

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Assessment of Student Learning Reports

Assessment of Student Learning Committee  
(Inactive)

---

Spring 2015

### Elementary and Secondary Education Disciplines Assessment Report 2014/2015

Elementary Education Discipline

Secondary Education Discipline

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/aslc\\_reports](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/aslc_reports)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Elementary Education Discipline and Secondary Education Discipline, "Elementary and Secondary Education Disciplines Assessment Report 2014/2015" (2015). *Assessment of Student Learning Reports*. 97.

[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/aslc\\_reports/97](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/aslc_reports/97)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by the Assessment of Student Learning Committee (Inactive) at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Assessment of Student Learning Reports by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

# Assessment of Student Learning Report

## UMM Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

### September 2015

## Assessment System

### Policies and Procedures

Policies and procedures (described in [2.4.a.1](#)) show that the system is multifaceted, ongoing, and up-to-date. It allows us to gather, track, analyze, use, and review data for candidates, programs, and the unit. Assessments reflect our conceptual framework, align with the Minnesota Standards ([1.4.a.1](#), [1.4.a.2](#), [1.5.c.3](#), [2.4.a.4](#)), and are collected at key transition points ([1.4.c.1](#), [2.4.a.2](#), [2.4.a.3](#)). Evaluation of the system is ongoing and inclusive. The small size of the Teacher Education Program (TEP) faculty allows for an assessment committee of the whole ([2.4.d.1](#)). As a unit, we discuss the system and the measures, results, and implications of the data both in formal data days and in regular TEP meetings. Based on discussion, we have adapted assignments and rubrics, held reliability sessions prior to scoring shared assignments, created new assessment measures, and made changes to courses. The support personnel are critical to the success of the system as they contribute ideas for ways to improve collection, storage, and dissemination of data. In summer 2014, we secured funds to purchase Tk20 to assist in tracking and reporting assessment data.

The Tk20 system is currently being built and implemented to meet our program needs.

## Establishing Fairness, Accuracy, & Consistency

The unit works to ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. As described in [2.4.c.1](#), the efforts include alignment to standards, review of assessments, multiple measures, clarity of procedures, and analyses of reliability and validity.

- 2014 Score Comparison Analysis for Student Teaching Assessments ([2.4.c.2](#)) reveals that scores assigned by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on summative evaluations were within one rating level nearly 100% of the time. Complete agreement was especially strong for the elementary program, with identical scores on nine out of ten items in over 50% of the cases. Simple correlation analysis comparing supervisor and cooperating teachers reveals a very strong and significant positive correlation for elementary program scores. The positive correlation of .32 for secondary education program scores indicates general agreement, but analysis of the individual items reveals that the strength and direction of agreement is variable.
- On the 2014 edTPA assignment, university supervisor assessments were within one rating of official Pearson scores between 82-100% of the time for the 15 individual rubrics. The ELED, scores were exact matches 32-64% of the time. While the simple correlations performed for the comparisons on the 15 individual rubrics reveal correlations that differ in strength and direction, the total scores assigned to the edTPAs have moderately healthy correlations of .35 (elementary) and .48 (secondary).
- Paired Samples of T-Test ([2.4.c.3](#)) were completed in consultation with a professor in the statistics discipline. Paired t-tests of the ELED summative evaluation scores by cooperating teachers and university supervisors supported the null hypothesis that there were no significant differences in scores ( $p < .05$ ) for nine out of the ten elements. For Standard 10: Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships, the scores were found to be statistically different ( $p < .05$ ). SEED comparisons revealed inconsistent findings with 4 of the 10 elements and the total score significantly different. In most cases, there was little disagreement for low scores. Rather, the inconsistencies were found when assessing a candidate as either Proficient or Distinguished. The only significant difference found between Pearson and university scores on the edTPA was for ELED Task 2: Engagement.

## Data Collection, Analysis, & Evaluation

The Key Assessments Collection, Analysis, and Dissemination Plan ([1.4.c.1](#)) outlines the unit's assessment system by showing the schedule of data collection, the personnel involved, where data is stored, how it is used, and how it is disseminated. Key assessments for candidates, aligned to program standards, include GPA data overall and in content areas, performance-based assessments, and disposition documents. Program and unit assessments include candidate performance on key assessments, course evaluations (used by faculty to improve instruction), Ed 4901 survey of program completers ([2.4.a.6](#)), and graduate and employer surveys ([1.4.i.1](#) & [1.4.j.1](#)), and feedback from school partners (individual communication, Teacher Ed Advisory Committee and surveys--[3.4.a.1.a](#); [3.4.a.1.b](#) & [3.4.a.4](#)).

## Aggregated Data

Aggregated data is reported for each measure by categorizing specific items as they relate to content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge & skills, professional and pedagogical knowledge & skills, disposition, and impact on student learning.

### Content Knowledge

Data indicate that candidates know the subject matter they teach.

- MTLEs

Over 80% of completers have passed all required MTLEs. Pass rates on basic skills exams exceed 80% and surpass state pass rates. The unit pass rate for content exams is 96%. Three programs, not reported due to small N (even with combined years of data), have pass rates less than 80%, and we continue to address the problem. Most candidates involved in the three programs earned licensure in areas where they had met all of the requirements ([1.4.d.2](#)).

- GPA

The four-year average GPA of 3.38 overall and 3.31 in licensure areas ([1.4.d.1](#)) indicates that candidates do well in all courses and exceed minimum GPA requirements.

- Key Program Assessments

Between 92-100% of candidates in the past three years were rated proficient or above in subject matter understanding and between 70-100% in planning instruction. Mean portfolio scores ranging from 3.76 to 4.59 (5 point scale) provide further evidence of content knowledge understanding ([1.4.d.11](#)).

- edTPA

Two elements of the edTPA relate to content understanding (1 Planning for Instruction, and 9 Subject Specific Pedagogy: Using Representations). Data ([1.4.d.6](#)) reveal that on rubrics 1, most candidates earn a score of 3 (proficient) or above. On element 9, only 67% of secondary education candidates received the proficient rating.

- Graduate and Employer Surveys. For the past four years, 100% of ELED graduates indicated that they were at least somewhat prepared, and mean scores indicate that they considered themselves generally to very prepared. For SEED graduates, a low response rate magnifies the impact of one or two candidates expressing dissatisfaction on several items. We continue to consider the feedback carefully. 100% of employers rated the graduates proficient or above on survey item 1 Knowledge of Subject ([1.4.d.6](#)).

### Pedagogical Content Knowledge and Skills

Data indicate that candidates understand the knowledge and skills required to teach in their content area ([1.4.d.7](#)).

- Key Program Assessments

High percentages of candidates are proficient or above in their performance related to pedagogical content knowledge and skills. Candidates are rated as proficient or above more than 80% of the time and often 100% on summative evaluations. Portfolio scores indicate 100% proficiency.

- edTPA

On 1 Planning and 7 Engaging Students rubrics, over 80% of candidates met proficiency standards on the Pearson scores. On rubric 9 Subject Specific Pedagogy Using Representations, 67 % of SEED candidates were rated proficient or above with a lower mean score and wider deviation. Our analysis will focus on the specific candidates with the lower scores to determine reasons and solutions.

- Graduate and Employer Surveys

For the past four years, 100% of ELED graduates indicated that they were at least somewhat prepared, and mean scores indicate that they considered themselves generally to very prepared. For SEED graduates, a low response rate again magnifies the impact of one or two negative responses. 100% of employers rated the graduates proficient or above on survey items 1 Knowledge of Subject and 2 Development of Daily Lessons and Unit Plans.

### **Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge & Skills**

Candidates in elementary and secondary programs learn and refine professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in their program courses and practicum experiences.

- MTLEs

100% of program completers received passing scores on the pedagogy MTLEs for the past three years.

- Key Program Assessments

CT and US ratings on the summative evaluations of student teaching indicate that high percentages of candidates are proficient or above in their performance related the many key elements of professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills. CT ratings for the learning environment are lower than US ratings. Scores also indicate that candidates need more experience in the area of assessment.

- edTPA

The fifteen rubrics on the edTPA all were relevant to pedagogical skills. On most rubrics, over 80% of candidates receive scores of proficient or above. The highest unit rating (95%) was in 6 Learning Environment. The four areas of interest due to lower ratings are 8 Deepening Student Learning, 9 Subject Specific Pedagogy Using Representations, 13 Student Use of Feedback, and for ELED, 14 Analyze Students' Language Use and Learning. We have added supports for increasing candidate understanding in these areas and in edTPA preparation and look forward to analyzing the 2015 results.

- Graduate and Employer Surveys

For the past four years, 100% of ELED graduates indicated that they were at least somewhat prepared, and mean scores indicate that they considered themselves generally to very prepared. 100% of employers rated the graduates proficient or above on survey items 1 Knowledge of Subject and 2 Development of Daily Lessons and Unit Plans ([1.4.d.8](#)).

### **Professional Dispositions**

Candidates demonstrate the professional dispositions needed for teaching.

- Key Program Assessments

Candidate portfolio scores and CTs and USs ratings on summative evaluations indicate that most candidates are proficient, meeting and sometimes exceeding the standard requirements. ([1.4.f.1](#))

- Graduate and Employer Surveys

In most years, 100% of employers found the graduates to be well prepared in communication with parents and families and in professional responsibility. ELED and SEED graduates reported that they were at least somewhat prepared in these areas.

- Disposition Assessment ([1.4.f.2](#))

Data reveal that most candidates (often 100%) demonstrate professional standards on many key standards. Collaboration is the weakest area for students with only 61% of candidates providing evidence that they communicate about instruction to special ed and/or other professionals. Only 76% of candidates provide evidence that they have communicate with parents appropriately. We believe that this can be improved programmatically with clearer expectations about the candidates seeking out experiences. (See e.g. 8/15/14 Data Day Minutes [2.4.d.1](#))

## **Impact on P-12 Student Learning**

Student learning is at the heart of the UMM TEP conceptual framework, and candidates demonstrate their impact on P-12 student learning ([1.4.d.9](#)).

- Key Program Assessments

High portfolio scores indicate that candidates can reflect on student learning in meaningful ways. 89 to 100% of candidates were rated proficient or above on the elements related to student learning in summative evaluations. Data reveal that some candidates, while meeting standards at a minimum level, continue to struggle in demonstrating the knowledge and skills needed.

- edTPA

On most elements, over 80% of candidates receive scores of proficient or above. The highest unit rating (93%) was in 15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction. The three areas of interest, due to lower ratings, are: 8 Deepening Student Learning, 13 Student Use of Feedback, and for ELED, 14 Analyze Students' Language Use and Learning. We have added supports for increasing candidate understanding in these areas and in edTPA preparation and look forward to analyzing the 2015 results.

- Assessment of Integrated Technology

Candidate use of technology to maximize learning was rated adequate to exemplary 96 to 100% of the time ([1.4.d.3](#)).

- Graduate and Employer Surveys

Respondents indicated high ratings for candidate preparation in the areas related to student learning. Though 100% prepared, the mean of 2.73 (ELED) and 2.25 (SEED) on 10 Identify and design instruction appropriate to students' stages of development, learning, styles, and strengths, and needs was the lowest rating of the set. We note that the response is variable from year to year.

## **Use of Data for Program Improvement**

Assessment results are discussed in ongoing meetings with appropriate stakeholders. Individual candidate data, reviewed only by appropriate personnel, is used for candidate advising, coaching, and decision making. For program evaluation and improvement, aggregated data is shared with stakeholders who assist in making decisions and determining priorities. Program faculty members make decisions about curriculum, instruction, assessment, scheduling, field experiences, and other program considerations. The unit's policies and procedures for student appeals are clear and prominently displayed for candidate use if needed ([2.4.e.1](#)). The unit maintains a file of candidate complaints, unit responses, and resolutions (available on site). The advisory committee and content area

faculty are also included in these conversations when appropriate for the task. Program Changes Based on Data ([2.4.g.1](#)) shows recent changes. Results are disseminated broadly to share program achievements. Reports are regularly provided to the following: US Department of Education and the State of Minnesota Title II, Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP/NCATE), American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Professional Education Data System (AACTE PEDs), Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Teacher Quality Measures (MACTE MTQM) UMM Assessment Committee, academic dean, and Teacher Education Advisory Committee. Aggregated assessment information is also available online for viewing by interested candidates, school partners, graduates, and employers.