

Interdisciplinary Studies BA, BS (Elementary EC-6)
Assessment Plan Summary

Interdisciplinary Studies BA, BS (Elementary EC-6)

Program Quality And Effectiveness

Goal Description:

Program Quality and Effectiveness

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

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

Learning Objective Description:

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

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Pass Rates On The Teacher Work Sample

Indicator Description:

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 Description:

At least 90% of candidates during the 2015-2016 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.

Findings Description:

[Caveat] During the summer and early fall of 2015, the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) unit assessment was reviewed by the college Assessment Committee based on feedback from stakeholders (principals, mentors, student teachers, professors, etc.). Consequently, the faculty voted to simplify the TWS process and to have our candidates complete a reflection and self-evaluation of their teaching using the rubric (see attachment) that is aligned with the original TWS.

Fall 2015 marked the pilot phase of this revised assessment which was completed by the student teachers as a capstone requirement. Field supervisors were asked to score these reflections and post scores in TK20 at the completion of student teaching semester.

We further analyzed disaggregated data for each of the following 5 components of this revised assessment:

1. Interpretation of student learning (93% of student teachers met indicators)
2. Insights on effective instruction and assessment (85% of student teachers met indicators)
3. Alignment among goals, instruction, and assessment (97% of student teachers met indicators)
4. Implications for future teaching (85% of student teachers met indicators)
5. Implications for professional development (78% of student teachers met indicators)

In general, 86% of the 223 student teachers in our program met all the indicators (score of 3) while 12% partially met all the indicators. Students teachers did quite well on the first four components above) but were not highly successful on the last component (Implications for professional development).

Attached Files

[☐ Rubric. Reflection & Self-Evaluation](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Action

Action Description:

Goal #1:

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

Action Plan for Goal #1:

As explained in the *results* component of this report, the unit assessment we used to measure goal #1 was the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) which included 7 sections (from Contextual Factors to Self-reflection and Professional Growth). In response to new national standards for educator preparation (CAEP), the faculty decided to eliminate the TWS as a capstone project and to replace it with an electronic portfolio. Since AY 2015-16 was the transition period for this new assessment, the objectives and rubric of this new capstone requirement have not been fully articulated. A new faculty committee has just been assigned and charged to study further the E-portfolio assessment and recommend procedures, outcomes, and accountability.

What is currently used as an assessment for goal #1 is the *Self-reflection and Professional Growth* (just one section of the TWS) required of student teachers. However, it does not assess thoroughly goal #1. Consequently, this assessment will be incorporated in a much larger unit assessment called the Electronic Teacher Portfolio which is currently being designed. This capstone requirement is expected to be piloted during the Spring of 2017.

Hence, the action plan to meet goal #1 involves several faculty meetings for planning, implementing, and reporting data on the new E-portfolio. Throughout the academic year numerous training sessions will be scheduled for scoring the E-portfolio and for helping our teacher candidates to develop their own portfolio early into the program.

Goal #2:

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 (see 4 Domains listed below) our candidates need to demonstrate.

Although the overall result on the state PPR was strong with 95% passing rate, when we disaggregated the data, it showed that our candidates answered correctly less than 80% of the total test items in each domain. This suggests that our candidates were successful on only two-thirds of the total items, especially in Domain 3.

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 total examination items)
4. The teacher fulfills professional roles and responsibilities and adheres to legal and ethical requirements of the profession. (20% of exam items).

Action Plan for Goal #2.

-

Our plan for school year 2016-17 is to improve success on each of four domains listed above. That is, to increase the number of correct responses on each of the 4 domains. Our strategy for this is to examine each of the Curriculum and Instruction courses to make sure that the new teacher educator standards (both national and state) are being addressed adequately and intentionally. Preliminary analysis of our courses revealed the need for a closer alignment with current standards and more coherent sequencing of academic courses. This process has already begun and a new re-aligned curriculum for the EC-6 program will "phase in" during the Fall semester of 2017.

To be more successful in Domain 1 which requires a deeper understanding of the content (e.g., math, science, social studies) along with pedagogy, it is important to improve the candidates' performance on the state teacher examination, the Core Subject EC-6 (291) for the generalist certification. Please refer to uploaded document for test information. This standardized state examination has been newly administered in its revised form. Our candidates are having challenges passing all content areas as first-time takers.

Hence, the plan is to add a third goal to our program: The candidates will demonstrate a higher passing rate (85%) on the state Core Subjects Examination for EC-6 generalist which is an indicator of the level of content knowledge (Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Reading/Language Arts) our candidates possess.

By having an intentional third goal, the faculty and assessment staff in our college will develop a clear plan to help our candidates gain strong content knowledge that will drive and support effective teaching practices. This will obviously involve a stronger collaboration between the faculty in the sciences and education colleges. Re-examining curricula-both content and pedagogy, will definitely be a top priority. Luckily, we can reach across colleges without much constraints.

Attached Files

 [core subjects ec 6 291 TAAG](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

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

Learning Objective Description:

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.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Pass Rates On PPR Certification Exams

Indicator Description:

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 studies of the tests during their development. 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 Description:

First time pass rates on all levels of the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Examination will exceed 90%. The set criterion was decided based 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 2015-16 academic year.

Attached Files

[PPR_Standards.EC-12.Manual](#)

Findings Description:

Data on 241 teacher candidates in the program who took the PPR (Texas Teacher Examination) for the first time between August 1, 2015 and June 2016 showed a passing rate of 95%, which exceeded the target criterion (90% passing rate). The resulting passing rate was much higher than the overall average for the state of Texas (less than 85%).

The following disaggregated data further showed how our candidates performed on the each of the 4 domains assessed on the PPR. Please refer to the uploaded file (*PPR Standards, EC-12 Manual, page 12*) for a brief description of these domains:

Domain 1 - on average, 77% of the related test questions were correctly answered

Domain 2 - on average, 79% of the related test questions were correctly answered

Domain 3 - on average, 75% of the related test questions were correctly answered

Domain 4 - on average, 77% of the related test questions were correctly answered

The data above revealed our teacher candidates (student teachers) were most successful in Domain 2 (creating a positive learning climate) and least successful in Domain 3 (implementing instruction, assessment, & technology applications).

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Action

Action Description:

Goal #1:

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

Action Plan for Goal #1:

As explained in the *results* component of this report, the unit assessment we used to measure goal #1 was the Teacher Work Sample (TWS) which included 7 sections (from Contextual Factors to Self-reflection and Professional Growth). In response to new national standards for educator preparation (CAEP), the faculty decided to eliminate the TWS as a capstone project and to replace it with an electronic portfolio. Since AY 2015-16 was the transition period for this new assessment, the objectives and rubric of this new capstone requirement have not been fully articulated. A new faculty commi ee has just been assigned and charged to study further the E-portfolio assessment and recommend procedures, outcomes, and accountability.

What is currently used as an assessment for goal #1 is the *Self-reflection and Professional Growth* (just one section of the TWS) required of student teachers. However, it does not assess thoroughly goal #1. Consequently, this assessment will be incorporated in a much larger unit assessment called the Electronic Teacher Portfolio which is currently being designed. This capstone requirement is expected to be piloted during the Spring of 2017.

Hence, the action plan to meet goal #1 involves several faculty meetings for planning, implementing, and reporting data on the new E-portfolio. Throughout the academic year numerous training sessions will be scheduled for scoring the E-portfolio and for helping our teacher candidates to develop their own portfolio early into the program.

Goal #2:

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 (see 4 Domains listed below) our candidates need to demonstrate.

Although the overall result on the state PPR was strong with 95% passing rate, when we disaggregated the data, it showed that our candidates answered correctly less than 80% of the total test items in each domain. This suggests that our candidates were successful on only two-thirds of the total items, especially in Domain 3.

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 total examination items)
4. The teacher fulfills professional roles and responsibilities and adheres to legal and ethical requirements of the profession. (20% of exam items)

Action Plan for Goal #2.

-

Our plan for school year 2016-17 is to improve success on each of four domains listed above. That is, to increase the number of correct responses on each of the 4 domains. Our strategy for this is to examine each of the Curriculum and Instruction courses to make sure that the new teacher educator standards (both national and state) are being addressed adequately and intentionally. Preliminary analysis of our courses revealed the need for a closer alignment with current standards and more coherent sequencing of academic courses. This process has already begun and a new re-aligned curriculum for the EC-6 program will "phase in" during the Fall semester of 2017.

To be more successful in Domain 1 which requires a deeper understanding of the content (e.g., math, science, social studies) along with pedagogy, it is important to improve the candidates' performance on the state teacher examination, the Core Subject EC-6 (291) for the generalist certification. Please refer to uploaded document for test information. This standardized state examination has been newly administered in its revised form. Our candidates are having challenges passing all content areas as first-time takers.

Hence, the plan is to add a third goal to our program: The candidates will demonstrate a higher passing rate (85%) on the state Core Subjects Examination for EC-6 generalist which is an indicator of the level of content knowledge (Mathematics, Science, Social Studies, and Reading/Language Arts) our candidates possess.

By having an intentional third goal, the faculty and assessment staff in our college will develop a clear plan to help our candidates gain strong content knowledge that will drive and support effective teaching practices. This will obviously involve a stronger collaboration between the faculty in the sciences and education colleges. Re-examining curricula-both content and pedagogy, will definitely be a top priority. Luckily, we can reach across colleges without much constraints.

Attached Files

 [core subjects ec 6 291 TAAG](#)

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

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 a 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.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

During the AY 2015-16, the program coordinators involved in our EC-6 teacher preparation program has spent long hours (summer 2016) discussing how the new standards for teacher educators can be implemented smoothly. What do we want our candidates to look like when they exit our program?

There was no easy way but to re-organize course sequencing and course descriptions. Extensive dialogues and forums have occurred among faculty from different departments. A blueprint of our EC-Generalist (Interdisciplinary Studies) is currently being re-examined by several stakeholders (e.g., faculty from different colleges, school leaders).

Addressing 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, the AY 2016-17 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. The new courses needed have already been designed and submitted for approval to university curriculum committee and then the state board of educator preparation. Continued discussions on the logistics for the full implementation of the re-aligned EC-6 curriculum will continue during the AY 2016-17. Partner school leaders will be invited to several forums to elaborate on the field experience requirements and how to strengthen the university-school collaboration and partnership.

Furthermore, the College of Education will open officially the SHSU Charter School to provide rich opportunities for our teacher candidates to observe state-of-the-art teaching and to participate actively in teaching young children of varied cultural and economic backgrounds. This charter school will support collaboration from different school districts, and most importantly, provide excellent field experience for our candidates. In doing so, the 3 goals we have envisioned for the EC-6 program should be well supported by the different initiatives already in place in our college.

Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

While the unit assessment for Goal #1 is under revision and articulation by joint departments, the program faculty decided to add a third goal to our program which can be measured quantitatively using the state data for teacher certification. One of the challenges we faced in our program is that our candidates have not been doing very well on the Core Examination (EC-6) which measures content knowledge in Science, Mathematics, Social studies, Reading Language Arts, and Fine Arts. The faculty and administrative staff are now finding solutions and defining processes to resolve this deficiency, recognizing the fact that this Core Examination has been revised from the old state exam for teacher certification (EC-6). Continuous monitoring of state data and providing support to our candidates will be top priorities. In addition, a total revision of our EC-6 generalist program is in process. Three academic departments (curriculum & instruction, Language, Literacy, and Special Education, Arts and Sciences) are responsible for the planning, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating the new, re-aligned program. In addition, the Center for Assessment and Accreditation has been re-organized to support all programs in the College of Education. The Center has guided the faculty in identifying transition point assessments, validating unit assessments, and collecting assessment data.