

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

B.S. Elementary Education (3102)

Division: College: Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development

Department: School of Education

Prepared by: April Giddens

Date: June 19, 2020

Confirmed by GCEHD Assessment Coordinator Susan Kahn

Approved by: Kimberly McAlister

Date: July 19, 2020

Northwestern Mission. Northwestern State University is a responsive, student-oriented institution that is committed to the creation, dissemination, and acquisition of knowledge through teaching, research, and service. The University maintains as its highest priority excellence in teaching in graduate and undergraduate programs. Northwestern State University prepares its students to become productive members of society and promotes economic development and improvements in the quality of life of the citizens in its region.

Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development Mission. The Gallaspy Family College of Education and Human Development is committed to working collaboratively to acquire, create, and disseminate knowledge to Northwestern students through transformational, high-impact experiential learning practices, research, and service. Through the School of Education and Departments of Health and Human Performance, Military Science, Psychology, and Social Work, the College produces knowledgeable, inspired, and innovative graduates ready for lifelong learning who contribute to the communities in which they reside and professions they serve. Additionally, the GCEHD is dedicated to the communities served by the Marie Shaw Dunn Child Development Center, NSU Elementary Laboratory School, NSU Middle Laboratory School, and the NSU Child and Family Network to assist children and their families related to learning and development

School of Education Mission. The School of Education offers exemplary programs that prepare candidates for career success in a variety of professional roles and settings. As caring, competent, reflective practitioners, our graduates become positive models in their communities and organizations. This mission is fulfilled through academic programs based on theory, research, and best practice. Further, all graduates learn to value and work with diverse populations and to incorporate technologies that enrich learning and professional endeavors.

B.S. Elementary Education Program Mission Statement: The mission of the Northwestern State University undergraduate elementary education program is to prepare students with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be effective teachers in the elementary classroom. The program prepares candidates to meet the diverse needs of children in a variety of educational settings while documenting and assessing their growth over time in relation to Louisiana state competencies. Upon completion of the program, candidates are equipped to meet the many demands of the

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

teaching profession.

Methodology: The assessment process for the BS in elementary education program is as follows:

1. Data from assessments tools are collected and returned to the department chair and program coordinator.
2. The program coordinator will analyze data to determine whether students have met the measurable outcomes.
3. Results from the assessment will be shared and discussed with program faculty.
4. The program coordinator, in consultation with program faculty and stakeholders, will review data and propose changes to measurable outcomes, assessment tools for the next assessment period, and where needed, curricula and program changes.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1: Candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge related to elementary education.

Course Map: Candidates must take and pass the Praxis Subject Assessments, Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) and Elementary Content Knowledge or Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects exams at the completion of the third or fourth year of coursework.

Elementary Content Knowledge/Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects
EDUC 4080: Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom
EDUC 4230: Teaching Methods in Numeracy and Mathematical Practices in the Elementary School
EDUC 4330: Content and Techniques of Teaching Science in the Elementary School
EDUC 4430: Content and Techniques of Teaching Social Studies in the Elementary School

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1, Praxis Subject Assessments)	Candidates will demonstrate content and pedagogical knowledge related to elementary education.

Measure 1.1. (Direct – Knowledge)

SLO 1 is assessed through the Praxis Subject Assessments, Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT): Grades K-6 test (#5622) and Elementary Content Knowledge test

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

(#5018) / Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (#5001). The assessment is a computer-based standardized test, and the benchmark performance is a minimum score of 160 on the PLT Grades K-6 and 163 on the Elementary Content Knowledge test, Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects (Reading and Language (#5002) – 157; Mathematics (#5003) – 157; Social Studies (#5004) – 155; and Science (#5005) – 159) as required by the State of Louisiana for certification as an elementary teacher. Quality of the assessment/evidence is assured because (1) the State of Louisiana requires this test, and (2) the test is nationally normed.

Based on the evidence, candidate success is assessed through the achievement of a score that meets or exceeds the state minimum required scores of 160 on the PLT, 163 on the Elementary Content Knowledge test, or Elementary Education: Multiple Subjects scores of 156 (Reading and Language), 157 (Mathematics), 157 (Social Studies) and 159 (Science).

Finding. Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2016-2017:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, 100% of candidates met the target. Candidate scores ranged from 167 – 189 with a mean score of 176 on the PLT. The candidates' mean score surpassed the national median average of 166. Candidate scores range from 163 – 180 on the Elementary Content Knowledge test with a mean score of 174 (n=6). Candidates' mean scores surpassed the national median average score of 170.

Previously the Elementary Content test combined all content tests for one overall score; however, in September of 2017, the Elementary Content Knowledge test changed to Elementary Multiple Subjects. Candidates are now required to achieve passing scores on each individual content test (Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies) in order to meet the state requirements for certification. 100% of candidates taking this test met or exceeded the qualifying scores on each subtest.

Candidate scores:

Reading & Language Arts subtest range from 165 to 192; mean=174.71 (n=7);

Mathematics subtest scores range from 159 to 200; mean=177.28 (n=7);

Social Studies subtest scores range from 159 to 183; mean= 168.57 (n=7); and

Science subtest scores range from 160 to 197; mean=176 (n=7).

Candidate scores continue to exceed the national median averages on all subtests.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. After examining the evidence from AC 2018-19, in AC 2019-2020 faculty offered more test prep seminars for candidates, addressing all content areas. Faculty offered multiple PRAXIS seminars which addressed all needed content areas. Also, the university partnered with the Natchitoches Parish Library to offer access to Learning Express, a source for PRAXIS test preparation.

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

In AC 2019-2020, the target was 100% candidates achieved the required scores for state certification. The goal was met with 100% of the candidates earning scores that met or exceeded the state required scores and national averages. In addition, average scores increased on the PLT (#5622) and Elementary Education Multiple Subjects Social Studies (#5004) and Science (#5005) tests.

In AC 2019-2020, 100% of candidates met the target. Candidate scores ranged from 161 – 181 with a mean score of 173 on the PLT. The candidates' mean score surpassed the national median average of 166. Previously the Elementary Content test combined all content tests for one overall score; however, in September of 2017, the Elementary Content Knowledge test changed to Elementary Multiple Subjects. Candidates are now required to achieve passing scores on each individual content test (Reading/ELA, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies) in order to meet the state requirements for certification. 100% of candidates taking this test met or exceeded the qualifying scores on each subtest.

Candidate scores:

Reading & Language Arts subtest range from 162 to 190; mean= 170 (n=17);

Mathematics subtest scores range from 158 to 195; mean= 176.3 (n=17);

Social Studies subtest scores range from 165 to 177; mean= 165.15 (n=17);

Science subtest scores range from 159 to 190; mean= 170.95 (n=17).

Candidate scores also continue to exceed the national median averages on all subtests.

These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will provide several PRAXIS preparation resources and learning opportunities for all students.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

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

SLO 2: Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of Appropriate Practices relating to Elementary education, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and managing classroom procedures.

Course Map: SLO 2 is assessed in **EDUC 4960: Residency II- Teaching in the Elementary School**. This course is taken during their final year in the program.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice	Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of Appropriate Practices relating to Elementary education, curriculum, instruction, assessment, and managing classroom procedures.

Measure 2.1. (Direct – Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions).

SLO 2 is assessed through a teaching competency portfolio in EDUC 4960, Residency II – Teaching in the Elementary School, which candidates take during the final year of the program. Candidate performance is assessed related to teaching (curriculum and instruction), assessing students, and managing classroom procedures. Candidates are provided with the rubric based on the Danielson Framework to evaluate their performance. The rating scale was adjusted to reflect course grading requirements, but the criteria and indicators were not adjusted from the Framework. The assessment and rubric continue to be tweaked as necessary with each iteration based on results of student learning and changes in state standards. Program faculty have reviewed the for validity and reliability, ensuring that the assessment measures what is intended to measure and this it is reliable over time. The goal is for at least 80% of all candidates to score at least a 2 out 3, “Meets Expectations,” on the evaluation instrument.

Finding.

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target was Not Met. 50% of candidates met target
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target was Met. 93% of candidates met target
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2016-2017:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, 93% (13 out of 14) of candidates were rated “Meets Expectations” or “Target” by scoring at least a “2” on each area of the rubric. The mean score was 2.82, with n = 17. The areas where

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

candidates missed points fell into these categories: adjusts lessons when appropriate and stimulates and encourages higher order thinking at the appropriate developmental levels. One candidate scored a 1 out of 3 in 40 out of 50 categories assessed. Although the number of candidates scoring “Meets Expectations” or “Target” on the rubric decreased from AC 2017-2018 (100%) to AC 2018-19 (93%), the evidence supported student learning and program faculty used videos and more detailed explanations in course work to provide learner support in the areas where candidates missed points which were the same areas (Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources and Managing Student Behavior) as in the previous assessment cycle. Even though the number of students scoring at target decreased, the results are evidence of improvement in the desired direction of the SLO. The results continue to provide evidence of student growth because program faculty has focused on instructional planning, curriculum, and assessment. Because the assessment and rubric are tied to InTASC standards, state standards, and Louisiana teacher competencies, candidates’ artifacts demonstrated student learning via mastery of state and content standards.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty examined the evidence to determine student learning in each area and added professional development sessions on managing classroom procedures and selecting resources in Elementary methods courses to provide learner support and prepare candidates for Student Teaching/Residency. This effort to engage in program improvement will strengthen candidates’ knowledge and skills relating to elementary education curriculum, instruction, assessment, and managing student behavior. These changes had a direct impact on the student’s ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.

Although changes were made, in AC 2019-2020 the target was not met.

In AC 2019-2020, the target was 100% of candidates score at least a 2 out 3 on the evaluation instrument. In AC 2019-2020, data show that 50% of candidates met target and scored at least a “2” on each area of the rubric. Candidates’ mean score was 1.88, with n = 22. The areas where candidates missed points fell into these categories: using questioning and discussion techniques, adjusts lessons when appropriate and stimulates and encourages higher order thinking at the appropriate developmental levels. One candidate scored a 1 out of 3 in 40 out of 50 categories assessed. Although the number of candidates scoring “Meets Expectations” or “Target” on the rubric decreased from AC 2018-2019 (93%) to AC 2019-20 (50%), the evidence supports student learning and program faculty will to use videos and more detailed explanations in course work to provide learner support in the areas where candidates missed points which were the same areas (Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources and Managing Student Behavior) as in the previous iteration. Even though the number of students scoring at target decreased last year, the results are evidence of improvement in the desired direction of the SLO. The results continue to provide evidence of student growth because program faculty has focused on instructional planning, curriculum and assessment. Because the assessment and rubric are tied to

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

InTASC standards, state standards, and Louisiana teacher competencies, candidates' artifacts demonstrated student learning via mastery of state and content standards.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was not met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will examine the evidence to determine student learning in each area, and professional development sessions on managing classroom procedures and selecting resources to add in Elementary methods courses to provide learner support and prepare candidates for Student Teaching/Residency. This effort to engage in program improvement will strengthen candidates' knowledge and skills relating to elementary education curriculum, instruction, assessment, and managing student behavior.

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

Moving forward, SLO 2 will be assessed via a Teacher Candidate Observation Form in EDUC 4961 and EDUC 4962 *Residency I and Residency II – Teaching in the Elementary School*, which candidates take in their last two semesters of coursework. This change was made to align with departmental goals and meet CAEP accreditation demands. 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 Ration (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,

- CVR mean = -.03 with CVR (Critical, 11) = .59 and no single item meeting critical value of .59.
- ICC = .59. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects "fair" inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered "good."

Because the assessment is tied to national and state standards, candidates' artifacts demonstrated student learning via mastery of those standards.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

SLO 3: Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics that are professional and ethical.

Course Map: SLO 3 is assessed in **EDUC 4080, Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom** and **EDUC 4230, Teaching Methods in Numeracy and Mathematical Practices in Elementary School**. These courses were previously taken the semester before student teaching. Now, these courses taken during the final year in the program as part of the yearlong residency.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics. (Dispositional Evaluation)	Candidates will model behaviors and characteristics that are professional and ethical.

Measure 3.1. (Direct – Dispositions)

SLO 3 is assessed through a disposition's form/observation form in EDUC 4080, Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom and EDUC 4230, Teaching Methods in Numeracy and Mathematical Practices in Elementary School. The assessment is evaluated using a rubric, and the target performance is that 80% of candidates will score at least "Sufficient" on the rubric. Mentors evaluate candidates' dispositions at midterm and discuss the evaluation with candidates so that they are aware of strengths and weaknesses. Mentors again use the assessment at the end of the semester (end of semester data is reported below). Faculty created the dispositional evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards. The assessment provides evidence for meeting the state identified standards because it is aligned with InTASC standards, and face validity was established for the instrument. Steps were taken to assure Quality of the assessment/evidence. Face validity was 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. The goal is for at least 80% of candidates to score "Sufficient".

Findings: Target was Met

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2016-2017:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, 100% of candidates met target and scored at least "Sufficient." Candidates' mean score was 4.49 (n = 12). One candidate lost points in the Attendance and Punctuality and Professional Appearance

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

and Demeanor Categories.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty emphasized Time Management (Attendance and Punctuality) and Professionalism (Appearance and Demeanor) to support candidates' performance. This effort to engage in program improvement strengthened candidates' dispositions relating to growing as culturally responsive professionals. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to model professional behaviors and characteristics.

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

In AC 2019-2020, 100% of candidates met target and scored at least "Sufficient." Candidates' mean score was 4.2 (n = 20). Although 100% of candidates met the target, program faculty examined the evidence to determine student learning in each area, and emphasis on Diversity was strengthened in coursework to provide learner support. This proved to be effective.

As this assessment is used in the Methods Course, which is one of the last courses candidates take before Student Teaching (EDUC 4960), faculty expect scores to be strong. Because the assessment and rubric are tied to national standards, candidates' artifacts demonstrated student learning via mastery of those standards.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will add enhanced and adapted emphasis on Time Management (Attendance and Punctuality) and Professionalism (Appearance and Demeanor) to support candidates' performance. This effort to engage in program improvement will strengthen candidates' dispositions relating to growing as culturally responsive professionals.

Moving forward, this assessment will be used in Residency I (EDUC 4961) and Residency II (EDUC 4962) as the courses that were formerly referred to as Methods Course will become part of the year-long Residency block of courses. These courses will be taken during the candidates last year of the program.

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

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

SLO 4: Candidates will design and implement developmentally appropriate lesson plans that reflect research on best practices in Elementary Education.

SLO 4 is assessed through a lesson plan and reflection in EDUC 4080, Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom and EDUC 4960 *Student Teaching in the Elementary Classroom*, which candidates take in their final year.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline (SPA #3, Lesson Plan)	Candidates will design and implement developmentally appropriate lesson plans that reflect research on best practices in Elementary Education.

Measure 4.1 (Direct – Knowledge and Skills)

SLO 4 is assessed through lesson plans and reflections in **EDUC 4080, Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom** and **EDUC 4960 Student Teaching in the Elementary Classroom** which candidates take in their final year. The assessment is evaluated using a rubric, and the target performance is that 80% of candidates will score at least a “3” on the rubric, which is aligned with the state teacher assessment. A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the lesson planning template to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Louisiana State Standards’ expectations. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which in-service teacher evaluations were based. 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 eight 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. To determine criteria for success,

- CVR mean = -.58 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 13 items (62%) meeting critical value of .75
- ICC = .573. ICC of .4 - .59 reflects “fair” inter-rater agreement, and .6 is considered “good.”

Finding: 100 % of candidates met expectations.

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

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

- **AC 2016-2017:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, 100% of candidates met target and scored at least a “2.” Candidates’ mean score was 2.64 (n = 17). At the end of the course, program faculty examined the evidence to determine student learning in each area and determined that more emphasis was needed on Differentiation, specifically Integration Across and Integration Within Content Fields.

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty included additional professional development related to the Integration of Critical Thinking Strategies and Reflecting on Instruction to support student learning. Faculty increased course content on Differentiation and added two professional development sessions provided by outside presenters to enhance learner support. This effort to engage in program improvement strengthened candidates’ ability to think critically and reflect on their practice to improve student outcomes in the classroom. These changes had a direct impact on the student’s ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline.

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

In AC 2019-2020, candidates’ mean score was 2.65 (n = 20). Candidates’ lowest scores fell into the Integration of Critical Thinking Skills and Reflecting on Instruction categories. This aligns with a department-wide need for an emphasis on critical thinking and reflection.

Because the assessment and rubric are tied to InTASC standards and state standards, candidates’ artifacts demonstrated student learning via mastery of InTASC and content standards.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will include additional professional development related to the Integration of Critical Thinking Strategies and Reflecting on Instruction to support student learning. This effort to engage in program improvement will strengthen candidates’ ability to think critically and reflect on their practice to improve student outcomes in the classroom.

These changes will improve the student’s ability to exhibit creative thinking that yields engaging ideas, processes, materials, and experiences appropriate for the discipline, thereby continuing to push the cycle of improvement forward.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

SLO 5: Candidates will assess the quality of instructional decision making using the P12 Student Learning Impact Assessment.

Course Map SLO 5 is assessed in **EDUC 4960, Residency-Teaching in the Elementary School** through the teaching portfolio which is assessed using the P12 Student Learning Impact Assessment during the last semester of the program.

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate (SPA #5, Student Learning Impact)	Candidates will assess the quality of instructional decision making using the P12 Student Learning Impact Assessment.

Measure 5.1. (Direct – Knowledge and Skills)

SLO 5 is assessed through the P12 Student Learning Impact Assessment, a component of the culminating portfolio, during Residency II. Residency II is taken during the last semester of the program. The assessment is evaluated using a rubric. 80% of all students will score 2 out of 3 on the benchmark performance.

A group of faculty and cooperating teachers collaborated to create the Student Learning Impact Assessment to align with (at the time) new Louisiana Compass and Common Core State Standards' expectations. The assessment requires candidates to plan for, create, administer, and analyze student learning. Candidates then reflect on and make instructional decisions based on their analyses. 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. A panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous student learning impact work samples submitted by candidates in four different initial teacher preparation programs. Analyses were conducted using the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

To determine criteria for success,

- CVR mean = -.61 with CVR (Critical, 8) = .75 and 7 items (78%) meeting critical value of .75
- ICC = .954. ICC greater than .75 reflects "excellent" inter-rater reliability.

Finding: 100% of candidates met expectations.

- **AC 2019-2020:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2018-2019:** Target was Met. 100% of candidates met target
- **AC 2017-2018:** Target was Met. 90% of candidates met target
- **AC 2016-2017:** Target was Not Met. 33% of candidates met target

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019, the target was met. In AC 2018-2019, 17 students completed the Student Learning Impact Assessment as part of their culminating portfolio. 100% of candidates met the target by scoring at least a “2”. Score levels changed from 1, 2, 3, 4, in 2017-2018 to 1, 2, 3 in 2018-2019. Candidates’ mean score was 2.64 (n =17) on the assessment. Candidates’ mean scores ranged from 2.59 – 2.88 (n=17) on each of the components assessed on the rubric. Evidence showed that candidates’ lowest scores were in higher order thinking and the reflective practice category. This aligned with a department- wide need for an emphasis on reflection

Based on analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, faculty made the following changes in AC 2019-2020 to drive the cycle of improvement. Faculty assessed the quality of students’ instructional decision making using the PK-12 Student Impact Assessment. This decision was made in order to meet CAEP demands and to align with departmental goals. Faculty increased course content on setting and writing student learning targets and added professional development sessions provided by outside presenters to enhance learner support. As a result, scores increased in this area, and 100% of candidates met target on the student learning target component.

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

In AC 2019-2020, twenty students completed the Student Learning Impact Assessment as part of their culminating portfolio. 100% of the candidates met the target and scored at least a “3.” Candidates’ mean scores range from 0.5 - 4 (n = 20) on each of the components assessed on the rubric. Evidence showed that all candidates scored a “3” or better on setting assessment criteria and analysis of formative data. At the end of the course, program faculty examined the evidence to determine student learning in each area and determined that more emphasis was needed on student learning targets.

Evidence from AC 2018-2019 to AC 2019-2020 supports the students’ ability to set assessment criteria and prepare instructional assignments. Expectations were met in AC 2018-2019 and AC 2019-2020. The ratings on the instrument in AC 2019 – 2020 supports that students can assess the quality of instructional decision making.

These changes had a direct impact on the student’s ability to make responsible decisions and problem-solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate.

Action - Decision or Recommendation:

In AC 2019-2020, the target was met.

Based on information gathered from analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data, faculty will implement the following changes in AC 2020-2021 to drive the cycle of improvement. In AC 2020-2021, faculty will assess the quality of students’ instructional decision making using the PK-12 Student Impact Assessment. This decision was made in order to meet CAEP demands and to align with departmental goals.

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

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

Comprehensive Summary of Key Evidence of Seeking Improvement Based on Analysis of Results.

Program faculty made several decisions after examining results of data analysis which resulted in improved student learning and program improvement.

- Multiple PRAXIS seminars were offered to candidates, addressing all content areas. Also, the university partnered with the Natchitoches Parish Library to offer access to Learning Express, a source for PRAXIS test preparation to support candidate learning and their ability to meet SLO 1.
- Evidence show that candidates are mastering the InTASC standards and Louisiana Teacher Competencies addressed in these assessment tools. 100% of candidates pass the Praxis tests with qualifying scores set by the state of to progress through the program and achieve certification.
- Videos and resources addressing using questioning techniques, designing student assessments and managing classroom procedures were added to courses to support candidate learning and their ability to meet SLO 2.
- Emphasis on integration across and within content fields, integration of critical thinking strategies and reflection on instruction was strengthened in EDUC 4080, Applications of Teaching Literacy in the Elementary Classroom and EDUC 4230, Teaching Methods in Numeracy and Mathematical Practices in Elementary School coursework to provide learner support and enhance their ability to meet SLO 3.
- Faculty increased course content on Differentiation and added professional development sessions to provide learner support and help them meet SLO 4.
- Emphasis on setting and writing student learning targets was strengthened in EDUC 4960, Residency – Teaching in the Elementary School, to support candidate learning and help them meet SLO 5.
- Faculty have placed greater emphasis on professionalism, based on conversations with principals and other stakeholders in the field.
- Faculty have added emphasis on current assessments and curricular programs as a result of conversations with principals and other stakeholders

AC 2019 – 2020 Assessment

in the field.

- Faculty added more professional development sessions than ever in the program, strengthening the overall program.
- Finally, faculty have added an experiential learning component to our undergraduate program as part of our QEP.

Plan of Action Moving Forward.

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

- Faculty will continue to offer PRAXIS seminars and partner with the Natchitoches Parish Library to offer access to Learning Express, a source for PRAXIS test preparation to support candidate learning and their ability to meet SLO 1.
- Faculty will add additional resources and videos addressing designing coherent instruction, designing student assessment, using questioning and discussion techniques, using assessment in instruction, and demonstrating flexibility and responsiveness to support student learning in elementary education courses to support candidate learning and their ability to meet SLO 2.
- Moving forward, SLO 2 will be assessed with a Teacher Observation Form in order to meet CAEP requirements and align with departmental goals.
- Faculty will add additional resources focusing on Professionalism in Elementary courses to positively impact candidates' professional dispositions to help them meet SLO 3.
- Faculty will add professional development related to Reflecting on Instruction to Elementary education courses to provide learner support and help them meet SLO 4.
- Faculty will continue to place emphasis on setting and writing student learning targets was strengthened in EDUC 4960, Residency – Teaching in the Elementary School, to support candidate learning and help them meet SLO5.
- Moving forward, SLO 5 will be assessed with a PK-12 Student impact assessment to meet CAEP accreditation requirements and align with departmental goals.