

Initial Programs Assessment Committee Report

June 13, 2012

Committee Members

D. Holman

J. Grymes

A. Ross

S. Bounds

A. Bowser

Table of Contents

	Page
Initial Programs Assessment Committee Charge -----	1
Background-----	2
Recommendations -----	4
Initial Licensure Candidates 2011 Academic Year -----	6
Undergraduate Initial Programs Retention and Assessment Procedures -----	7
Reevaluation of Initial Programs Assessment -----	10
Sources -----	14

Initial Programs Assessment Committee Charge

1. Review and analyze unit assessment artifacts at the initial level.
2. Review/evaluate the assessment system as it applies to the initial level.
3. If InTASC standards are approved as a state framework, devise a revision plan.
4. Create an Initial Programs Assessment Procedures Sheet similar to the Advanced Programs Procedure Sheet.
5. Complete a unit assessment report and send to the Head of the Unit by May 31, 2012. The report will include areas of strength and/or areas of improvement.

Background

Common Core State Standards (CCSS)

The goal of CCSS is to make students career or college ready upon completion of high school. In Arkansas the implantation process is underway with the following timeline:

K-2 2011-2012

3-8 2012-2013

9-12 2013 -2014

Common Assessments (PARCC) are to be ready in 2014-2015

Currently, CCSS exist for mathematics, English Language Arts and Literacy, with other standards being developed. The general premises of CCSS are that by reducing the amount of content in school curricula, by focusing upon key concepts, by being more coherent in planning student progression across grade levels, by balancing the teaching of concepts and skills, and by fostering reasoning and sense-making students can master the knowledge and skills to be career or college ready upon high school graduation. CCSS blend content with higher-order thinking skills (reasoning, problem-solving, creativity, etc.) into a single process that emphasizes learning embedded in real-world linked learning activities.

Arkansas is a member of the *Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers* (PARCC), member states involved in the creation of the common assessments. K-12 students will experience a series of formative and summative assessments, using “adaptive technology” that terminates in the grade 11 *College Readiness Assessment*. From this assessment students’ knowledge and skills related to college and career readiness will be determined. It will also be one metric for measuring teacher training effectiveness and the ability of teachers to be effective in student achievement.

InTask Model Core Teaching Standards

Released in April of 2011, the InTASC standards are linked to and can be seen as an extension of the CCSS:

In updating the InTASC model standards, efforts were made to ensure **they align with other national and standards documents** (emphasis added) that were recently revised or released. Specifically, this document has been reviewed to ensure compatibility with the recently-released Common Core State Standards for students in mathematics and English language arts . . . (InTASC, 2011, p.5)

Within the InTASC standards language used to describe outcomes parallels the language of CCSS and the expectations for teacher skills and abilities are similar. For example, some selected major themes emphasized in the 2011 standards that teachers must be able to attend to, and which cut across

multiple InTASC standards are Collaboration (Cross-disciplinary), Creativity/Innovation (Cross-disciplinary) , Critical thinking (Cross-disciplinary) , Problem solving(Cross-disciplinary), Cultural competence, Individual differences, Interdisciplinary, Student-directed learning, and use of data to support learning. Of note is the reference to “Cross-disciplinary” planning; in CCSS, curricular planning and implementation are considered to be “holistic” processes that cross disciplines and require teachers to work as colleagues engaged in a common endeavor. These expectations and others are embedded in the performances, essential knowledge, and critical dispositions that define the domains of InTASC and are utilized in CCSS. It is consequently difficult to separate CCSS when discussing InTASC standards.

Recommendations

1. General Recommendations

InTASC standards for effective teaching have been significantly modified since earlier versions and have been designed to be compatible with the CCSS. Changes in InTASC language follow the CCSS standards which emphasize less content, greater use of higher level thinking skills, deeper learning, and integration of content and skills in reality-based lessons. P-20 alignment of CCSS with higher education is expected and new teachers are expected to depart higher education common core ready.

- a. If not already been completed, programs in the college of education should be reviewed for graduate “readiness”; the content and processes expected in the CCSS should be embedded in program outcomes and requirements.
- b. In both CCSS and InTASC standards, cross-disciplinary curriculum planning is emphasized for future teachers. How the cross-disciplinary component is, or will be integrated into programs should be reviewed. This may be more of an issue for 9-12 where a discipline-orientation tends to drive thinking.
- c. InTASC standards specifically reference “Pedagogical Content Knowledge” which should be factored into program planning, if not already been addressed.

2. Assessment Recommendations

- a. Assessment of COE students’ skills related to InTASC and mastery of CCSS need to be added to the assessment process. With a focus upon each student’s ability to develop and implement fully integrated materials, addition of artifacts into the assessment process to document student skills should be considered.
- b. Arkansas is a member of the PARCC assessment consortium. Continued monitoring of the development of the PARCC assessments by COE should be in place. This assessment will use “Adaptive Technology” and teachers should understand this technology and how it will impact their teaching.

3. Strength

Responding to student diversity is a major issue for both CCSS and InTASC. Historically, ASU has had a strong diversity component. This is a strength of the ASU program and a feature upon which the COE can build.

**Initial Licensure Candidates
2011 Academic Year**

<u>Licensure Area</u>	<u>n</u>
Agriculture	2
Art	4
Biology	2
Business	1
Chemistry	2
ECH P-4	106
ECH Sp. Ed.	14
English	7
History	1
Instrumental Music	1
Math	5
MLED	168
PE	6
PE/Coaching	1
Social Sciences	10
Spanish	1
Total	233

Undergraduate Initial Programs Retention and Assessment Procedures Sheet (4/11 draft)

Check Point	Assessment Tools	When Data are Collected	Who Generates the Report	When are Reports Generated	Who Analyzes Data	When Data are Analyzed at the Unit Level	How Data are Used
Check Point One: Admission To Teacher Education Program	GPA	Candidate application to Teacher Education program	Institutional Research Office	Spring	Initial Unit Assessment Committee (IUAC), COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Determines program admission
	Praxis I	Candidate application to Teacher Education program	PEP Director	Annually	IUAC, COPE, Head of Unit	Spring	Determines program admission, Licensure requirement
	Specific Course Grades	Candidate application to Teacher Education program	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Determines candidate program admission
	Career Awareness Assessment	Candidate application to Teacher Education program	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Determines candidate program admission
	Philosophy of Education	Candidate application to Teacher Education program	Associate Dean	Summer	Candidate, Instructor, Course Faculty, Program Faculty, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Determines program admission; candidate and unit evaluation
Check Point Two: Pre-Teacher Internship Checksheet	Overall GPA	Candidate submission of Pre Teacher Internship Check Form	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention
	Professional Education/Major coursework grades	Candidate submission of Pre Teacher Internship Check Form	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention

Check Point Three: Intent for Teaching Internship Check	Overall GPA	Candidate submission of Pre Teacher Internship Check Form	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention
	Professional Education/Major coursework grades	Candidate submission of Intent for Teaching Internship Form	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention
Mid Point Unit Assessment	Field Experience Summative Evaluation	Pre-internship semester	Associate Dean	Summer	Candidate, Instructor, Clinical Supervisor, Course Faculty, Program Faculty, IUAC, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Candidate, program and unit evaluation,
Check Point Four: Internship Check Point	Completion of major courses and Major GPA	Beginning of Internship semester	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention
	Overall GPA	Beginning of Internship semester	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention
	Licensure Requirements (Medical, legal)	Beginning of Internship Semester	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, PEP Director	NA	Candidate retention, Licensure requirement
End Point Unit Assessments And Check Point Five	GPA	Prior to graduation	NA	NA	Verified by Advisor, Registrar	NA	Candidate retention
	Praxis II Exam	Prior to graduation	PEP Director	Fall	Candidate, Program Faculty, IUAC, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Program and unit evaluation, licensure requirement
	Internship Summative Evaluation	End of Internship, Practicum, lab	PEP Director	Summer	Candidate, Internship University Supervisor, Internship Clinical Supervisor, Course faculty, Program faculty, PEP Director, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Candidate, program and unit evaluation
	Learning to Teach Teaching to Learn	End of Internship	Associate Dean	Summer	Candidate, Intern Supervisor, Program	Spring	Candidate, program and

	Portfolio				faculty, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit		unit evaluation
	Effect on Student Learning	End of Internship	Associate Dean	Summer	Candidate, Internship Clinical Supervisor, Internship University Supervisor, Course Faculty, Program Faculty, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit		Candidate, program and unit evaluation
	Teacher Intern Evaluation of School Experience	End of Internship	PEP Director	Summer	Program faculty, PEP Director, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Program and unit evaluation
	Teacher Intern evaluation of Teacher preparation program	End of Internship	PEP Director	Summer	Program faculty, PEP Director, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	Spring	Program and unit evaluation
<u>Post-Graduation Unit Assessments</u>	Follow up Survey of Graduates^^	__ years following program completion	Arkansas Department of Education	^^	Program faculty, PEP Director, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	^^	Program and unit evaluation
	Follow up of Employers^^	__ years following program completion	Arkansas Department of Education	^^	Program faculty, PEP Director, IUAC, COPE, Associate Dean, Head of Unit	^^	Program and unit evaluation

New assessment implemented by Arkansas Department of Education; schedule and procedures are not yet available.

**ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT
Teacher Education Assessment Management Systems
(TEAMS)
UNIT ASSESSMENT HANDBOOK
FOR INITIAL PROGRAMS**

Fall 2011

(updated August 20, 2011)

<http://www.astate.edu/education/TEAMS>

1

07-29-10

**Arkansas State University
Professional Education Unit
Teacher Education Assessment Management Systems
(TEAMS)**

Unit assessment is a continuous process that underlies all excellent programs of teaching and learning. The Unit has designed the Teacher Education Assessment Management System (TEAMS) as a systematic process for determining the extent to which the initial and the advanced programs address the outcomes of the conceptual framework. Internal and external program assessment data are collected in order to help evaluate the work of the Unit. The goal is to direct improvement efforts in order to ensure program quality.

The unit assessment process uses multiple pieces of data that are reviewed by programs coordinators, department chairs, the **Initial Programs Unit Assessment** committee and the other committees from the Council of Professional Education (COPE). The data collection is coordinated by the COE Associate Dean with data derived from the Office of Institutional Research and Planning, Professional Education Programs office and the College of education dean's office. The process is designed to provide data and information to the appropriate faculty members or committees to make course or program changes.

The **Initial Programs Unit Assessment** committee has the responsibility to review data that is tied to the **Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn** conceptual **framework** and Praxis scores. They provide an annual review of this data with the charge or mandate to make an annual report. The report should include areas of strength and/or areas of improvement. If there are areas in need of improvement the unit assessment committee will recommend to the head of unit what committee, program area, department or combination of the above that should address the area of improvement. (Appendix A)

The Head of Unit will provide an annual report of the unit assessment activities from the previous academic year. The report will be sent to the unit no later than November 1 of each year.

ASSESSMENT ARTIFACTS

Initial Teacher Preparation

Initial teacher preparation programs are those programs at baccalaureate or post-baccalaureate levels that prepare candidates for the first licensure to teach.

Internal Program Assessment Data

Field Experience Summative Evaluation

Internship Summative Evaluation

Learning to Teach Teaching to Learn Portfolio

Philosophy of Education

Teacher Education Preparation Programs Assessment by Exiting Teacher Intern (described below under external but not listed – seems an internal not an external evaluation)

Teacher Intern Evaluation of School Experience ??? (described below but not listed here)

External Program Assessment Data

Praxis I Exam Scores

Praxis II Exam Scores

Praxis III/Pathwise Scores (as available)

Teacher Education Preparation Programs Assessment by Alumni

EXPLANATION OF ASSESSMENT ARTIFACTS

Initial Programs - Internal

Field Experience Summative Evaluation

The Field Experience Evaluation is an evaluation instrument that assesses pre-service teachers during their pre-internship field experience in ECH 4013, MLED 4033/4034, or SCED 3515. This

instrument assesses pre-service teachers' application of the ASU Conceptual Framework standards in their field experience.

Internship Summative Evaluation

Teacher, counselor, administrator and other school personnel interns are assessed at the end of each of their placements by their clinical supervisor and/or their university supervisor. Criteria for this evaluation is based on the conceptual framework.

Learning to Teach, Teaching to Learn Portfolio

This is a portfolio that is ~~developed~~ **completed** by the pre-service teacher during his/her internship to demonstrate his/her mastery of the standards established by the College of Education and communicated in the ASU Conceptual Framework. This portfolio must be completed in College Live Text and class specific assignments **from throughout the program** may be required by individual programs. Completed portfolios will be submitted to the designated faculty as specified by the program.

Philosophy of Education

The Philosophy of Education is an assignment that is completed in one of the three Introduction to Teaching classes, i.e. **ECH 2022/2033, MLED 2022/2033 or SCED 2514/2513**. The ultimate goal of this assignment is to guide pre-teachers' thinking about professional practice.

(MOVED FROM EXTERNAL ASSESSMENT)

Teacher Education Preparation Programs Assessment by Exiting Teacher Interns

Teacher interns are surveyed at the end of their internship. This survey gathers information on teacher interns' perceptions of how well the teacher education program prepared them to teach. The conceptual framework provides the criteria for assessment. Results are shared with Department Chairs.

Teacher Intern Evaluation of School Experience

Data is collected each semester on teacher interns' perceptions regarding the effectiveness of the school for the internship experience, the effectiveness of the clinical supervisor and the intern's ability to interact with students in the assigned school. Data on individual schools are only reported once an adequate number of students have been placed in a particular school setting to ensure students' anonymity. Data is used for reviewing future placements at contracted schools. Results are kept in the Professional Education Programs office.

Initial Programs - External

Praxis I Scores

Praxis I Pre-professional Skills Test is a standardized exam available from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). This exam is designed to measure students' achievement in reading, writing and mathematics. Minimum scores for admission into the teacher education program (Checkpoint 1) have been established, i.e. reading 172, writing 173, and mathematics 171.

Praxis II Scores

Praxis II Principles of Learning and Content exams are standardized exams available from the Educational Testing Service (ETS). These exams are designed to measure candidates' understanding of the principles of learning and program content knowledge respectively. Praxis II scores reported by assessment areas are received and disseminated to department chairs and program coordinators each year. Praxis II scores are analyzed each academic year and presented to the faculty during a Professional Education Faculty meeting. The report consists of the sample size, the number of students who met or exceeds the passing score and subcategory raw scores.

Praxis III/Pathwise Scores

Praxis III/Pathwise is a standardized assessment of professional practice developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) and administered by the Arkansas Department of Education to first or second year teachers. Performance on this assessment determines whether a teacher with an initial license is awarded a standard license. Results are kept in the Professional Education Programs office.

Teacher Education Preparation Programs Assessment by Alumni

One and/or three years past graduation, alumni are surveyed concerning their perception of how well they were prepared for their respective licensure area. Survey questions were directly related to the Conceptual Framework.

(should be moved to internal assessments?)

Teacher Education Preparation Programs Assessment by Exiting Teacher Interns

Teacher interns are surveyed at the end of their internship. This survey gathers information on teacher interns' perceptions of how well the teacher education program prepared them to teach. The conceptual framework provides the criteria for assessment. Results are shared with Department Chairs.

INSERT finalized

Undergraduate Initial Programs Retention and Assessment Procedures Sheet

Delete the two internal/external assessment grids – data in above chart will be there

INSERT prior to the Other Unit Assessment grids:

Unit assessment extends beyond the initial programs and beyond candidate performance on assessments. Programs and departments have responsibility to assess programs along standards specific to the professional expectations of the specialty area. Broader unit assessments are also evaluated. Below are identified other unit assessments that are reviewed by other organizations/committees within the Unit.

(maintain current matrix of other assessments)

Sources

- Cohn, M. (2010). *Overview of PARCC's Approach*. Achieve, American Diploma Project Network. Washington, DC. Retrieved from: http://www.acenet.edu/Content/NavigationMenu/ProgramsServices/CPA/core_o7_2010.htm.
- Common Core (2009). *Common core state standards for mathematics*. Common Core: State Standards Initiative. Retrieved from: <http://www.corestandards.org/>.
- Common Core Learning Standards. (2010). *Instructional shifts for the common core*. Engage, NY. Retrieved from: <http://www.engageNY.org>.
- Council of Chief State School Officers. (2011, April). *Interstate teacher assessment and support consortium (InTASC) model core teaching standards: A resource for state dialogue*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from: http://www.ccsso.org/Documents?2011/InTASC_Model_Core_Teaching_Standards_2011.pdf
- Loveless, T. (2012, February). *How well are American students learning?* Brown Center on Education Policy. Retrieved from: <http://www.brookings.edu/about/centers/brown/brown-center-reports>.
- PARCC Overview (2011). *Career and college readiness for the next generation*. Retrieved from: <http://www.aps.edu/academics/common-core-state-standards/documents/PARCC-Overview-Dec2011.pdf>
- Poda, J. & Lowe, V. (2012). *How the common core will impact college readiness and teacher education*. TaskStream, Collaboration Exchange. Retrieved from: <http://image.s4.exct.net/lib/fe9815707365007972/m/1/February+Collaboration+Exchange+Presentation+Common+Core.pdf>
- Science and Mathematics Teacher Imperative (SMTI), (2010). *Discussion paper- The common core state standards and teacher preparation: The role of higher education*. Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities. Retrieved from: <http://www.aplu.org/document.doc?id=3482>.