

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Middle School Masters of Art in Teaching (MS MAT) (507)

Division: Gallaspy College of Education and Human Development

Department: School of Education

Prepared by: Marty Young

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.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Program Mission Statement. The MAT Middle Level Program faculty provide highly effective coursework, fully online, to meet the needs of candidates who are seeking their initial certification as middle level educators. Program candidates gain the knowledge and skills necessary to implement literacy- and standards-based instructional strategies for increasing student content learning in each candidate's academic area of study; candidates also develop effective management expertise critical to the establishment of responsive student-centered learning environments.

During the course of their program, candidates become reflective educators who also develop the pedagogical skills necessary to differentiate instruction, to meet the widely diverse needs of young adolescent students, to apply assessment data for instructional planning, and to collaborate professionally with their peers and administrators within a school setting. The development of the program and courses is based on standards set by the American Middle Level Education (AMLE), InTasc, and the State of Louisiana. The overarching goal is to educate and credential highly effective teachers for employment in Louisiana schools where they will have positive impact on student learning.

Methodology.

- (1) Program assessment begins as part of the application process for each potential candidate. Entry into the program depends upon passage of, Praxis II, the core knowledge standardized assessment required by the State of Louisiana for each subject area(s) of certification.
- (2) As candidates matriculate through the program, they complete signature assignments for each course; additionally, an end-of-program portfolio is completed to showcase program learning. These assessments are evaluated by program faculty and inform adjustments to courses.
- (3) Upon completion of coursework, candidates complete a two-semester internship during which they are evaluated regularly by faculty supervisors and school administrators for mastered subject area knowledge and for effective application of their teaching and management skills.
- (4) Program faculty and stakeholders regularly review and analyze data on selected assessments. Data analyses guide any needed curricular or program adjustments.

Student Learning Outcomes:

SLO 1.

Course Map: Because this is a gateway assessment, the courses required for the development of a candidate's depth of subject knowledge are completed in previous programs.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge (SPA #1)	To ensure successful student content learning, middle-level teacher candidates demonstrate depth and breadth of subject matter content knowledge in the area(s) in which they plan to certify.

Measure 1.1. (Direct – knowledge)

SLO 1 is assessed through the ***Praxis II: Middle School Content Knowledge Exam*** in one of four core areas of certification (English 5047, Social Studies 5089, Science 5440, or Math 5169), depending on the candidate’s chosen area of certification. Designed by the Education Testing Service (ETS), each examination measures the depth of content knowledge in one of the four core areas for teachers at the middle school level. The quality of these assessments is assured by its recognition by the State of Louisiana as a requirement for the initial credentialing of middle level teachers. The Praxis II is also an acceptable measure of content learning for meeting SPA reporting for the MAT programs. Faculty depend on Praxis II to demonstrate subject area content knowledge. The target is achieved by meeting or exceeding the State of Louisiana’s cut scores.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2019-2020: 100% of candidates met target.
- AC 2018-2019: 100% of candidates met target.
- AC 2017-2018: 100% of candidates met target.

Analysis:

Average Performance Ranges on Praxis II

Subject Areas for Middle School Grades 4-8	NSU Range for Accepted Applicants 2018-2029	NSU Range for Accepted Applicants 2019-2020	#Accepted to NSU to #Applied	National Range 2019-2020
English (State cut score = 164)	170 - 184	180-182	2/14	154 -172
Math (State cut score = 165)	169 - 179	166-183	13/44	157 - 180

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Science (State cut off score = 150)	158 - 174	152-158	3/20	146 - 171
Social Studies (State cut off score = 149)	157 - 175	153-184	4/10	154 - 179

In AC 2018-2019 the target was met. When comparing the data from AC 2018-2019 to the national averages, NSU candidates averaged higher in middle school ELA and Science. Scores in Social Studies and Math were consistent with national averages for middle school applicants.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results, the following change was implemented in AC 2019-2020 to drive improvement and increase numbers of applicants: NSU MAT Middle faculty provided online links to subject area study sessions, and, in some cases advised applicants, who lacked strong knowledge of content, to take content specific refresher courses. These changes had a direct impact on the student's ability to demonstrate discipline-specific content knowledge.

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

Analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data included comparisons between applicant scores in AA 2018- 2019 and the number of candidates who were successful in comparison to applicants who fell short of the cut off. Data indicated that NSU candidates ranged higher in middle school ELA and Math. Scores in Social Studies and Science were consistent with national averages for middle school applicants.

Decision:

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 expand the Praxis II preparatory workshops to include WebEx sessions designed to meet specific subject area requirements for candidates who live at a distance or feel uncomfortable with face-to-face meetings in the current Covid19 crisis.

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.

Course Map:

EDUC 5420 & 5421 Middle School Internship in Teaching – 2 semesters.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice (SPA #2)	Interns pass a teaching evaluation to assess content, pedagogical knowledge, and skills in professional practice

Measure 2.1. (Direct – Knowledge, Skills)

The **Teacher Candidate Observation Form** is based on effective teaching behaviors listed on the Danielson Framework for Teaching instrument. Domains of assessment include (1) planning/preparing lessons to include alignment among standards, activities, and assessments and the implementation of engaging activities through literacy enhancement of the content subject (2) instructing/assessing students to include questioning techniques, differentiating strategies for varied student needs, and establishing an ongoing form of informal assessment on which to base instructional adjustments as well as more formal assessments of subject matter (3) establishing positive classroom environment to include procedures and motivational techniques that support content learning.

University field supervisors and cooperating principals evaluate each criterion using a three-point rating scale with the following options: Ineffective = 1, Effective Emerging = 2, and Emerging Proficient = 3; the scale is based on the Louisiana Compass Teaching Evaluation. Items on the instrument are evaluated 10 times during the two internship semesters (8 times by the university supervisor, and twice by the cooperating principal). Scores are uploaded to TaskStream for each candidate.

Alignment to InTASC standards and content validity are supported by a panel of 11 P-12 clinicians who viewed two 20-minute teaching vignettes and conducted independent evaluations of the teaching performance using this tool. Analyses were conducted using the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

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."

The target for this assessment is for 85% of candidates to meet a 2.5 of 3.0 mean.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2018-2019 (baseline): 100% of interns met target.
- AC 2019-2020: 88% of interns met target.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019 the target was met. The cohort mean for all subject areas was 2.93 on a 3.00 scale (n=19). 100% of candidates in each subject area exceeded the target: ELA candidates (n=8) 2.91; Science candidates (n=5) 2.88; Social Studies candidates (n=3) 2.98; Math candidates (n=3) 2.97. Data showed that candidates scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment. Three candidates received scores of 2 more frequently than others in their cohort in the areas labeled “Makes Instructional Decisions Based on Assessment, Adjusts Lesson when Appropriate, and Uses Formal and Informal Assessment Techniques Effectively.” Another area in which there was a slight dip in scores was “Accommodates Individual Differences.” Scores were consistent in each degree program, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results the following changes were implemented in AC 2019-2020 to drive improvement: Faculty provided annual training for field supervisors for the meaningful evaluation of this somewhat complicated assessment. Supervisors were asked to be more diligent when considering the rubric language and ratings and in giving specific feedback for categories.

These changes had a direct impact on the student’s ability to apply discipline-specific content knowledge in professional practice.

As a result of these changes, in AC 2019-2020 scores were somewhat lower than in previous year; however, the target was met.

Analysis of the AC 2019-2020 data included a composite of the scores in each of the three areas from the Danielson Framework--. Data showed that candidates scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment. Scores were consistent in each degree program, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom.

The cohort mean for all subject areas was 2.523 on a 3.00 scale (n=22). Data showed that interns scored primarily in the Emerging Proficient and Effective Emerging categories, suggesting that they consistently met the expectations set forth in the assessment.

Scores were consistent in each degree program, and data indicated that by the end of their program, candidates were prepared and ready to be effective teachers in the classroom.

The scores ranged from 2.485 to 2.853. Data showed that most interns scored in the two highest categories across all items—Exemplary or Proficient. Areas of excellence included effective communication with students (2.794) and strong content knowledge (2.853). Lower scores were in the areas of using assessment to drive instruction (2.485) and

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

questioning and discussion techniques (2.559). Data collected for EPP purposes likely exceed those relevant for CAEP accreditation.

Decision:

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, field supervisors will list rubric areas in which interns need to refine their practice, targeting each area with specific evidence from the observation. Faculty will focus improvement efforts to be progressive in nature and discussed in each following observation debriefing session.

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.

SLO 3.

Course Map:

EPSY 5490 Educational Psychology Applied to Teaching

EDUC 5840 Research Based Decision-Making in Education

EDUC 5420 & 5421 Middle School Internship in Teaching – 2 semesters

Departmental Student Learning	Program Student Learning Outcome
Model professional behaviors and characteristics (SPA #6)	Middle-level teacher candidates/interns demonstrate the professional dispositions and characteristics of effective educators in their interactions with students, administrators, co-workers, parents, and university faculty throughout the program.

Measure 3.1 (Indirect/Dispositions)

SLO 3 outcomes are assessed using the ***Professional Dispositions and Characteristics (PDC) Likert Scale***, which is scored by university faculty, NSU field supervisors, cooperating principals, and candidates themselves in key courses throughout the program. The criteria checklist was revised in 2016 to better assess strengths and weaknesses of middle school teacher candidates as outlined in the Association for Middle Level Education (AMLE) standards. These revisions have added specificity to the categories, making assessment items more relevant to the MAT MS candidates/interns and the data more valid to faculty in this online program. Interns complete this assessment themselves during EPSY 5490 as a form of self-reflection and to familiarize them with the professional expectations measured on this instrument; it is then completed at least twice by their university field supervisor and twice by their

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

cooperating principals during the yearlong internship. Additionally, instructors of EDUC 5840 complete this assessment on each graduating candidate.

The instrument has 42 items placed within three domains—Professionalism Expected of the Middle Level Educator, Professional Demeanor and Attitudes Expected of a Middle Level Educator, and Communication Acumen and Commitment to Professional Growth Expected of a Middle Level Educator. Faculty created the evaluation based on agreed-upon best practices and constructs outlined in InTASC standards, which underscore its content validity. The likert scale offers 5 categories for scoring each descriptor: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, Strongly Disagree, and N/A (added to facilitate scoring candidates in online programs). The quality of the evidence is further established because faculty 1) aligned items to constructs, 2) avoided bias and ambiguous language 3) stated items in actionable terms.

Target for this assessment was for 90% of candidates to score a 4.00/5.00.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2019-2020: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.
- AC 2018-2019: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.
- AC 2017-2018: 100% of candidates/interns met or exceeded target.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019 the target was met. Compiled assessments in AC 2018-2019 (n=29) had item mean scores falling between 4.76 and 5.00. 100% of the candidate scorings exceeded the target of 4.00. The highest scores were garnered in areas that measured the valuing of diversity and the respect shown to children and adults of various cultural backgrounds. Lower scores were given in the area of analyzing problems and attempting to resolve them independently.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results the following changes were implemented in AC 2019-2020 to drive improvement: A second self-evaluation of the assessment was added at the beginning of EDUC 5421, the second semester of the intern year. Interns discussed the self-assessment with their field supervisor at the first meeting and submitted a plan for improving the areas they recognized as lacking in themselves. The plan was evaluated at the end of the semester after the final scoring of the assessment. 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 (n=8) a small cohort of interns had similar item mean scores falling between 4.500 and 5.000 on the 5-point scale. Interns scored above the target on 40 of 42 category items. Stronger scores of 4.88 or above were garnered in areas that measured the valuing of diversity and the respect shown to children and adults of various cultural backgrounds, seeking clarification and/or assistance as needed, and demonstrating positive interactions with peers, professionals, and other personnel. Lower ratings of 4.50

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

included “uses appropriate tone of voice” and “responds to unforeseen circumstances in an appropriate manner and modifies actions or plans when necessary.” The aggregate score for the 42 items was 4.83/5.00.

Decision:

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, field supervisors will require interns to complete a self-improvement plan, if deemed necessary, based on the intern’s self-scoring of the instrument at the first meeting. Faculty will collaborate with interns to agree upon a plan going forward and monitor individual progress as part of each observation’s debriefing session.

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

SLO 4

Course Map:

EDUC 5611 Instructional Methodology

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)	Middle-level teacher interns create a lesson plan to demonstrate their ability to select/create appropriate instructional practices to deliver/assess the content of their discipline, specifically to engage student learners and increase achievement.

Measure 4.1. (Direct – Knowledge, Skills)

The **Lesson Plan Assessment** addresses the Louisiana State Standards and is aligned to InTASC standards for content validity. The template requires candidates to plan for and explain elements of lessons on which MAT Middle teacher evaluations were based for AY2018-19. Interns were measured on a wide variety of knowledge and skills needed to teach effectively in accordance with the Louisiana Compass rubric, the Louisiana State Standards, and the AMLE; each lesson plan was scored for its application of specific content in an engaging and meaningful design and delivery format. Scores for the lesson planning expertise of interns were entered in the Middle MAT Portfolio on TaskStream under the heading of Aggregate Planning. To establish validity, a panel of 8 EPP faculty each conducted four independent rubric-based evaluations of anonymous lesson plan work samples submitted by candidates in four different initial teacher preparation programs. Analyses were conducted using the

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Lawshe Content Validity Ration (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability.

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

Target for this assessment is that 85% of the candidates score a 3.00/4.00 mean.

Findings: Target was Met

- AC 2019-2020: 88% of interns met target.
- AC 2018-2019 (baseline): 90% of interns met target.

Analysis:

In AC 2018-2019 the target was met. In AC 2018-2019 the MAT Middle mean cohort score was 3.57 on a 4.00 scale. The scores were also collected in the areas of: English (n=12) ranged from 3.00 to 3.92 with a subject mean of 3.62; Math (n=8) ranged from 2.50 to 3.75 with a subject mean of 3.20; Science (n= 3) ranged from 3.33 to 4.00 with a subject mean of 3.76; Social Studies (n=3) ranged from 3.00 to 4.00 with a subject mean of 3.70. Data showed that most candidates scored in the two highest categories across all items—Exemplary or Proficient. Three math candidates were scored on a total of 18 lesson plan submissions; of these plans, 6 were scored below the 3.00 target which accounted for the shortfall. Strengths from this data included literacy and alignment to state standards. Most groups scored a perfect average on these two categories. Weaker categories included technology and reflection on instruction as to how assessment should inform instruction. Technology scores may reflect a lack of technology in the classrooms rather than a lack of planned integration on the part of candidates, particularly in Math..

Based on the analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results the following changes were implemented in AC 2019-2020 to drive improvement: Faculty focused on the two areas in need of improvement: (1) The selection and implementation of technology-based strategies to engage student learning; (2) The selection and implementation of effective assessment as the means to plan next-step student learning. Rationales for both areas were added to the lesson planning process.

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 2019-20 the MAT Middle mean cohort score was 3.467 on a 4.00 scale. Scores ranged from 2.00 to 4.00. Data showed that most candidates scored in the two highest categories across all items—Exemplary or Proficient. Highest scores included the areas of

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

contextual factors & student learning adaptations, evaluation and reflection of instruction, and integration of literacy strategies to support content learning in all subject areas. Weaker scores were noted in the areas of developing higher order thinking, significance of learning objectives, and active inquiry.

Decision:

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, field supervisors will specifically address two areas in need of improvement for identified interns: The development of effective methods of inquiry and how to lead their students to higher order thinking through these questioning techniques. Faculty will place these areas on the remediation plans for interns who are in need of further support.

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.

SLO 5

Course Map:

EDUC 5421 Middle School Internship in Teaching

Departmental Student Learning Goal	Program Student Learning Outcome
Make responsible decisions and problem- solve, using data to inform actions when appropriate (SPA #5)	Middle-level teacher interns demonstrate the ability to select/implement appropriate instructional/assessment practices in an ongoing, data informed process to ensure all students are successful.

Measure 5.1 (Direct – Knowledge, Skills)

Faculty and cooperating teachers worked together in 2016 to create the **Student Learning Impact (SLI)** assessment which closely aligns with the Louisiana Compass teaching performance evaluation, based on InTASC standards, the Louisiana State Standards, and the AMLE standards. The assessment provides scores in 6 basic domains that include 9 sets of criteria, requiring interns to plan and create instruction, administer assessments, and analyze data to interpret rates of student learning. Candidates then reflect on and make instructional decisions/adjustments based on these findings.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

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. The assessment was validated by the Lawshe Content Validity Ratio (CVR) statistic (validity) and the Fisher Intra-class Correlation Coefficient (ICC) for reliability. 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.

Target for this assessment is for 90% of candidates to score a 3.00 or better mean based on a 4.00 scale.

Findings. Target was Met

- AC 2019-2020: 100% of interns exceeded the target.
- AC 2018-2019: 100% of interns exceeded the target.
- AC 2017-2018: 100% of interns exceeded the target.

Analysis:

In 2018-2019 the target was met. In AC 2018-2019 26 candidates completed the MAT Middle Level Student Learning Impact Data. With 6 basic domains and 9 sets of criteria, the overall mean score was 3.63/4.00. The average means by groups were as follows: Setting assessment criteria 3.75; Preparing instructional assignments or activities 3.85; Analysis of formative data 3.54; Student learning targets 3.53; Self-reflection of performance 3.58; Student learning targets based on reflective practice 3.54.

Based on the analysis of the AC 2018-2019 results the following changes were implemented in 2019-2020 to drive improvement: Faculty emphasized data results from lessons and the direct alignment between data and next-step instructional planning to enhance student learning; (2) interns were also required to self-reflect on plan’s effectiveness, when considering outcomes.

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.

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

In AC 2019-2020 six interns were scored on this assessment. The overall mean score was 3.54/4.00 with a range of 3.498-3.75. The average mean by groups were as follows: Setting assessment criteria 3.75; Preparing instructional assignments or activities 3.75; Analysis of formative data 3.50; Student learning targets 3.50; Self-reflection of performance 3.623; Student learning targets based on reflective practice 3.498.

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

Decision:

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 an interactive discussion forum or Zoom to reinforce the ongoing use of formative assessment to drive instructional next steps. Faculty will assign the exploration of meaningful resources prior to the discussion.

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 Improvements Based on Analysis of Results in AC 2018-2019, in 2019-2020 NSU MAT Middle

SLO 1. Faculty provided campus workshops, online links to subject area study sessions, and, in some cases advised applicants, who lacked strong knowledge of content, to take content specific refresher courses.

SLO 2. Annual training for field supervisors was provided by the Field Director for the meaningful evaluation of this somewhat complicated assessment. Supervisors were asked to be more diligent when considering the rubric language and ratings and in giving specific feedback for categories.

SLO 3. Faculty required a second self-evaluation of the assessment at the beginning of EDUC 5421. Interns discussed the self-assessment with their field supervisor at the first meeting of the second semester during the year of internship and submitted a plan for improving the areas they found lacking in themselves during the final semester of the program. The plan was monitored throughout and evaluated at the end of the semester.

SLO 4. Faculty focused on the two areas in need of improvement: (1) The selection and implementation of technology-based strategies to engage student learning; (2) The selection and implementation of effective assessment as the means to plan next-step student learning. Rationales for both areas were added to the lesson planning process.

SLO 5. Faculty emphasized data results from lessons and the direct alignment between data and next-step instructional planning to enhance student learning; (2) Interns were also required to self-reflect on plan's effectiveness, when considering outcomes.

Plan of Action Moving Forward: Based on Analysis of Results in AC 2019-2020

SLO 1. Faculty will expand the Praxis II preparatory workshops to include WebEx sessions designed to meet specific subject area requirements for candidates who live at

Assessment Cycle 2019-2020

a distance or feel uncomfortable with face-to-face meetings in the current Covid19 crisis.

SLO 2. Field supervisors will list rubric areas in which interns need to refine their practice, targeting each area with specific evidence from the observation. Improvement efforts will be noted and discussed in the following observation debriefing session.

SLO 3. Field supervisors will require interns to complete a self-improvement plan, if deemed necessary, based on the intern's self-scoring of the instrument at the first meeting. Agreeing upon a plan going forward and monitoring individual progress will become a part of each observation's debriefing session.

SLO 4. Field supervisors will specifically address two areas in need of improvement: The development of effective methods of inquiry and how to lead students to higher order thinking through these questioning techniques. These areas will be placed on the remediation plans for interns who are in need of further support.

SLO 5. Based on the analysis of the 2019-2020 results the following changes will be made: Faculty will add an interactive discussion forum or Zoom to reinforce the ongoing use of formative assessment to drive instructional next steps. The exploration of meaningful resources will be assigned prior to the discussion.