempts to resolve them independently (as appropriate) (cumulative mean=4.76), uses appropriate tone of voice (cumulative mean=4.76), and initiates communication to resolve conflict (cumulative mean=4.76). The area of weakest performance for candidates was in responding to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary (cumulative mean=4.71).

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will add instructional materials and resources in responding to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary to support student learning and strengthen candidate readiness to demonstrate content and pedagogical mastery in this domain.

These changes will improve the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

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: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 3.00 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 3.72 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Not Met**.** Cohort mean was 2.88, which did not meet the target of 3.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 3.72, with a target of 3. Evidence from AC 2018-2019 showed 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. 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.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 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 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, the cohort mean was 3.00, a decline from the previous assessment cycle. Candidate scores ranged from 1.00-4.00. Candidates were rated highest in significance of learning objectives (cumulative mean=4.0) and weakest in contextual factors and student learning adaptations (cumulative mean=1.0) and higher order thinking (cumulative mean=2.0).

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will add additional instructional materials and resources to support contextual factors and student learning adaptations and higher order thinking.

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
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: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 3.56 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target Met. Cohort mean was 3.73 which met the target of 3.
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target Not Met. Cohort mean was 2.67, which did not meet the target of 3.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, the cohort mean was 3.73 exceeding the target of 3. Candidates scores ranged between 3.25-4.0, with a mean of 3.71 in the areas related to interventions to maintain or improve student achievement. Candidates earned between 3.42-4.0 in ability to analyze student data and aligning student assessment with instructional outcomes.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty added a new data literacy and assessment course to the AC 2019-2020 curriculum. The course focused specifically on middle/secondary teaching to improve student learning. The new planning course provided greater instructional focus on data and assessment. These changes had a direct impact on the student’s ability to make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met. In AC 2019-2020, the cohort mean was 3.56 exceeding the target of 3. One area of candidate strengths in performance included preparing instructional assignments of activities (cumulative mean=4). Highlighted areas of candidate weaknesses in performance included setting assessment criteria (cumulative mean=2) and analysis of formative data (cumulative mean=2).

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will modify instructional design and strategies to support student learning in setting assessment criteria and analysis of formative data.

These changes will improve the student's ability to make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

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 2018-2019 which resulted in improved student learning and program improvement in AC 2019-2020.

- SLO 1: Faculty supported candidates who were not on track to achieve passing standard by providing study materials, providing tutoring, and recommending undergraduate content courses to take if results in a sub-test area are consistently low. Faculty and advisors provided study materials for potential teacher candidates interested in taking Praxis II Subject Assessments for Secondary Education.
- 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.
- SLO 3: 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: Faculty added a new data literacy and assessment course to the AC 2019-2020 curriculum. The course focused specifically on middle/secondary teaching to improve student learning. The new planning course provided greater instructional focus on data and assessment.

Plan of Action Moving Forward:

Program faculty have examined the evidence and results of data analysis from AC 2019-2020 and will take steps to continue to improve student learning in AC 2020-2021:

- SLO 1: Faculty will modify instructional design and strategies in biology and social studies to support student learning in these content areas and strengthen candidate preparedness for this nationally normed standardized assessment.

- SLO 2: Faculty will add instructional materials and resources in using assessment in instruction and designing student assessment to support student learning and strengthen candidate readiness to demonstrate content and pedagogical mastery in this domain.

- SLO 3: Faculty will add instructional materials and resources in responding to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary to support student learning and strengthen candidate readiness to demonstrate content and pedagogical mastery in this domain.

- SLO 4: Faculty will add additional instructional materials and resources to support contextual factors and student learning adaptations and higher order thinking.

- SLO 5: Faculty will modify instructional design and strategies to support student learning in setting assessment criteria and analysis of formative data.