

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

### PREP- Alternate Certification

**College: Education and Human Development**

**Prepared by: Jodi Shirley**

**Date: June 2, 2021**

**Approved by: Kimberly McAlister**

**Date: June 24, 2021**

**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.

#### **Methodology:**

The assessment process for the PREP program includes:

- (1) Data from assessment tools are collected and returned to the program coordinator;
- (2) Data will be analyzed to determine student learning and whether students have met measurable outcomes;
- (3) Results are shared with program faculty and discussed;
- (4) The program coordinator, in consultation with program faculty, will determine proposed changes to instruction or assessment tools for the next assessment period.

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

### Student Learning Outcomes:

#### SLO 1.

#### Course Map: Praxis PLT

- Candidates take the Praxis PLT exam upon completion of PREP courses prior to certification.

| Departmental Student Learning Goal                                   | Program Student Learning Outcome   |
|--|--|
| Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge. (Praxis PLT exam) | Earn a passing score established by LDOE on knowledge of teaching pedagogy related to their area of certification on a standardized test |

#### Measure 1.1. (Direct-Knowledge)

#### Demonstrate discipline-specific knowledge of teaching pedagogy

SLO 1 is addressed with the Praxis PLT exam (Practices of Learning and Teaching), which is nationally normed. The Praxis exams demonstrate knowledge and skill in pedagogy and instruction. This assessment is nationally validated and reliable. Candidates must meet or exceed state established minimum scaled scores as mandated by the State Department of Education. The required minimum passing scaled scores are as follows: Elementary test #5622 score is 160, Middle school test #5623 score is 160, Secondary school test # 5624 score is 157. The reported scaled scores range from 100-200. The benchmark performance is that 100% of students will score at the passing criteria established by LDOE.

**Finding:** Target was not met.

#### Analysis:

In AC 2019-2020 the target was not met

In AC 2019-2020, 40% (2 out of 5) attempted the exam and met the benchmark. This low score is in great part due to the lack of availability of Praxis testing during the COVID 19 pandemic. Testing centers were closed, and candidates were limited by the opportunities to take this exam. Data from the PLT exams indicate scaled scores of 177 on the Elementary PLT #5622 and 168 on the Secondary PLT #5624.

Conclusions cannot be determined based on the limited data available for this SLO. Based on the limited data, the Praxis score report revealed that on the Elementary PLT, the candidate's scores were within the average range in the following areas:

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

students as learners, assessment, professional development leadership and community, and analysis of instructional scenarios. The candidate scored below the average performance range of 13-16 (raw points) in the category of instructional process with a raw score of 11. The secondary candidate scored within the average performance ranges in the following areas: students as learners, instructional process, assessment, professional development leadership and community. The secondary candidate scored well below the average performance range of 7-12 in analysis of instructional scenarios with a raw score of 5.

Based on the analysis of AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty completed the following actions: (1) Candidates were provided with information regarding access to the Learning Express Library and resources available through *The Study Companion* documents published by ETS/Praxis. This document includes an overview of the test, a template study plan, study topics, practice questions and explanations of correct answers and links to detailed information related to the test. (2) Concepts included on the PLT exams are embedded in PREP courses: EPSY 5480, EDUC 5650/5670, and EDUC 5660/5680.

Although these changes were implemented, in AC 2020-2021, the target was not met. In AC 2020-2021, 81% of candidates (13 out of 16) met or exceeded the minimum Praxis PLT required score.

| Test #       | Test                 | Number passed/tested | Percentage passed |
|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| 5622         | Elementary PLT       | 5 of 7               | 71%               |
| 5623         | Middle School PLT    | 3 of 4               | 75%               |
| 157          | Secondary School PLT | 5 of 5               | 100%              |
| <b>total</b> |                      | <b>13 of 16</b>      | <b>81%</b>        |

Further breakdown of the Elementary PLT highlight lowest scores in the following areas: *students as learners (mean raw score of 12 out of 23) and analysis of instructional scenarios (mean raw score of 10 out of 16)*. The highest scoring areas on the Elementary PLT were: *the instructional process (mean raw score of 15.4 out of 20) and professional development leadership and community (mean raw score of 10 out of 14)*.

Further breakdown of the Middle School PLT highlight lowest scores in the following areas: *assessment (raw mean score of 9.7 out of 14)*.

The highest scoring areas in Middle School were in: *instructional process (mean raw score of 16 out of 21), professional development, leadership, and community (mean raw score of 10 out of 14), and analysis of instructional scenarios (mean raw score of 11.7 out of 16)*.

Further breakdown of the Secondary PLT highlight lowest scores in the following areas: *professional development, leadership, and community (raw mean score of 8.2 out of 14) and the highest score in the area of assessment (raw mean score of*

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

10.8 out of 14).

Due to the need for distance learning support in 2020-2021, candidates were provided with electronic resources to assist in their preparations for the Praxis PLT. They were also given the opportunity to enroll in an online tutoring program, 240 Tutoring, at a reduced rate as an NSU student. No in-person Praxis seminars were scheduled. Candidates were sent email reminders and an offer of support as they prepared for the PLT exam. Suggestions for how to prepare for the exam and a copy of The Study Companion document were included in the email messages.

### Decision, action or recommendation.

Based on the analysis of AC 2020-2021 scores, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. Analysis of these 2020-2021 scores by test category do not reveal a consistent pattern across the three certification levels. The highest score on the Secondary level PLT was in assessment, while on the Middle School PLT assessment was the lowest scoring test category. The Middle and Secondary level PREP students take the same coursework with the same instructor. The overall test results will be shared with all PREP instructors for analysis. Individualized feedback will be provided to students scoring low in assignments aligned to PLT with opportunities for remediation.

### SLO 2

**Course Map: PREP Internship courses (EDUC 5410, 5411 for Elementary, EDUC 5420, 5421 for Middle School, and EDUC 5430, 5431 for Secondary)**

SLO 2 is assessed through a teaching evaluation form. Candidates apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice during their Internship semesters.

| <b>Departmental Student Learning Goal</b>                            | <b>Program Student Learning Outcome</b>   |
|--|---|
| Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice | At least 80% of candidates will met the target of a mean score of 2 out of 3 on a teaching evaluation to assess content, pedagogical knowledge, and skills in professional practice |

### Measure 2.1. (Direct-Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions)

SLO 2 is assessed via a Teacher Candidate Observation form in EDUC 5410 (elementary), EDUC 5420(middle), and EDUC 5430(secondary) by a University supervisor, a mentor teacher, and a school principal. These courses are taken during the two-semester internship portion of the PREP program prescription of study.

**Findings:** Target was met.

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

### Analysis:

In AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

An incomplete data set was reported for 2019-2020. Only data for Fall 2019 is available due to internship school closures in March due to COVID 19. No data from Spring 2020 is available.

In 2019-2020, the mean score on the teaching evaluation instrument for the Elementary candidate for all indicators was 2.56 on a 3-point scale. The lowest score being 2.25 in *managing classroom procedures*. The mean score on the teaching evaluation instrument for Middle school was 2.60. The lowest score being 1.71 in *using questioning and discussion techniques*. Two other areas of weakness for Middle School candidates were *demonstrating knowledge of resources* with a mean score of 1.85 and *designing coherent instruction*, also with a mean score of 1.85. The mean score for Secondary candidates for all indicators was 2.39.

Based on the analysis of AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty provided models of best practices in managing classroom procedures through modeling examples in virtual field experiences. Video recordings of "The Effective Teacher" by Dr. Harry and Rosemary Wong were added to EDUC 5650 and EDUC 5670. To improve the area of using questioning and discussion techniques, PREP instructors added emphasis on application of Bloom's taxonomy in coursework as well as identifying best practices in questioning through virtual field experiences. Candidates were assigned videos and audio recordings that demonstrate effective classroom management and effective questioning to watch, evaluate, and summarize.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2020-21, the target was met.

In AC 2020-2021, 100% of candidates met or exceeded a mean score on the teaching evaluation instrument. The mean score for all candidates was 2.86 out of a possible 3.0. This exceeds the goal of scoring at least 2.0 and exceeds last year's goal of 2.51 from all certification levels. Areas that earned the highest mean scores were in the components of:

- Demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy-3.0
- Establishing a culture for learning-2.96
- Communicating with students-2.96
- Creating an environment of respect and rapport-2.94
- Setting instructional outcomes-2.92

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

Areas that earned the lowest scores were in the components of:

- Using questioning and discussion techniques-2.79
- Using assessment in instruction-2.77
- Demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness-2.77
- Engaging students in learning-2.75

The scores from AY 2020-2021 indicate significant improvement over AY 2019-2020. The lowest mean score in a category was 2.75 out of 3.0 in AY 2020-2021 as compared to the lowest mean score in a category of 1.71 out of 3.0 in AY 2019-2020. In accordance with the plan of action in 2019-2020, the PREP faculty included professional teaching videos through Atlas resources in online courses and audio recordings of “The Effective Teacher”. Due to COVID protocols established by school districts, PREP candidates were not allowed to conduct face to face field experiences in classrooms prior to beginning their internship. Virtual field experiences were crucial as an instructional component during PREP courses. The highest mean score in a category in AY 2020-2021 was 3.0 out of 3.0 in the component of demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy.

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. The assessment provides evidence for meeting the state identified standards because it is aligned with InTASC standards, and content validity was established for the instrument. Steps were taken to assure Quality of the assessment/evidence. 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 Ratio (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability. The goal is for at least 80% of candidates to score a “2” on the rubric. To determine criteria for success,  $5 \cdot CVR \text{ mean} = -.03$  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.”

### **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 following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement.

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

Instructors in the PREP program placed additional emphasis on teaching strategies that enhance student engagement. Candidates should be introduced to, learn to evaluate, and select engaging teaching strategies that can be effectively used in their certification/subject area. Instructors will contribute to a master list of teaching strategies that are included in PREP coursework. The list will serve as a reference and reminder to PREP candidates to incorporate during their teaching internship.

### SLO 3

**Course Map:** EDUC 5410, EDUC 5420, EDUC 5430-PREP internship courses

- SLO 3 is assessed through a dispositions form during the PREP Internship semesters, which is a component of the LDOE certification requirement. Candidates will model professional behaviors and characteristics.

| Departmental Student Learning Goal  | Program Student Learning Outcome   |
|---|--|
| Model professional behaviors and Characteristics.<br>(Dispositional Evaluation) | Candidates will score at least 4.0 on a 5 point scale as assessed through a professional dispositions form that measures behaviors and characteristics that are professional and ethical |

### Measure 3.1. (Direct-Dispositions)

SLO 3 is assessed through a professional dispositions form during the internship portion of the PREP program. Faculty created the dispositional evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards. 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.

**Findings:** Target was met

### Analysis:

In AC 2019-2020 the target was met

100% of candidates met the target based on the incomplete data set available for AC 2019-2020. Only data for Fall 2019 is available due to internship-based school closures in March. No data from Spring 2020 is available. Mean scores ranged from 4.0-4.8 on a 5-point scale.

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

The indicators that received the highest mean ratings of 4.8 were:

- Demonstrates passion/enthusiasm about teaching and learning.
- Incorporates technology into professional work.
- Uses appropriate professional and/or content standards and continues to seek knowledge and professional development.

The indicators that received the lowest mean scores of 4.0 were:

- Is realistically self-assured, and competently handles demands of coursework and/or field experiences.
- Communicates defectively, verbally and in written work.
- Routinely models standard English in professional settings.

Based on the analysis of AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty implemented more opportunities for live interaction with candidates through Webex to strengthen oral communication skills. Opportunities were also given for candidates to make revisions on assignments after feedback had been given by instructors thereby ensuring 100% of candidates met benchmark score of at least "sufficient".

In accordance with the plan of action from 2018-2019, in 2019-2020, the PREP faculty began planning for the inclusion of a videotaping assignment in which candidates will submit a video of themselves teaching a lesson for the purpose of evaluating these attributes.

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

Indicators that received the highest mean ratings of 5.0 out of 5.0 were:

- *Demonstrating a positive attitude about working with diverse people, peers, professionals, and in diverse environments*
- *Incorporates technology into professional work.*

Indicators that also received high mean ratings of 4.9 out of 5.0 were:

- *Respect's children and adults of various cultural backgrounds, ethnicities, religions, sexual orientations, social classes, abilities, political beliefs, etc.*
- *Demonstrates passion/enthusiasm about learning and teaching.*
- *Exercises sound judgement and ethical professional behavior.*
- *Represents a positive role model for others.*

The indicator that received the lowest mean rating of 4.09 was:

- *Analyzes problems critically and attempts to resolve them independently (as appropriate)*

Other low scoring indicators that received a mean score of 4.18 and 4.27 are respectively:

- *Respond to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary.*
- *Initiate's communication to resolve conflict.*

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

### 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 will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. The three lowest scores are connected to conflict resolution and responding appropriately. PREP instructors will locate exemplar classroom videos that address such situations and resolutions to include as virtual field experiences. Having candidates identify the conflict and resolution on a reflection will highlight appropriate ways to identify and develop this skill. Including possible classroom scenarios for candidates to respond to will also assist in practicing this skill.

### SLO 4

#### Course Map:

- **SLO 4 is an assessment of lesson planning effectiveness as evaluated through a rubric associated with the candidate's online portfolio during their Internship.**

| <b>Departmental Student Learning Goal</b>  | <b>Program Student Learning Outcome</b>   |
|--|---|
| Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline | Design and implement developmentally appropriate lesson plans that score at least "proficient" (3.0 on a 4.0 scale) |

### Measure 4.1 (Direct- Knowledge and Skills)

SLO 4 is assessed in Internship I and II through an evaluation of lesson plans included in candidates' Internship portfolio. 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 describe elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based. The benchmark performance is that 100% of students will score at the Proficient level or higher in the area of lesson planning.

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

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

value of .75

- ICC = .573. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects “fair” inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered “good.”

**Findings:** Target was not met.

**Analysis:** In AC 2019-2020 the target was not met.

An incomplete data set is reported for 2019-2020 that includes 4 of the 5 PREP candidates. Only data for Fall 2019 is available due to Internship school closures in March 2020. No data from Spring 2020 is available. The limited data indicates a mean score of 3.35 on a 4-point scale in lesson planning for 4 out of 5 candidates. The mean score for elementary is 3.5, for middle school the mean score is 3.35, and for secondary 2.83. This secondary score is 0.17 below the benchmark score. This data indicates that additional support is needed for candidates in the secondary level.

Lesson planning instruction and opportunities were incorporated into all PREP courses, with the opportunity for faculty feedback. Portfolio artifact evaluations of lesson planning included a more complete dataset which included their ability to create lesson plans that:

- Show depth of understanding and extensive application of content appropriate to teaching specialty.
- Present clear and extensive evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem-solving, decision making and/or responsibility taking.
- Include numerous and varied instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners.
- Include technology integrated into lesson, involves interaction by all learners, is appropriate to content, and supports instruction.

Based on the analysis of AC 2019-2020 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. Due to limited available data for this SLO, instructors were recommended to offer individual assistance and feedback to candidates regarding lesson planning instead of overall course revisions. Needs varied among candidates as to what type of support was needed to strengthen lesson plan writing skills. Instructors offered options for resources that include best teaching practices to all PREP candidates.

As a result of this focus, in AC 2020-21, the target was met.

The AC 2020-2021 mean scores on the three elements of lesson planning indicated on the portfolio evaluation were: 3.4 for element 1, 3.25 for element 2, and 3.38 for element 3. All scores exceed the minimum criteria of 3.0 out of 4.0. Providing exemplary models of lesson plans, personalized feedback, and opportunities for revisions throughout Summer PREP course EDUC 5670 strengthened candidates' ability to plan for instruction. The result was for candidates to show more depth of

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

understanding and extensive application of content, include varied instructional opportunities for diverse learners through the modeling and feedback practices.

### Decision, action or recommendation

Based on the analysis of AC 2020-2021 data, faculty implemented the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement PREP faculty should continue to provide specific, actionable feedback to candidates in response to their lesson plans. Exemplar lesson plans will be included as additional course documents on Moodle as a resource. Candidates should have the opportunity for peer review and reflection of lesson plans before submitting them for grading. Opportunities for revising lesson plans should also be offered to students throughout PREP courses.

### SLO 5

#### Course Map: Internship of PREP program

| Departmental Student Learning Goal   | Program Student Learning Outcome  |
|--|---|
| Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate<br>(Student Learning Impact) | Candidates will assess the quality of instructional decision-making using an assessment project to analyze student learning and provide evidence of using data for instructional decision-making. |

#### Measure 5.1. (Direct: Skills and Dispositions)

Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate.

**Finding:** Target was not met.

#### Analysis.

In AC 2019-2020 the target was met.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was established that all candidates will score at least 80% on a data analysis assessment project related to student learning targets (SLT) as evaluated on a rubric and submitted in the form of a portfolio. Analysis of this assessment project revealed overall weakness in data analysis and decisions involving instruction based on data as indicated on the PREP Portfolio score report. The project is directly linked to current student data the candidates utilize in establishing and analyzing their SLTs. The assessment project requires PREP candidates to disaggregate student data, identify trends, identify conceptual errors, and provide evidence of using data for instructional decision-making. As a result, in AC 2020-2021, the mean score on this assessment was 81%. The area that showed the lowest mean

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

score of 78% on the rubric is *disaggregation of data and summary of results*. Specific components within this indicator include a summary that addresses learning for the whole class as well as subgroups and individual students. The highest mean score for this assessment was 82% in the component of *analysis of student learning targets*. The mean score on this assignment of 80% is a decline from the previous AC 2019-2020 analysis which indicated a mean score of 91%. PREP candidates need additional support in disaggregating data in various ways that provide for meaningful findings about student performance. Summarizing student performance for the whole class as well as subgroups is an area that needs improvement.

### **Decision, action or recommendation.**

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2020-2021 data faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2021-2022 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2021-2022, faculty will place additional emphasis on training on disaggregating data.

PREP instructors can provide additional support through examples that include student work samples. These can serve as an exemplar to PREP candidates and included in the assessment project materials.

These additions and monitoring of identified emphasis will improve the students' ability to demonstrate effective data analysis and identify and analyze whole class, subgroups, and individual students.

### **Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Seeking Improvement Based on Analysis of Results:**

- Due to the need for distance learning support in 2020-2021, candidates were provided with electronic resources to assist in their preparations for the Praxis PLT. They were also given the opportunity to enroll in an online tutoring program, 240 Tutoring, at a reduced rate as an NSU student. Key concepts included on the Praxis PLT were embedded in PREP courses and textbook resources. No face-to-face Praxis seminars were scheduled. Candidates were sent email reminders and an offer of support as they prepared for the PLT exam. Suggestions for how to prepare for the exam and a copy of The Study Companion document were included in the email messages to meet SLO 1.
- Candidate weaknesses in the areas of using questioning and discussion techniques, using assessment in instruction, demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness, and engaging students in learning were identified. Instructors addressed these weaknesses through virtual field experiences, various course assignments, and material provided in a Classroom Management textbook for SLO 2.

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

- Candidate weaknesses are identified by a professional disposition's evaluation in the areas of analyzes problems critically and attempts to resolve them independently (as appropriate), respond to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary, and initiates communication to resolve conflict were identified. The professional disposition forms were utilized at three times throughout each semester along with specific, actionable feedback from university supervisors to improve SLO 3.
- Lesson planning instruction and opportunities were incorporated into all PREP courses to strengthen SLO 4, with the opportunity for faculty feedback. Portfolio artifact evaluations of lesson planning included a more complete dataset which included their ability to create lesson plans that: show depth of understanding and extensive application of content appropriate to teaching specialty, present clear and extensive evidence of instructional focus on critical thinking, problem-solving, decision making and/or responsibility taking, include numerous and varied instructional opportunities adapted to diverse learners, include technology integrated into lesson, involves interaction by all learners, is appropriate to content, and supports instruction.
- For SLO 5, an assessment project was completed by candidates during the Internship II semester. The area that showed the lowest mean score of 78% on the rubric is disaggregation of data and summary of results. Specific components within this indicator include a summary that addresses learning for the whole class as well as subgroups and individual students. The data used in this assignment was taken from the candidate's current students providing an authentic assessment experience.

### Plan of Action Moving Forward.

Program faculty have examined the evidence and results of data analysis from AC 2020-2021 and will take steps in AC 2021-2022 to improve PREP candidates learning and performance:

- Analysis of the Praxis PLT scores by test category do not reveal a consistent pattern across the three certification levels. Low student performance on assignments in PREP courses should be followed up with specific feedback and opportunities for remediation. Concepts included on the Praxis PLT will continue to be embedded as course objectives. An opportunity to enroll in 240 Tutoring as a preparation tool for the Praxis PLT will be available as well as resources from the Learning Express Library to support SLO 1.
- Instructors in the PREP program should place an emphasis on teaching strategies that enhance student engagement. Candidates should be introduced to, learn to evaluate, and select engaging teaching strategies that can be effectively used in their certification/subject area. Instructors will contribute to a master list of teaching strategies that are

## Assessment Cycle 2020-2021

included in PREP coursework. The list will serve as a reference and reminder to PREP candidates to incorporate during their teaching internship to support SLO 2.

- SLO 3 addresses components on the Professional Dispositions form connected to conflict resolution and responding appropriately. PREP instructors should locate exemplar classroom videos that address such situations and resolutions to include as virtual field experiences. Having candidates identify the conflict and resolution on a reflection will highlight appropriate ways to identify and develop this skill. Including possible classroom scenarios for candidates to respond to will also assist in practicing this skill.
- PREP faculty should continue to provide specific, actionable feedback to candidates in response to their lesson plans to strengthen SLO 4. Exemplar lesson plans will be included as course documents on Moodle for candidates. Candidates should have the opportunity for peer review and reflection of lesson plans before submitting them for grading. Opportunities for revising lesson plans should also be offered to students throughout PREP courses.
- PREP candidates need additional support in disaggregating data in various ways that provide for meaningful findings about student performance. Summarizing student performance for the whole class as well as subgroups is an area that needs improvement. PREP instructors can provide additional support through examples that include student work samples. These can serve as exemplars to PREP candidates and included in the assessment project materials to support SLO 5.