# Online Assessment Tracking Database

Sam Houston State University (SHSU) 2014 - 2015

Interdisciplinary Studies BA, BS (Elementary EC-6)

Goal

# Program Quality And Effectiveness 🎤

Program Quality and Effectiveness

# Objective (L)

# Candidates Will Be Able To Plan, Implement, Assess, And Modify Effective Instruction For All Learners.

Candidates will be able to plan, implement, assess, and modify effective instruction.

#### Indicator

# Pass Rates On The Teacher Work Sample # P

The Teacher Work Sample (TWS), adapted from The Renaissance Partnership for Improving Teacher Quality Project (http://fp.uni.edu/itq), is a performance assessment designed to demonstrate evidence of Sam Houston State University candidates' ability to facilitate learning for all students. This sample illustrates the candidate's ability to plan, implement, modify and assess instruction during their student teaching semester. During the early part of the student teaching semester, candidates choose one (12 to 14 week placement) or two (6 to 7 week placements). During the first 6 to 7 weeks of their placement, candidates are required to create and teach a unit as a Teacher Work Sample. After consulting with their mentor teacher about the unit focus, candidates teach a minimum of five lessons from the unit in their mentor's classroom. Additionally, the candidates are evaluated on their unit planning and teaching of unit lessons. They are also required to reflect on their decision-making and teaching practice including their impact on student learning. The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) focuses on seven teaching processes that are crucial for effective/reflective teaching and must be considered when planning for the learning of all students. Each process is defined by a performance standard, specific task, a student prompt and a rubric that identify the desired performance of the candidate related to that process. Candidates score a 1 - they have to redo the assignment; a 2 or 3 demonstrates that the candidate proficiently completed the document.

Criterion

## Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Scores # P

At least 90% of candidates during the 2012-2013 academic year will achieve a score of 2 or 3 on the Teacher Work Sample. Information on Scoring Procedures: As recommended by the Renaissance Group, each candidate's Teacher Work Sample is blindly scored by a minimum of two trained scorers. Each scorer evaluates and assigns a score of three (target), two (acceptable), or one (unacceptable) to each indicator, Additionally an overall score of three, two or one is given to each of the seven processes as well as and an overall three, two or one to the entire Teacher Work Sample. If the first two scorers agree on the overall Teacher Work Sample score, the scoring process is complete. However, if the two scorers do not agree the Teacher Work Sample is scored for a third, possibly fourth time, until agreement is reached. For this reason, the data presented in the following charts represents the number of scorings not the number of Teacher Work Samples scored. Once agreement is reached on the Teacher Work Sample

score, the overall scores are sent to the student teachers.

## Finding

## Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Results P

During the school year 2014-2015 there were 247 teacher candidates who submitted their program capstone requirement called the Teacher Work Sample. Of this number, 99% of student teachers received a score of either 2 (Acceptable) or 3 (Target) on first attempt. Using a weighted mean, this sample obtained a 2.65 score (2=Acceptable; 3= Target) on the TWS that were scored by at least 2 scorers. Examining the TWS results by components showed teacher candidates scored lowest (weighted mean=2.59) on the Assessment Plan as well as on the Contextual Factors (weighted mean=2.59). Teacher candidates scored the highest (weighted mean=2.66) on Design for Instruction as well as on Analysis of Student Learning (weighted mean = 2.65).

### Action

# Performance On The Teacher Work Sample P

Although most of our student teachers did well on the TWS, disaggregated data showed improvement can focus on Assessment Plan. This area has consistently showed lower scores compared to the other six sections of the TWS for varied reasons which may be programmatic or beyond our control (e.g., public school mentors have a different view of assessment, mostly traditional paper-pencil approach). The action taken to address this area of need entails an overall re-alignment of the EC-6 program in order to meet new national and state standards as well as designing new unit assessments to measure gaps and strengths of our program. In this new re-alignment the Assessment course will be required early into the program and not during student teaching semester which is quite late. Furthermore, teacher preparation faculty are in discussion about replacing TWS with a newer assessment based on student teachers' feedback. All these new initiatives (actions) will take effect in Fall 2017.

### Objective (L)

# The Candidates Will Demonstrate Mastery Of The State Mandated Standards For The Pedagogy And Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Certification Exam.

The candidates will demonstrate mastery of the state mandated standards for the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Certification Exam. There are four general teaching and professional standards candidates need to demonstrate. Each of these is also referred as "Domain".

- 1. The teacher designs instruction appropriate for all students that reflects an understanding of relevant content and is based on continuous and appropriate assessment. (34% of exam items)
- 2. The teacher creates a classroom environment of respect and rapport that fosters a positive climate for learning, equity, and

excellence. (13% of exam items)

- 3. The teacher promotes student learning by providing responsive instruction that makes use of effective communication techniques, instructional strategies that actively engage students in the learning process, and timely, high-quality feedback. (33% of exam items)
- 4. The teacher fulfills professional roles and responsibilities and adheres to legal and ethical requirements of the profession. (20% of exam items)

Under each standard, at least 40 knowledge and skills are identified. The state teacher examination assesses candidates' competencies in meeting these standards.

### Indicator

### Pass Rates On PPR Certification Exams P

Candidates seeking initial certification, advanced teacher certification, or certifications for other school personnel must take one or more of the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES). These examinations directly correspond to the state content competencies that have been identified for the certification desired. These content competencies are aligned with and based on the appropriate state standards the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) statements, which describe the state mandated curriculum for students.

Each TEXES examination is criterion-referenced and is designed to measure a candidate's level of content knowledge and skills appropriate for educators in the State of Texas. Each test was collaboratively developed by the State Board of Educator Certification (SBEC), National Evaluation Systems, Inc. (NES), an independent corporation specializing in educational measurements, with additional participation by committees of Texas educators. Individual test items developed to measure the state competencies were reviewed and rated by the various committees of Texas educators to ensure appropriateness of content and difficulty, clarity, and accuracy. These committees also ensured that the test items matched the appropriate competencies and were free from potential ethnicity, gender, and regional biases. The committees also helped prepare scoring rubrics for written response items and training materials for those who would score the tests.

Separate standard-setting panels were convened to review statistical data about candidate scores from initial pilot of the tests during their development. studies Recommendations were forwarded to the SBEC, which made the final decisions about establishing passing scores. TEXES examinations are centrally administered by SBEC and NES at pre-determined sites and on pre-established dates across Texas similar to many of the national achievement tests. This regime provides for a professional, equitable, and secure testing environment for candidates. Alternative testing arrangements are also permitted for those requiring special consideration. Sites are selected after a careful review of security and accessibility potential, and the quality of overall testing conditions. Tests are scored centrally.

### Criterion

## Pass Rates For EC-12 PPR Certification Exam P

First time pass rates on all levels of the Pedagogy and Professional Examinations will exceed 90%. The set criterion was decided baded on the fact that the PPR has been revised to include early childhood (EC) to high school (Gr. 12) and was perceived slightly more difficulty than the previous version. While the accountability system for the state examines scores for each completer cohort and provides for students to repeat the examination if they are not successful on the first attempt, the faculty decided to focus on the first time pass rate instead of the overall pass rate for the 2014-15 academic year.

# Finding

# Candidates' Performance On The State PPR EC-12

During the school year 2014-2015 there were 164 teacher candidates who took the PPR. Of this number, 160 of the teacher candidates passed the PPR on first attempt. This constituted a 98% passing which is above the pre-set criterion (90%). This result also surpassed the faculty's plan (stated in the continuous improvement plan) that included a set goal of 95% passing rate on the PPR (Goal 2).

On the state certification examination (PPR), our teacher candidates showed higher mean percent correct on Domain 2 (*Creating a positive, productive classroom environment*) compared with the other three domains. Specifically, they made the lowest percent correct on Domain 3 (*Implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment; also includes technology applications*). Domains 1 (*Designing instruction and assessment to promote student learning*), 3 (*Implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment*), and 4 (*Fulfilling professional roles and responsibilities*) are areas for improvement.

### Action

# Candidates' Passing Rate On The State Teacher Certification Exam (PPR EC-12) ₱

The one-year data on the passing rate for all our program candidates revealed a strong passing rate (98%) that surpassed our initial criterion.

Our passing rate is much higher than the state average. Areas for improvement include Domain 3 (implementing effective instruction and assessment) which is consistent with the areas of concern on the TWS described above. Last spring 2015, the program faculty headed by our Associate Dean for Undergraduate Students, started the process of realigning the educator preparation program to address issues regarding "assessment of learning" and the use of instructional technology. One clear action would be infusing assessments and technology throughout the education courses. Additionally, the current Assessment course (offered in Student Teaching semester) will be revised and

will be offered in the candidates junior year, and reinforced in all content methods courses until student teaching.

Another domain on the PPR examination that needs greater attention is "fulfilling professional roles and responsibilities". The plan of action for this includes designing a "seminar" course during student teaching that will address needs such as communication with school leaders and parents, analysis of school data, becoming teacher leaders, new teacher observation instrument, and other campus-related issues a new teacher are confronted with. A team of professors and school leaders will start working on the course design immediately. The plan for full implementation of revised program is Fall 2017.

## Previous Cycle's "Plan for Continuous Improvement"

In order to meet both goals, the faculty will continue to model good assessment practices (e.g., project based, performance-based), engaging teaching models, and infusing instructional technology into all our courses. We need to address our inadequate technology to model what public schools are using in their classrooms. Our department will purchase more "high" technology for faculty to use and to model effective practice. Additionally, faculty will collaborate with public school officials so that early field experience of our candidates will include professional development on the use of campus-based technology.

Faculty will focus more intently on helping teacher candidates address the needs of diverse population in planning and implementing instruction. Faculty will emphasize this more during lesson planning with particular attention to accommodation strategies (specific to English Learners and students of poverty).

We will challenge our faculty and teacher candidates by increasing our criterion for meeting both goals/objectives. The faculty teaching in the EC-6 Interdisciplinary Program will set a goal of 95% passing rate on the PPR (Goal 2) and 95% of all student teachers receiving an overall score of 2 or 3 on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (Goal 1).

For a tighter alignment between courses and new standards (national and state), a revised template for course syllabi will be used effective Fall, 2014. More importantly, the standards on Dispositions, Diversity, and professionalism will be given more emphasis in all education courses.

The faculty in the EC-6 Program, which include many adjunct instructors will develop a plan for better communication and information about "standardizing" courses, course assessments, etc. in order to strengthen the program. Currently, EC-6 program courses are taught in 3 different campuses (includes day and night sections). Consequently, communication among instructors and accountability is a challenge. This plan should support Goals 1 and 2.

Please detail the elements of your previous "Plan for Continuous Improvement" that were implemented. If elements were not implemented please explain why, along with any contextual challenges you may have faced that prevented their implementation.

The following plans for continuous improvement have been carried out during AY 2014-2015, which had direct impact on the EC-6 Program:

The EC-6 faculty will continue to model good assessment practices (e.g., project based, performance-based), engaging teaching models, and infusing instructional technology into all

our courses.

Evidence of implementation of this plan can be traced back to a revised course syllabus format, quality of lesson plans posted in TK20, faculty modeling varied authentic forms of assessment for learning, and requiring/promoting project based learning in designing learning units.

- The department has purchased a smart board for education classes to use as part of the technology lab. However, classes (e.g., content methods) taught off-campus (public schools) tend to have less access to high technology compared to those taught in main and satellite campuses. Instructors have been letting teacher candidates bring their own devices (iphones, laptops, Ipads) for them to use when instructors would model integrating technology. Content methods instructors have been requiring candidates to integrate high technology in every aspect of teaching, especially during assessments (formative and summative).
- 2. Faculty will focus more intently on helping teacher candidates address the needs of diverse population in planning and implementing instruction.
  - The faculty had joint meetings with the Department of Language, Literacy and Special Population (LLSP) to discuss ways to strengthen the components of the lesson plan template, especially the state standards associated with accommodation strategies (specific to English Learners), and how the reading course "Using literacy in teaching content areas" can support candidates in teaching diverse population.
  - The two departments involved in teacher preparation collaborated in sharing information and resources to improve the standard lesson plan format used in the content methods block.
- 3. We will challenge our faculty and teacher candidates by increasing our criterion for meeting both goals/objectives. The faculty teaching in the EC-6 Interdisciplinary Program will set a goal of 95% passing rate on the PPR (Goal 2) and 95% of all student teachers receiving an overall score of 2 or 3 on the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) (Goal 1).
  - This goal has been met by implementing strategies such as, small classes, collaboration
    with offices for student services, content methods faculty helping candidates design and
    write strong TWS prior to student teaching. This combined effort resulted in: 98%
    passing rate on the PPR, 99% of the TWS were scored either "Acceptable" or "Target".
- 4. Tighten alignment between courses and new standards (national and state), a revised template for course syllabi will be used effective Fall, 2014. More importantly, the standards on Dispositions, Diversity, and professionalism will be given more emphasis in all education courses.
  - Part of the plans we have implemented are described in #2 above.

- In addition, faculty set high expectations for candidates to hold accountable for strong dispositions and professionalism in every course. They are required to self-assess their growth in these areas at the end of each semester (Literacy block, Content methods block, Student teaching). Faculty would evaluate candidates' progress and these data are posted in TK20 for candidates' easy access.
- 5. The faculty in the EC-6 Program, which include several adjunct instructors will develop a plan for better communication and information about "standardizing" courses, course assessments, etc. in order to strengthen the program.

We have addressed this plan in the following ways, which, in turn, helped us to meet both program goals:

- By appointing a Coordinator for the EC-6 Generalist program who serves as liaison person to communicate, meet, and train adjunct instructors in the Teacher Preparation program (EC-6). The coordinator is a tenured faculty teaching in the teacher preparation program who also needs to work with the Associate Dean for undergraduates.
- Currently two departments (LLSP & C & I) are responsible for the EC-6 program. Classes
  are taught in 3 different campuses (day and night sections) which, in the past, made
  communication among instructors and accountability a bit challenging. The current
  program coordinator ensures frequent and timely communication with the LLSP chair and
  instructors teaching different specialized areas (Special Ed, Bilingual, Reading). A
  stronger relationship has been developed as a result of our continued discussions on the
  new (revised) program that will be effective in Fall 2017.

# Plan for Continuous Improvement - Please detail your plan for improvement that you have developed based on what you learned from your 2014 - 2015 Cycle Findings.

We have learned much about our program's strengths and challenges from interacting with our teacher candidates, instructors, school administrators, mentors, and analyzing the data base in TK20. Integrating updated technology in instruction and assessment will be part of s bigger plan to re-align the EC-6 program with newer standards and certification expectations.

Last academic year we were not able to implement plans to resolve issues regarding inadequate technology to model what public schools are using in their classrooms. Although, our department had purchased more "high" technology for faculty to use and to model effective practice, more training is needed to help our faculty learn how to use smart boards, for instance.

Additionally, having faculty to collaborate with public school officials so that early field experience of our candidates will include professional development on the use of campus-based technology has not been fully conceptualized. Some faculty members are currently writing proposals for external grants to help both our candidates and mentors learn how to use mobile devices in instruction. We have plans to involve our teacher candidates in implementing

professional development for mentors on technology integration.

To address the need for re-alignment of courses to meet new standards (CAEP) entails an overall re-alignment of the EC-6 program and designing new unit assessments to measure our goals. In this new re-alignment the Assessment course will be required early into the program and not during student teaching semester which is quite late. Furthermore, teacher preparation faculty are in discussion about replacing the capstone, TWS with a newer assessment based on previous student teachers' feedback. All these new initiatives (actions) will take effect in Fall 2017.

Hence our plan for the AY 2015-16 is to continue having extensive dialogues with faculty and chairs in the college of education and colleges across campus about meeting the national/state standards for teacher preparation.

Committees will be formed to work on designing new courses (or revising old ones) and have them approved by the university curriculum committee and then the state board of educator preparation.

Discussions on the logistics for the full implementation of the re-aligned EC-6 curriculum will begin during the AY 2015-16. Partner schools will be invited to several forums to elaborate on the field experience requirements and how to strengthen the university-school collaboration and partnership.