

Degree/Certificate: Undergraduate BAE programs

Major/Option: Education

Submitted by: Tara Haskins, Chair Department of Education and Jan-Olov Johansson, Director of Assessment CALE

Date: October 7, 2016

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2015-16

Part I – for the 2015-16 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Synthesis Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

Teacher candidates in our undergraduate teacher preparation program will:

- use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs (5A1);
- integrate subjects across content areas (5A2);
- use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction (5A3);
- create a safe, productive learning environment (5A4);
- plan and/or adapt curricula for diverse student needs (5A5);
- ensure that students can articulate learning targets and can monitor their own progress toward those targets (5A6);
- plan Standards-driven curricula to develop student capacity for problem-solving strategies in content areas (5A7);
- prepare responsible citizens for a diverse society (5A8);
- ensure cultural competence in teaching (5A9);
- integrate technology into their classroom and/or planning (5A10);
- involve and collaborate with student families and community (5A11);
- utilize feedback and reflection to improve teaching practice (5B1);
- collaborate in and contribute to school improvement (5C1);
- demonstrate knowledge of responsibilities and policies related to the teaching profession (5C2).

Our alignment of the Teacher Preparation Program SLOs with Washington Standard 5 for Teachers and Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) is outlined below. This alignment has been updated with the proposed TPEP, edTPA and Standard V alignment provided by PESB and part of the larger P-12 and Teacher Preparation alignment efforts. An alignment chart was provided in our last SLO report, but has in this report been updated with the new proposed alignment. Note, ONLY standards and rubrics discussed in this report are included. The table below outlines this alignment in a two column format where the left column

presents our SLOs and Standard 5 criteria and the right column presents the corresponding edTPA rubric(s). edTPA rubrics in red are currently used by the department in an in-depth analysis and discussion (Task 3, Rubrics 10, 13 & 14) while edTPA rubrics in black are used in a summative analysis and discussion.

Table 1: SLOs, Standard 5 and edTPA Alignment

| SLOs & Standard 5 (WAC 181-78A-270(1)) | edTPA Washington rubric |
|---|---|
| A. Effective teaching | Elem math rubrics are used as examples! |
| (1) Using multiple instructional strategies, including the principles of second language acquisition, to address student academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds. TPEP Criterion 2: Demonstrating effective teaching practices. | EM10: How does the candidate use knowledge of students' language development to identify a key language demand central to content learning? EM11: How does the candidate support academic language development associated with content learning? EM12: How does the candidate reveal students' understanding and use of academic language associated with content learning? |
| (2) Applying principles of differentiated instruction, including theories of language acquisition, stages of language, and academic language development, in the integration of subject matter across the content areas of reading, mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning. (5) Planning and/or adapting standards-based curricula that are personalized to the diverse needs of each student reasoning. TPEP Criterion 3: Recognizing individual student learning needs and developing strategies to address those needs. | EM10: How does the candidate use knowledge of students' language development to identify a key language demand central to content learning? EM11: How does the candidate support academic language development associated with content learning? EM12: How does the candidate reveal students' understanding and use of academic language associated with content learning? EM2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students' development of conceptual understanding, computational/procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills? |
| (3) Using standards-based assessment that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies to monitor and improve instruction. TPEP Criterion 6: Using multiple student data elements to modify instruction and improve student learning. | EM3: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to provide evidence of student progress toward the standards/learning targets? EM6: How does the candidate demonstrate an understanding of student performance with respect to standards/learning targets? EM8: How does the candidate use conclusions about what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction? EM7: How does the candidate provide students feedback to guide their further learning? EM9: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet the varied learning needs? |
| (6) Aligning instruction to the learning standards and outcomes so all students know the learning | EM13: How does the candidate focus student attention on the learning targets? |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>targets and their progress toward meeting them.</p> <p>(7) Implementing classroom/school centered instruction, including sheltered instruction that is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, and includes knowledge and skills for working with others.</p> <p>TPEP Criterion 4: Providing clear and intentional focus on subject matter content and curriculum.</p> | <p>EM14: How does the candidate support students to access resources for learning and to monitor their own learning progress?</p> <p>EM15: How does the candidate use student-voice evidence to identify instructional improvements?</p> <p>EM4: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understandings of mathematical concepts?</p> |
| <p>B. Professional development</p> | |
| <p>(1) Developing reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practices through regularly evaluating the effects of his/her teaching through feedback and reflection.</p> <p>TPEP Criterion 8: Exhibiting collaborative and collegial practices focused on improving instructional practice and student learning.</p> | <p>EM8: How does the candidate use conclusions about what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction</p> <p>EM9: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet the varied learning needs?</p> |

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

_____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

 X SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

_____ SLO is met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

In Jan. 2014 the edTPA became consequential for all teacher preparation programs in the State of Washington after extensive field work and testing (see information provided in the part II of this report). Our department developed an edTPA assessment plan, strategy and evaluation tool. These functions were outlined in our previous SLO report. Our edTPA assessment and evaluation methods include:

- a. organization of edTPA data,
- b. alignment of rubric scores with SLOs and Standard 5 measures,
- c. creation of average rubric scores,
- d. distribution counts and percentages across each rubric scale (1-5),
- e. summative as well as informative statistics, and .
- f. individual and/or group analysis.

PESB has announced that WA edTPA cut score will change from 35 to 40 starting the 2017-2018 school year. This change can dramatically impact our results if we are not prepared. We

started the conversation last year regarding changes to the WA edTPA cut score and the potential impact on our teacher preparation program (i.e., our pass rate, remediation process, resources, student support and an additional course). We will continue this work 2016-2017 and it will be an ongoing topic of our faculty meetings and work conducted by the department's assessment committee.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
 - a. Data included in the edTPA summary table are “consequential” edTPA “undergraduate” teacher candidate data from 2015-2016, 2014-2015 and 2014.
 - i. Current result shows that our “overall” pass rate is **97.6 percent** (445/456) to date (2014-2016) for **undergraduate teacher candidates** with a WA cut score of 35. In 2015-2016, 181/184 (98.4percent) teacher candidates passed the edTPA compared to 146/151 (96.7 percent) in 2014-2015. A few of our students have yet to retake the edTPA. According to current state policy they have up to 18 months to retake the test.
 - ii. In 2015-2016, the average total Rubric Score for Rubrics 1-15 was 45.6 (out of 75) compared to 44.5 (out of 75) compared 2014-2015 and 45.9 (out of 75) in 2014. (passed tests only)
 - iii. In 2015-2016, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.2) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.0) and Task 3: Assessment (3.0). In 2014-2015, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.1) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (2.9) and Task 3: Assessment (2.9). In 2014, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.2) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.0) and Task 3: Assessment (3.0). (passed tests only)
 - iv. In 2015-2016, average scores for Rubrics 1-5 and 11-12 at 3.13-3.19 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 9, 10, and 13 at 2.81-2.89 were lower. In 2014-2015, average scores for Rubrics 1, 2, 4, and 12 at 3.12-3.18 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 9, 10, 13 and 14 at 2.65-2.88 were lower. In 2014, average scores for Rubrics 1, 2, 4, 5, and 12 at 3.19-3.29 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 13 and 14 at 2.70-2.72 were lower. (passed tests only)
5. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

a. Findings:

In 2015-2016, passed test results suggested that 10 out of 15 rubrics have average scores above 3.0 or at or above Level 3 compared to nine out of 15 rubrics in 2014-2015 (compared to 12 in 2014). A rubric score of 3 or above (Level 3) can be interpreted as a “proficient” score or a score that indicates candidates’ “knowledge and skill level **demonstrating a readiness to teach,**” according to edTPA rubric information. In Table 2, this “proficient” score is displayed by a “blue” font color. An orange font color suggests a score indicating candidates’ “knowledge and skill level demonstrating a **possible readiness to teach**” among teacher candidates, while a red font color suggests a score indicating “knowledge and skill level of teacher candidates who are **not ready to teach.**” In addition, displaying results by “passed” and “failed” tests (columns) allow us to assess difference in strengths and weaknesses of candidates who pass and fail or score lower than their peers the edTPA. Finally, our analysis tool allows us to make additional queries, such as by test (content area), by quarter or year, and by program (EDUC or MIT).

Table 2: edTPA Data (2015-2016 & 2014-2015)

| Values | Column Labels | | | | Grand Total |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | | |
| | Fail | Pass | Fail | Pass | |
| Count of Candidates | 10 | 162 | 9 | 164 | 345 |
| Percent (Candidates) | 3% | 47% | 3% | 48% | 100% |
| Count of Test | 10 | 162 | 9 | 164 | 345 |
| Percent (Tests) | 3% | 47% | 3% | 48% | 100% |
| Average of Total Rubrics 1-15 | 28.3 | 44.8 | 28.6 | 45.7 | 44.3 |
| Average of Planning - Task Average | 2.32 | 3.12 | 2.32 | 3.16 | 3.10 |
| Average of Planning - Score 1: Planning for subject-specific understanding | 2.39 | 3.18 | 2.44 | 3.19 | 3.14 |
| Average of Planning - Score 2: Planning to support varied student learning needs | 2.39 | 3.13 | 2.33 | 3.15 | 3.10 |
| Average of Planning - Score 3: Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning | 2.28 | 3.06 | 2.33 | 3.21 | 3.10 |
| Average of Planning - Score 4: Identifying and supporting language demands | 2.31 | 3.13 | 2.60 | 3.11 | 3.09 |
| Average of Planning - Score 5: Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning | 2.22 | 3.10 | 2.11 | 3.15 | 3.08 |
| Average of Instruction - Task Average | 2.22 | 2.95 | 2.13 | 2.97 | 2.92 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 6: Learning environment | 2.67 | 3.11 | 2.88 | 3.11 | 3.09 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 7: Engaging students in learning | 2.33 | 3.01 | 2.13 | 3.00 | 2.97 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 8: Deepening student learning | 2.17 | 2.92 | 2.13 | 2.98 | 2.91 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - Using representations | 2.00 | 2.39 | 1.63 | 2.92 | 2.85 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness | 2.05 | 2.81 | 2.00 | 2.84 | 2.78 |
| Average of Assessment, Academic Language, Analyzing Teaching - Task Average | 1.86 | 2.93 | 2.16 | 3.03 | 2.93 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 11: Analysis of student learning | 1.86 | 3.11 | 2.14 | 3.18 | 3.10 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 12: Providing feedback to guide learning | 2.98 | 3.17 | 2.98 | 3.20 | 3.15 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 13: Student use of feedback | 1.56 | 2.68 | 1.86 | 2.84 | 2.71 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 14: Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning | 1.78 | 2.82 | 2.25 | 2.93 | 2.83 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 15: Using assessment to inform instruction | 1.72 | 2.39 | 2.13 | 3.01 | 2.90 |
| Average of Average Rubrics 16-18 Student Voice | 1.80 | 2.85 | 2.11 | 2.87 | 2.81 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 16: Eliciting student understanding of learning targets | 1.80 | 3.03 | 2.33 | 3.05 | 2.98 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 17: Supporting student use of resources to learn and monitor their own progress | 1.95 | 2.79 | 2.11 | 2.85 | 2.77 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 18: Reflecting on student voice evidence to improve instruction | 1.65 | 2.72 | 1.89 | 2.72 | 2.67 |
| Level 1: Represents the knowledge and skills of a struggling candidate who is not ready to teach. | Less than 1.99 (average) | | | | |
| Level 2: Represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is possibly ready to teach. | Between 2.0 and 2.99 (average) | | | | |
| Level 3 and higher: Represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is ready to teach. | 3.0 or higher (average) | | | | |

Note: Each edTPA rubric is composed of a scale from 1 – 5.

Based on our discussion and analysis of past results, the EDUC department focused their work and attention on **Task 3: Assessment, Academic Language, and Analyzing Teaching, specifically Rubric 13 – Students use of feedback & Rubric 14- Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning.** Results from 2014-2015 edTPA suggested that we need to look at **Task 2 Instruction - Rubric 10: Analyzing teaching**

effectiveness and recent results from 2015-2016 suggested that **Task 2 Instruction – Rubric 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - using representations** may be of importance, especially as we query and analyze results across content areas. Rubric 9 2015-2016 examples:

- Seven content area tests had an average score below 3.0
- Seven content area tests had an average score above 3.0
- Two content area tests had an average score above 3.1
- Five content area tests had an average score below 2.8
- Two content area tests had an average score below 1.8

| Rubric 9 | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Column Labels | | | |
| | | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % | |
| 1 | | 6 | 4% | 10 | 6% |
| 2 | | 35 | 20% | 24 | 14% |
| 2.5 | | 8 | 5% | 9 | 5% |
| 3 | | 97 | 57% | 103 | 60% |
| 3.5 | | 4 | 2% | 4 | 2% |
| 4 | | 19 | 11% | 22 | 13% |
| 4.5 | | 1 | 1% | | 0% |
| 5 | | 1 | 1% | | 0% |
| Grand Total | | 171 | 100% | 172 | 100% |

In 2015-2016, an analysis of the distribution of scores by identified rubric:

- **Rubric 9** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (60 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 19 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 62 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 13 percent of all scores.
- **Rubric 10** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (59 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 28 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 60 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 10 percent of all scores.
- **Rubric 13** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (58 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 23 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 62 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 15 percent of all scores.
- **Rubric 14** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (59 percent). Scores

| Rubric 10 | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Column Labels | | | |
| | | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % | |
| 1 | | | 0% | 2 | 1% |
| 1.5 | | | 0% | 1 | 1% |
| 2 | | 55 | 32% | 44 | 25% |
| 2.5 | | 9 | 5% | 6 | 3% |
| 3 | | 88 | 51% | 102 | 59% |
| 3.5 | | 3 | 2% | 1 | 1% |
| 4 | | 16 | 9% | 17 | 10% |
| 5 | | 1 | 1% | | 0% |
| Grand Total | | 172 | 100% | 173 | 100% |

| Rubric 13 | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Column Labels | | | |
| | | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % | |
| 1 | | 4 | 1% | 3 | 1% |
| 1.5 | | 1 | 0% | | 0% |
| 2 | | 60 | 27% | 46 | 19% |
| 2.5 | | 11 | 6% | 7 | 4% |
| 3 | | 85 | 57% | 92 | 58% |
| 3.5 | | 1 | 1% | 5 | 4% |
| 4 | | 9 | 8% | 18 | 15% |
| Grand Total | | 171 | 100% | 171 | 100% |

| Rubric 14 | | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|---------------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| | | Column Labels | | | |
| | | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % | |
| 1 | | 4 | 2% | 2 | 1% |
| 2 | | 40 | 24% | 33 | 20% |
| 2.5 | | 8 | 5% | 7 | 4% |
| 3 | | 99 | 60% | 96 | 59% |
| 3.5 | | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% |
| 4 | | 12 | 7% | 25 | 15% |
| Grand Total | | 164 | 100% | 164 | 100% |

between 2-2.5 accounted for 24 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 60 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 15 percent of all scores.

Interpretation of Rubric 9, 10, 13 & 14 distribution scores 2015-2016 suggested that about 74 percent (an improvement from 2014-2015) of our undergraduate teacher candidates demonstrated a level of “proficiency” (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA, while about 26 percent struggled in providing such evidence. In 2014-2015, about 69 percent of our undergraduate teacher candidates demonstrated a level of “proficiency” (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA, while about 31 percent struggled in providing such evidence.

There is a significant improvement in teacher candidates demonstrating a level of “proficiency” (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA of 11 percent from 63 in 2014 to 74 percent in 2015-2016!

In 2015-2016, scores of 2.5 or lower (Level 2 or lower) suggested that 26 percent of our undergraduate teacher candidates provided “vague” or “poor quality” in their explanations or explanations without evidence OR they provided “descriptions” without or with limited evidence for Rubric 9, 10, 13, and 14 compared to 31 percent in 2014-2015 and 37 percent in 2014.

We will continue using examples from the edTPA Handbooks for Rubrics 9, 10, 13 and 14 to provide feedback to students and faculty.

Overall, we believe that Rubrics 9, 10, 13 & 14 provide “**good examples**” of performance measures that can be aligned with for our identified SLOs. However, using the NEW alignment chart and evaluating how we use each rubric as a measure for our SLO’s suggests improvements over the OLDER alignment chart. In addition, the NEW alignment chart includes TPEP Criteria, measures and indicators which provides a wealth of descriptive examples of what our teacher candidates need to demonstrate.

We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is **98 percent**, undergraduate teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 9, 10, 13 & 14 were not as strong when we looked at the distribution of scores across the rubric scale and when we compared results across content areas.

We have improved how we can help our undergraduate teacher candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as provide them with “good” concrete examples of evidence that will guide their edTPA preparation while in our program. This has been a

component of our program approval process and the EDUC department's assessments and evaluation efforts.

6. What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

Our work over the last two years has been in conjunction with our state program approval process. Related to this work, we developed our curriculum scope and sequence as well as implementation of tools to assess undergraduate teacher candidates' progress and achievements over the course of the program. This work has been important because of multiple new faculty members responsible for core courses across our programs.

Presented below are continued examples of how the department has implemented their strategies related to SLO 1, 2 & 3 in 2014-2016. Some revisions were completed to this plan during a faculty workshop in September 2015 and through the CALE/EWU assessment process started in late October 2015. Additional work was completed 2015-2016 to complete our final one-year follow-up program approval report due in May 2016. We recognize that this work is an on-going process and may take 2-3 years until we see significant changes in our teacher candidates' performance.

SLO #1: Teacher candidates will use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs. (Standard 5.1 & edTPA Rubrics 10, 11 & 12)

We continued our work on developing our course syllabi, alignment with WA standards, key assessments and supporting new faculty:

Beginning Application Courses (EDUC 310 for elementary; 413 for Secondary BAE, and EDUC 457 for P-3) where our teacher candidates receive specific instruction on "differentiating instruction." In EDUC 310 Literacy Methods, candidates write a long range reading plan that must include consideration about language acquisition and language development. In EDUC 413 Secondary Content Area Reading, Management, and Assessment, students are taught how to integrate reading, writing, and communication with secondary content areas. In EDUC 457 Collaborative Reflective Teaching in ECE, candidates write lesson plans that include language development in all content areas.

Practice Content/Skill Courses (EDUC 338, EDUC 339, EDUC 341, and EDUC 547) where candidates continue to hone their ability to differentiate instruction and integrate subject matter by writing and teaching lesson plans that include multiple strategies for integration and language acquisition. In EDUC 339, which is an elementary science/social studies methods course, candidates are required to write a unit plan that integrates science and social studies with other content areas. In addition to integration, candidates must address how they will differentiate each lesson plan.

Because the department has implemented a standard lesson plan template, all candidates address differentiated instruction in every lesson plan they write.

SLO #2: Teacher candidates will integrate subjects across content areas. (Standard 5.2 & edTPA Rubrics 2, 10, 11 & 12)

We continued our work on developing our course syllabi, alignment with WA standards, key assessments and supporting new faculty:

In EDUC 303, candidates learn about and begin to apply principles of “differentiated instruction.” For example one assignment allows candidates the opportunity to create a lesson plan at multiple levels of complexity. The level of complexity each student receives is differentiated based on that student's current skills. Candidates' lessons may have as few as two tiers or as many as five based on the learning needs of their students.

We introduce candidates to various approaches of “differentiation,” including Marzano's research-based high yield strategies (TPEP). Students use this information to develop a lesson plan based on the context of the classroom in which they are placed. The lesson plan must address how they achieve differentiation based on individual student needs.

Beginning Application Courses (EDUC 310 for elementary; 413 for secondary BAE, and EDUC 457 for P-3) where candidates receive specific instruction on differentiating instruction (Conceptual Framework, CF1). In EDUC 310 Literacy Methods, candidates write a long range reading plan that must include consideration about language acquisition and language development. In EDUC 413 Secondary Content Area Reading, Management, and Assessment, students are taught how to integrate reading, writing, and communication with secondary content areas. In EDUC 457 Collaborative Reflective Teaching in ECE, candidates write lesson plans that include language development in all content areas.

Practice Content/Skill courses (EDUC 338, EDUC 339, and EDUC 341) where candidates continue to hone their ability to differentiate instruction and integrate subject matter by writing and teaching lesson plans that include multiple strategies for integration and language acquisition (Conceptual Framework, CF1). In EDUC 339, which is an elementary science/social studies methods course, candidates are required to write a Unit Plan that integrates science and social studies with other content areas. In addition to integration, candidates must address how they will differentiate each lesson plan.

SLO #3: Teacher candidates will use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction. (Standard 5.4 and 5.6 & edTPA Rubrics 4, 13, 14, & 15)

We continued our work on developing our course syllabi, alignment with WA standards, key assessments and supporting new faculty:

In our foundations courses candidates are introduced to the use of standards-based assessments as tools to monitor student learning, help students develop skills for independent self-assessment, and improve candidate instruction. For example, in EDUC 303 Foundations of Assessment, instructors discuss Lee Shulman's concept of "A Union of Insufficiencies" which helps candidates understand that having multiple modes of assessment is crucial to accurately measuring student mastery. Another topic addresses how candidates can ensure that the assessments they design are linked with instructional objectives and lesson tasks. Candidate success is measured by creating a lesson plan which includes, objectives, tasks, and assessments that reinforce one another as well as self-assessment.

We continued our work and alignment, in EDUC 493 Integrated Early Childhood Practices, candidates learn the processes of planning, implementing, and assessing, using authentic assessment strategies to gauge learning outcomes. The culminating assignment is a portfolio with a section devoted to assessment, including self-assessment.

In EDUC 500, candidates continue to learn about assessment needs, types, and processes and do a group presentation on what they have learned (self-assessment). A summative exam at the end of the quarter tests candidates' overall knowledge regarding assessment.

In EDUC 310 and 413, candidates learn about assessments and how to modify instruction based on the data. They also begin working with students in their field placement school, during which time they write and teach four (4) lesson plans, a section of which is devoted to strategies for the use of formative and summative assessments. In the candidate/supervisor post-conference, candidates reflect on

whole-class and individual student patterns identified by their assessments. They also discuss what the assessments tell them about their own teaching and how to use the data to drive future instruction.

Candidates in EDUC 338, 339 and 341 continue to learn about, practice, and reflect upon their use of assessment. Candidates continue working in their field placement school, creating and teaching at least eight (8) lessons. They also continue to meet with their supervisors for post-lesson reflection and self-assessment conferences.

BAE candidates in EDUC 420 complete a portfolio as their culminating assignment and include an artifact that shows how they have met Standard 5.A.4 and 5.A.6. During student teaching, conversations with Mentor Teachers and Supervisors increasingly focus on the use of multiple assessments, including self-assessment, and the need to use the data gathered to adjust current instruction and plan for future lessons.

During student teaching, candidates complete the edTPA. This allows them to demonstrate their skill and capacity to assess students' learning by collecting, analyzing and reflecting on evidence of student learning.

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

According to our department assessment plan adopted in 2013-2014 (revised 2014-2015) we assess progress on implementation and program changes each quarter, we are planning an annual evaluation to be conducted during each Summer and presented at our faculty retreat as part of our program approval process and in the process utilize data from the edTPA assessment and other measures identified above. We continue on much of the work that was planned, initiated and started during 2013-2014, especially, work related to and results of our program approval process.

Table 6: Results of SLOs, edTPA and edTPA Rubric Scale

| Quarter By the end of ... | SLOs and edTPA | Curriculum Scope and Sequence | Teacher Candidate Support |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| Fall 2015 | Continued analysis with additional rubrics. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 10, 13 & 14. | Identify “key” assessment in Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (Science, Math, Music) Part of the program approval | Utility of edTPA Handbooks. Discussion and implementation of use by faculty to target Rubrics 10, 13 & 14. Continued teacher candidate edTPA |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| | | process and recent CALE/EWU assessment process. | support (preparation, individual and group). |
| Winter 2016 | Continued analysis and alignment with other data – Lesson Observation Tool. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 10, 13 & 14. | Provide “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (English and other content areas) Part of the program approval process and recent CALE/EWU assessment process. | Faculty use examples of Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 and utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support. |
| Spring 2016 | Continued analysis and alignment with other data – PVA & Mid-Term & Final Evaluation Tool Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 10, 13 & 14. | Alignment “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses with edTPA and other evaluation tools. Cross-campus edTPA report. Part of the program approval process and recent CALE/EWU assessment process. | Faculty use examples for other Rubrics utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support. |
| Fall 2016 | Evaluation of 2015-2016 edTPA data, analysis and implementation – What have we learned? Update new edTPA coordinator. Reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty retreat Sept., 2016. • Cross-Campus meeting Sept., 2016. • Assessment Committee meeting Oct. 19, 2016. • Discuss potential impact of WA edTPA cut score change. | Evaluation of alignment and “key” course assessments/SLOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty alignment meeting Oct. 2016. • Incorporate feedback from cross-campus efforts • Incorporate Assessment Committee input and recommendations. • Provide updated edTPA handbooks and resources. | Evaluation of support examples and teacher candidate edTPA support. Implement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement student support/course. • Implement supervisor edTPA support strategies. • Improve CART process for candidates who failed edTPA. • Support faculty with resources. • Support cross-campus faculty with resources. |
| Winter & Spring 2017 | Continued edTPA analysis and implementation of support/resources. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty meeting. • Cross-Campus meeting. • Assessment Committee meeting. • Continued discussion of | Continued work on alignment and “key” course assessments/SLOs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty alignment work. • Cross-campus feedback. • Continued Assessment Committee input and recommendations. • Ensure all edTPA | Continued evaluation of support examples and teacher candidate edTPA support. Continued implementation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued student support/course. • Assess supervisor |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | potential impact of WA edTPA cut score change. | handbooks and resources have been distributed. | edTPA support strategies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess CART process for candidates who failed edTPA. • Continued support faculty with resources. • Continued support cross-campus faculty with resources. |
|--|--|--|---|

7. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

Results from Rubrics 9, 10, 13 & 14 provided “**good example**” of using edTPA data as performance measures for our identified SLOs. We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 98 percent, teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 9, 10, 13 & 14 can be improved by helping our candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as guide their edTPA preparation with concrete examples of quality evidence. Teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 9, 10, 13 & 14 can also be improved by allowing and supporting faculty to identify information, develop knowledge and improve their instruction in their courses as it related to these rubrics.

We improved upon our alignment through a collaborative process as part of our program approval process, CALE/EWU assessment efforts and our ongoing evaluation and analysis of data related teacher candidates experience and performance in our courses, field experiences and “student-centered” learning opportunities described in this report. We implemented strategies in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 that has and provided faculty with more edTPA information and support and “pedagogy” evidence in their support of our teacher candidate support. We will continue this work in 2016-2017. Our process and analysis has helped us identify what is needed in utilizing edTPA data for program improvement, candidate support and reporting, and we will continue our focus on how we can improve our process, cross-campus collaboration, analysis and reporting utilizing edTPA data.

Finally, we will ensure that all our edTPA communication, practices and collaboration are in place as WA PESB will increase the edTPA cut score 40 starting 2017-2018.

Degree/Certificate: MIT

Major/Option: Education

Submitted by: Tara Haskins, Chair Department of Education and Jan-Olov Johansson, Director of Assessment CALE

Date: October 7, 2016

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2015-16

Part I – for the 2015-16 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Synthesis Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

Teacher candidates in our undergraduate teacher preparation program will:

- use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs (5A1);
- integrate subjects across content areas (5A2);
- use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction (5A3);
- create a safe, productive learning environment (5A4);
- plan and/or adapt curricula for diverse student needs (5A5);
- ensure that students can articulate learning targets and can monitor their own progress toward those targets (5A6);
- plan Standards-driven curricula to develop student capacity for problem-solving strategies in content areas (5A7);
- prepare responsible citizens for a diverse society (5A8);
- ensure cultural competence in teaching (5A9);
- integrate technology into their classroom and/or planning (5A10);
- involve and collaborate with student families and community (5A11);
- utilize feedback and reflection to improve teaching practice (5B1);
- collaborate in and contribute to school improvement (5C1);
- demonstrate knowledge of responsibilities and policies related to the teaching profession (5C2).

Our alignment of the MIT Program SLOs with Washington Standard 5 for Teachers and Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) are presented in the undergraduate BAE program report p.2 of this document.

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

- _____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;
- X SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;
- _____ SLO is met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

In Jan. 2014 the edTPA became consequential for all teacher preparation programs in the State of Washington after extensive field work and testing (see information provided in the part II of this report). Our department developed an edTPA assessment plan, strategy and evaluation tool. These functions were outlined in our previous SLO report. Our edTPA assessment and evaluation methods include:

- a. organization of edTPA data,
- b. alignment of rubric scores with SLOs and Standard 5 measures,
- c. creation of average rubric scores,
- d. distribution counts and percentages across each rubric scale (1-5),
- e. summative as well as informative statistics, and .
- f. individual and/or group analysis.

PESB has announced that WA edTPA cut score will change from 35 to 40 starting the 2017-2018 school year. This change can dramatically impact our results if we are not prepared. We started the conversation last year regarding changes to the WA edTPA cut score and the potential impact on our teacher preparation program (i.e. our pass rate, remediation process, resources, student support and an additional course). We will continue this work 2016-2017 and it will be an ongoing topic of our faculty meetings and work conducted by the department's assessment committee.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
- a. Data included in the edTPA summary table are “consequential” edTPA “MIT” teacher candidate data from 2014 and 2014-2015.
 - i. Results show that our overall pass rate is 100 percent (52/52) to date for MIT teacher candidates with a WA cut score of 35. In 2015-2016, 17/17 (100 percent) and in 2014-2015, 16/16 (100 percent) MIT teacher candidates passed the edTPA.

- ii. In 2015-2016, the average total rubric Score for Rubrics 1-15 was 47.3 compared to 47.0 in 2014-2015 and 47.8 in 2014.
 - iii. In 2015-2016, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.3) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.2) and Task 3: Assessment (3.0). In 2014-2015, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.2) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.0) and Task 3: Assessment (3.1). In 2014, average Task scores for Task 1: Planning (3.4) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.2) and Task 3: Assessment (3.3) (passed tests). Comparing 2015-2016, 2014-2015 with 2014 suggests that average Task scores are consistent between 3.0-3.4.
 - iv. In 2015-2016, average scores for Rubrics 1, 3, 4, 5, and 8 at 3.32-3.41 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 10, 13 and 14 at 2.76-2.88 were lower. In 2014-2015, average scores for Rubrics 11 and 12 at 3.34-3.47 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 10, 13 and 14 at 2.84 were lower. In 2014, average scores for Rubrics 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11 and 12 at 3.32-3.47 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 10 and 13 at 2.84-2.94 were lower.
5. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.

Findings:

In 2015-2016, passed test results suggested that 12 out of 15 rubrics have average scores above 3.0 or at or above Level 3 compared to 12 out of 15 rubrics in 2014-2015 (compared to 12 in 2014). A rubric score of 3 or above (Level 3) can be interpreted as a “proficient” score or a score that indicates candidates’ “knowledge and skill level **demonstrating a readiness to teach,**” according to edTPA rubric information. In Table 2, this “proficient” score is displayed by a “blue” font color. An orange font color suggests a score indicating candidates’ “knowledge and skill level demonstrating a **possible readiness to teach**” among teacher candidates, while a red font color suggests a score indicating “knowledge and skill level of teacher candidates who are **not ready to teach.**” In addition, displaying results by “passed” and “failed” tests (columns) allow us to assess difference in strengths and weaknesses of candidates who pass and fail or score lower than their peers the edTPA. Finally, our analysis tool allows us to make additional queries, such as by test (content area), by quarter or year, and by program (EDUC or MIT).

Table 2: edTPA Data (2015-2016 & 2014-2015)

| Values | Column Labels | | Grand Total |
|--|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | |
| | Pass | Pass | |
| Count of Candidates | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| Percent (Candidates) | 50% | 50% | 100% |
| Count of Test | 16 | 16 | 32 |
| Percent (Tests) | 50% | 50% | 100% |
| Average of Total Rubrics 1-15 | 46.2 | 47.7 | 46.9 |
| Average of Planning - Task Average | 3.21 | 3.30 | 3.26 |
| Average of Planning - Score 1: Planning for subject-specific understanding | 3.25 | 3.44 | 3.34 |
| Average of Planning - Score 2: Planning to support varied student learning needs | 3.25 | 3.28 | 3.27 |
| Average of Planning - Score 3: Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning | 3.22 | 3.31 | 3.27 |
| Average of Planning - Score 4: Identifying and supporting language demands | 3.10 | 3.10 | 3.10 |
| Average of Planning - Score 5: Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning | 3.22 | 3.38 | 3.30 |
| Average of Instruction - Task Average | 3.01 | 3.21 | 3.11 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 6: Learning environment | 3.16 | 3.25 | 3.20 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 7: Engaging students in learning | 3.00 | 3.25 | 3.13 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 8: Deepening student learning | 3.03 | 3.44 | 3.23 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - Using representations | 3.00 | 3.22 | 3.11 |
| Average of Instruction - Score 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness | 2.84 | 2.91 | 2.88 |
| Average of Assessment, Academic Language, Analyzing Teaching - Task Average | 3.10 | 3.08 | 3.09 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 11: Analysis of student learning | 3.41 | 3.31 | 3.36 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 12: Providing feedback to guide learning | 3.28 | 3.22 | 3.25 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 13: Student use of feedback | 2.84 | 2.81 | 2.83 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 14: Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning | 2.83 | 2.87 | 2.85 |
| Average of Assessment - Score 15: Using assessment to inform instruction | 3.16 | 3.25 | 3.20 |
| Average of Average Rubrics 16-18 Student Voice | 3.17 | 2.85 | 3.01 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 16: Eliciting student understanding of learning targets | 3.47 | 3.09 | 3.28 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 17: Supporting student use of resources to learn and monitor their own progress | 2.83 | 2.91 | 2.87 |
| Average of Student Voice - Score 18: Reflecting on student voice evidence to improve instruction | 3.07 | 2.56 | 2.81 |
| Level 1: Represents the knowledge and skills of a struggling candidate who is not ready to teach. | Less than 1.99 (average) | | |
| Level 2: Represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is possibly ready to teach. | Between 2.0 and 2.99 (average) | | |
| Level 3 and higher: Represents the knowledge and skills of a candidate who is ready to teach. | 3.0 or higher (average) | | |

Note: Each edTPA rubric is composed of a scale from 1 – 5.

Based on our analysis and discussion of our results, the department and the MIT Program has focused their work and attention on Task 3: Assessment, Academic Language, and Analyzing Teaching, specifically Rubric 13 – Students use of feedback & Rubric 14- Analyzing students’ language use and subject-specific learning. Recent 2014-2015 edTPA results suggest that we need to look at Task 2 Instruction - Rubric 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness.

In 2015-2016, an analysis of the distribution of:

- Rubric 10** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3’s (63 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 25 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 63 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 13 percent of all scores.

| Row Labels | Column Labels | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---|
| | 2014-2015 | | 2015-2016 | |
| | Count | % | Count | % |
| 2 | | 3 19% | 3 19% | |
| 2.5 | | 1 6% | 1 6% | |
| 3 | | 11 69% | 10 63% | |
| 4 | | 1 6% | 2 13% | |
| Grand Total | | 16 100% | 16 100% | |

- **Rubric 13** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (40 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 24 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 48 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 27 percent of all scores.

| Rubric 13 | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Column Labels | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % |
| 1 | | 0% | 1 | 2% |
| 2 | 4 | 18% | 4 | 18% |
| 2.5 | 1 | 5% | 1 | 6% |
| 3 | 9 | 59% | 6 | 40% |
| 3.5 | | 0% | 1 | 8% |
| 4 | 2 | 18% | 3 | 27% |
| Grand Total | 16 | 100% | 16 | 100% |

- **Rubric 14** scores in 2015-2016, across the rubric scale 1-5, were mostly 3's (53 percent). Scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 33 percent, scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 53 percent, and scores between 4-5 accounted for 13 percent of all scores.

| Rubric 14 | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| Column Labels | | | | |
| 2014-2015 | | | 2015-2016 | |
| Row Labels | Count | % | Count | % |
| 2 | 4 | 27% | 3 | 20% |
| 2.5 | 1 | 7% | 2 | 13% |
| 3 | 8 | 53% | 8 | 53% |
| 4 | 2 | 13% | 2 | 13% |
| Grand Total | 15 | 100% | 15 | 100% |

Interpretation of Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 distribution scores 2014-2016 suggested that between 66-77 percent of our MIT teacher candidates demonstrated a level of “proficiency” (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA, while between 23-34 percent struggled in providing such evidence.

Scores of 2.5 or lower (Level 2 or lower) suggested that our MIT teacher candidates provided “vague” or “poor quality” in their explanations or explanations without evidence OR they provided “descriptions” without or with limited evidence for Rubrics 10, 13, and 14. We will continue with providing examples from the edTPA handbooks for Rubrics 10, 13 and 14 to support our students and faculty.

Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 provided “**good examples**” of performance measures that can be aligned with for our identified SLOs. However, using only Rubrics 10, 13 and 14 as a performance measure for both SLO 1 & 2 & 3 is clearly a limitation and other edTPA Rubrics should be added to strengthen our analysis.

We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 100 percent, MIT teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 were not as strong as the results on other rubrics and when we looked at the distribution of scores across the rubric scale.

We continue work on candidate and faculty support, edTPA strategies, alignment across our curriculum, and targeting Task 3. We have improved how we can help our

MIT teacher candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as provide them with “good” concrete examples of evidence that will guide their edTPA preparation while in our program. A new Director of the MIT Program started Fall 2016. We will provide support, resources and edTPA results to support our new faculty member.

6. What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

Our work during 2014-2016 has further developed our strategies to assess MIT candidates’ progress and achievements over the course of the program. Presented below are examples of how the department has implemented their strategies related to SLO 1, 2 & 3 in 2014-2015. MIT candidates take many of the same courses as our undergraduate teacher candidates. This information is the same as reported for our undergraduate program.

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

According to our department assessment plan and MIT Program assessment plan adopted in 2013-2014 we assess progress on implementation and program changes each quarter, we provided annual evaluation report related to edTPA to the MIT Director. In addition, assessment of MIT candidates’ performance on our SLOs was part of our program approval process. This information is the same as reported for our undergraduate program.

7. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

This information is the same as reported for our undergraduate BAE program.

NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP
FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2014-15 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities](#), this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2014-15, and then describe actions taken during 2015-16 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

PLEASE NOTE: The College-Level Synthesis report includes a section asking Deans to summarize which programs/certificates have demonstrated "closing-the-loop" assessments and findings based on the previous year's assessment report.

Working definition for closing the loop: *Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning.* Adapted 8.21.13 from <http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html>.

1. Student Learning Outcome(s) assessed for 2014-15

Teacher candidates in our undergraduate teacher preparation program will:

- use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs (5A1);
- integrate subjects across content areas (5A2);
- use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction (5A3);
- create a safe, productive learning environment (5A4);
- plan and/or adapt curricula for diverse student needs (5A5);
- ensure that students can articulate learning targets and can monitor their own progress toward those targets (5A6);
- plan Standards-driven curricula to develop student capacity for problem-solving strategies in content areas (5A7);
- prepare responsible citizens for a diverse society (5A8);
- ensure cultural competence in teaching (5A9);
- integrate technology into their classroom and/or planning (5A10);
- involve and collaborate with student families and community (5A11);
- utilize feedback and reflection to improve teaching practice (5B1);
- collaborate in and contribute to school improvement (5C1);
- demonstrate knowledge of responsibilities and policies related to the teaching profession (5C2).

2. **Strategies implemented** during 2015-16 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2014-15 assessment activities.

Faculty and staff participated in meetings and received edTPA information, training and reports. Program and state results were distributed and our plan for assessment, analysis and reporting was implemented and facilitated by the edTPA Coordinator and the Assessment Coordinator. Our Field Supervisors provided edTPA trainings.

A component of the program approval process was to identify and align data and evidence these SLOs (Standard 5) and to describe “how” we, within our programs plan, implement and support our teacher candidates in their development of knowledge and skills in our courses, field experiences and “student-centered” learning opportunities. Specifically, we focused on Task 3 and Rubrics 13 and 14. See #6 above. This information describe much of the work started in 2013-2015 and implemented in 2015-2016.

The work of our edTPA Coordinator providing up-to-date edTPA information and other materials, and our CARRT committee in providing individual student support and guidance are examples of this work. We implemented strategies in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 that have, and will continue to, provide faculty with more edTPA information, support and examples of quality “pedagogy” evidence. We strengthened the process of *when* and *how* we provide feedback and identify students that are in need of advice, support and academic counseling; as well as working with teacher candidates who needed to retake the edTPA or were identified as “struggling” students within our programs.

3. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

2015-2016 result shows that our overall pass rate is 98 percent to date for undergraduate teacher candidates and 100 percent to date for our MIT program with a WA cut score of 35. In 2014-2015, 96 percent undergraduate teacher candidates and 100 percent of MIT candidates passed the edTPA. A few of our students have yet to retake the edTPA. According to current state policy they have up to 18 months to retake the test.

In addition, see # 6”**What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**” above. This information describe much of the work started in 2013-2014 and implemented in 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.

4. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery**, etc. are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

This work became a starting point and an integral part of the evidence developed and collected in 2013-2014 and presented to the review team and PESB during 2014-2015 and for the one-year follow-up report May 2016 for our 2-year program approval process. The program approval process provided an opportunity to focus on our curriculum scope and sequence as aligned with Standard 5 and guided us through an assessment of our past and current level of practice. We will continue the work described above.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
4. **Observations gathered from data:** This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.
5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.
6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.

Some elements of this document have been drawn or adapted from the University of Massachusetts' assessment handbook, "Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement" (2001). Retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf