

ACADEMIC ASSESSMENT RECORD 2005-2006

YOUR COLLEGE/SCHOOL: College of Liberal Arts

DEGREE PROGRAM COVERED BY THIS PLAN: Master of Arts in Teaching

% OF YOUR FACULTY MEMBERS WHO CONTRIBUTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF THIS PLAN:

100% of steering committee members of the Teacher Preparation Council (four faculty, one administrative professional, one student, two members from Newport News Schools)

NAME OF YOUR DEPARTMENT'S ASSESSMENT REPRESENTATIVE: Marsha Sprague

TODAY'S DATE (FOR TRACKING): September 29 , 2006

CONGRUENCY OF OUTCOMES TO GUIDING DOCUMENTS:

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION REFERENCE: "CNU provides outstanding academic programs... We also serve the Commonwealth with Master's degree programs that provide intellectual and professional development for graduate level students."

Since the Master of Arts in Teaching Teacher Preparation program is a graduate program, we directly speak to the institutional mission of providing intellectual and professional development for graduate level students. Specifically, we seek to prepare students for a Virginia state teaching license. As such, we have developed four specific program goals: Students will develop competencies in:

1. Planning and preparing for instruction based on knowledge of content, resources and students
2. Creating a safe, orderly and nurturing environment that creates high expectations for all while recognizing and respecting diversity
3. Delivering and assessing instruction to meet state-mandated and district objectives, adjusting methods as needed to engage and teach every child
4. Professional responsibilities of dress, collegial behaviors, engagement with families, administrative duties, and self-directed growth.

The intended student outcomes reflect these goals, as outcome one deals with knowledge of content; outcome two deals with all other aspects of teaching skills, and outcome three addresses professionalism.

CNU GOALS SUPPORTED BY THE PROGRAM:

Goal 1: Provide high quality, liberal arts-oriented undergraduate programs while pursuing graduate studies appropriate to the needs of the community.

Goal 4: Provide educational programs that prepare students for career opportunities and for further education, including graduate and professional studies.

The CNU MAT program is definitely appropriate to the needs of the community, since there is a teacher shortage in Virginia impacting all areas, and especially the areas of elementary education, social studies education, Spanish education, and mathematics education. Thus the program prepares students for immediate employment upon graduation.

VISION 2010 GOALS SUPPORTED BY THE PROGRAM:

University priority one: A vital curriculum

Goal B: Support learning that cultivates critical and innovative thinking.

Goal C: Foster independent student learning.

University priority two: A culture of student learning and engagement

Goal C: Sustain and promote a climate of university-wide undergraduate and graduate intellectual engagement.

Goal E. Create learning opportunities that expand individual potential.

The Master of Arts in Teaching includes a challenging curriculum covering a range of disciplines including sociology, psychology, English, and computer science, as well as courses specific to the discipline to be taught. A series of field experiences engage students in thinking critically about public education. Coursework and practica lead them to increasingly develop a wide range of teaching skills, culminating in an internship where they assume all responsibility for a classroom.

I. Intended Student Outcome: All program completers will have knowledge of content appropriate to the endorsement area.

A. First Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The first means of assessment is the PRAXIS Specialty Area Exam (PRAXIS II). The PRAXIS II exam is a national test developed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS). Passing scores are set by the State Board of Education in consultation by ETS, and are required for issuing initial Virginia teaching licenses in all endorsement areas except theater. Because licensure is required for employment, and passing tests scores are required for degree and licensure fulfillment, 100% of MAT and licensure candidates are expected to pass the examination at the score level set by the Virginia Department of Education. In addition, at least 75% of the students will pass the exam on the first attempt in the fall.

In 2005-2006, 52 students out of 53 took the PRAXIS II test; there is no PRAXIS test for Theater. These were all students in the professional (fifth) year of the MAT or Licensure Only program. The test is administered six times a year on Saturdays at various testing centers in the region. The test is

administered via Educational Testing Service standards, and thus is a strictly controlled environment, with standardized conditions under the supervision of trained proctors. Most students took the PRAXIS II test in September or November. Those who needed to retake the test took it again in either January or March. Because of the high stakes, we assume students who took the test put forth their best efforts.

1. Assessment Results: In the 2005-06 cohort of the MAT, 96 % of student passed the PRAXIS II exams within the professional year. 92.5 % passed their exams on the first try.
2. Interpretation and Use of Results: Although the performance of the 05-06 students exceeded the criteria set, there was a slight drop from the 04-05 performance:

	PRAXIS II passed in professional year	PRAXIS II passed on first attempt
2004-2005	100%	94.7%
2005- 2006	96%	92.5%

On closer examination, it was found that both students who failed to pass the PRAXIS II exam during the professional year were students in the mathematics program; the only other student in this program also failed to pass in on her first attempt. This led to two changes proposed: first, the mathematics students this year were required to take the test early (September) to allow time for tutoring and second, a graduate course that reviews concepts covered on the test has been approved and will begin to be offered in summer 2007. This course, modeled after a similar course at Virginia Tech, is anticipated to alleviate student problems with passing the Mathematics PRAXIS II exam.

B. Second Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The second means of assessment is the final evaluation completed by university supervisor and classroom teacher during student teaching internship. This instrument was developed internally using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. The Framework is a nationally recognized evaluation system and is the basis for Newport News' Schools Teacher Evaluation. Student teacher supervisors are trained in the Frameworks and classroom teachers are also familiar with the instrument. This familiarity and training of the instrument increases inter-rater reliability. Criteria for assessment: at least 90% of the students will be rated as "competent" or "proficient" in their knowledge of content by both supervisors. This high criterion measure was arrived at by the steering committee of the Teacher Preparation Council, who felt that for teachers to be hired they must demonstrate competency in content knowledge. This item is assessed by Component A of Domain 1, Planning and Preparation.

All students in student teaching internships (53 out of 53) were evaluated. Given that these ratings represent a large part of their final grade in the internship course, students take the measures very seriously. They are reflective of the students' real-world effectiveness and efforts.

1. Assessment Results: 96.3% of students were rated as competent or proficient in their knowledge of content by university supervisors and classroom teachers. This was based on 53 ratings that were submitted by both the university supervisor and the classroom teacher.
2. Interpretation and Use of Results: As a result of this very positive outcome, no changes were made in content area preparation for any endorsement area.

II. Intended Student Outcome: Students will demonstrate skills of teaching in their content area including: planning and preparation, instruction, and classroom management.

A. First Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The first means of assessment is the final evaluation completed by university supervisor and classroom teacher during student teaching internship. This instrument was developed internally using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. The Framework is a nationally recognized evaluation system and is the basis for Newport News' Schools Teacher Evaluation. Student teacher supervisors are trained in the Frameworks and classroom teachers are also familiar with the instrument. This familiarity and training of the instrument increases inter-rater reliability. Criteria for assessment: at least 90% of the students will be rated as "competent" or "proficient" in their teaching skills (overall areas of planning and preparation, instruction, and classroom management representing domains I, II and III) by both supervisors. No student will receive less than "emerging" on any skill rating. These high criterion measure were arrived at by the steering committee of the Teacher Preparation Council, who felt that for graduates to be successful as first year teachers they must demonstrate competency (or at the very least, emerging) skills in these three areas.

1. Assessment Results: Results from the 2006 spring evaluations of supervisors and cooperating teachers appear below.

Domain I: Planning and Preparation

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Emer/Comp	Competent	Comp/Prof	Proficient
Supervisors	0	0	0	13%	31%	56%
Teachers	0	0%	8%	16%	26%	50%

TOTAL Competent or Proficient: Supervisors, 100%; Teachers, 92%. Below emerging: 0%.

Domain II: Classroom Environment

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Emer/Comp	Competent	Comp/Prof	Proficient
Supervisors	0	2%	0	15%	23%	60%
Teachers	0	2%	10%	16%	22%	50%

TOTAL Competent or Proficient: Supervisors, 98%; Teachers, 88%. Below emerging: 0%.

Domain III: Instruction

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Emer/Comp	Competent	Comp/Prof	Proficient
Supervisors	0	0	0	15%	35%	50%
Teachers	0	0	6%	22%	26%	46%

TOTAL Competent or Proficient: Supervisors, 100%; Teachers, 94%. Below emerging: 0%.

2. Interpretation and Use of Results: For the first criteria for success, 90% of students will achieve “competent or proficient status” in all three domains, this was achieved in the rating of university supervisors, but not in the ratings of classroom teachers. 12 % of students were rated below “competent” in the area of Classroom Environment, although the other domains, Planning and Preparation and Instruction did reach criteria. For the second criteria, no student will achieve less than emerging in any domain, both university supervisors and classroom teachers concurred in this rating.

To further investigate the problems in the area of “Classroom Environment,” the components of the domain were evaluated. This showed that a total of seven teachers or supervisors marked students as below competent in the component “Manages classroom behaviors” and 11 teachers or supervisors marked students below competent in the component “Manages student behaviors.” This was deemed significant as it represents at least 5% and 10% of total evaluations, respectively. To address this weakness, the course evaluations for “Classroom Management and Discipline” were scrutinized. Two adjuncts were not invited to return for the following cohort. The one new adjunct who was hired worked closely with Dr. Sprague to align objectives with outcomes for the course. In addition, a visit was made during the summer to a classroom teacher who illustrated concepts covered in the course. Finally, the students in the next cohort were allowed to begin the first portion of their student teaching in the first two weeks of the school year, where they were required to observe and note the institution and implementation of classroom procedures.

B. Second Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The second means of assessment is the portfolio. The portfolio was completed by 53 out of 53 students during the student teaching semester and submitted for review to the university supervisor for grading. It was hoped to be submitted to a content teacher as well, but because of time constraints the Teacher Preparation Council discarded this idea. The rubric used to assess the portfolio is based on program goals. Criteria for assessment: the goals related to teaching skills will be rated as satisfactory or above by both raters for 90% of program completers. This high criterion measure was arrived at by the steering committee of the Teacher Preparation Council, who felt that for graduates to be successful as first year teachers they must demonstrate competency in these three areas.

1. **Assessment Results:** For the first time, students were required to submit their documents through an electronic portfolio. Portfolios were submitted to the university supervisor at the end of the student teaching semester. The LiveText system provided a summary evaluation of the student dossier based on the four program goals. The three goals related to teaching and their assessment through the portfolio are as follows:

Results: Portfolio Assessment

	Excellent (4 pts)	Good (3 pts)	Fair (2 pts)	Poor (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Planning and Preparation	<u>68</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	3.85	4	0.39
Classroom Environment	<u>70</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>0</u>	3.81	4	0.48
Instruction	<u>59</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>5</u>	3.55	4	0.82

2. **Interpretation and Use of Results:** Due to the very high scores on the Portfolio, and because of the single rater, and because of the difficulty in teasing out information that can be helpful in making program adjustments based on data, it is proposed that another assessment measure be considered. At the end of the student teaching semester, the students are given a program evaluation and asked to rate the goals of the program as they relate to specific courses taught in the program. This spring, the students were asked to rate to what extent the following goals were met. Of the 53 student teachers, 48 completed the survey. The following chart offers their response:

1= Strongly Agree 2= Agree 3= Neutral 4=Disagree 5=Strongly Disagree

The following goals of the CNU T.P.P. (rated individually) were met and prepared me for student teaching: “Through my coursework and field experiences...”	1	2	3	4	5
1. I was provided with a firm base of knowledge in the academic subjects I will teach, including state and national standards for those subjects.	62.5%	29.1%	6.2%	0	2%
2. I was provided with the pedagogical skills to teach subject matter in an interactive and engaging manner.	54.1%	37.5%	6.2%	2%	0
3. I was provided with an understanding of how to meet the needs of individual and diverse learners.	45.8%	43.75%	8.3%	2%	0
4. I was provided with the skills necessary to organize and manage learning environments.	56.2%	25%	12.5%	6.2%	0
5. I was provided with the skills necessary to utilize technology effectively in an instructional program.	25%	22.9%	18.75%	16.6%	16.6%
6. I was provided with the placements necessary to observe and practice excellent teaching models in a variety of settings.	47.9%	25%	16.6%	8.3%	2%
7. I was provided with an understanding and appreciation of the historical, sociological, and legal foundations of education.	43.75%	43.75%	10.4%	0	2%
8. I learned to promote student acquisition and use of literacy tools in reading and writing. [MIDDLE/SECONDARY ONLY]	40%	53%	0	6.6%	0
9. I learned to promote student acquisition and use of literacy tools in reading, writing, science, and mathematics. [ELEMENTARY ONLY]	76.6%	20%	3.3%	0	0
10. I developed skills for the evaluation and assessment of student performance.	56.2%	35.4%	8.3%	0	0

This student self-report seems to have more potential as a measure for how well the program is preparing students to succeed in classroom teaching. Of the 10 items assessed, only two have more than 10 % of the students agreeing or strongly agreeing that their needs have not been met. The first, “I was provided with the skills necessary to utilize technology effectively in an instructional program” has been addressed by a complete redesign of the technology course, including adding a prerequisite, reducing the number of topics covered, and pairing it with student teaching. The second is the statement, “I was provided with the placements necessary to observe and practice excellent teaching models in a variety of settings.” This has to do with the difficulty of placing students in a large number of classes. To refine this process, the Associate Director of Field Placements has established new protocols for working with specified schools tied to many of the program courses. This should result in increased communication, efficiency, and effectiveness of the many student placements.

III. **Intended Student Outcome: Students will demonstrate professionalism appropriate to the role of a classroom teacher.**

A. First Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The first mean of assessment is the final evaluation completed by university supervisor and classroom teacher during student teaching internship. This instrument was developed internally using the Charlotte Danielson Framework for Teaching rubric. The Framework is a nationally recognized evaluation system and is the basis for Newport News' Schools Teacher Evaluation. Student teacher supervisors are trained in the Frameworks and classroom teachers are also familiar with the instrument. This familiarity and training of the instrument increases inter-rater reliability. Criteria for assessment: at least 90% of the students will be rated as "competent" or "proficient" in their professionalism by both supervisors (overall score for domain IV). No student will receive less than "emerging" on any component within this category. These high criterion measures were arrived at by the steering committee of the Teacher Preparation Council, who felt that for CNU students to be recommended for a Virginia teaching license, they must demonstrate competency (or at the very least, emerging) professionalism.

All 53 of the 53 student interns were evaluated. Because these results are used as a major part of their grade, it is assumed that the evaluations are reflective of their real-world effectiveness

1. Assessment Results: The ratings for the Professionalism domain by university supervisors and classroom teachers is as follows:

	Unsatisfactory	Emerging	Emer/Comp	Competent	Comp/Proficient	Proficient
University Supervisors	0	0	2%	4%	19%	75%
Classroom Teachers	0	0	2%	12%	24%	62%

TOTAL Competent or Proficient: Supervisors, 98%; Teachers, 98%. Below Emerging: 0%.

2. Interpretation and Use of Results: As hoped, well over 90% of evaluations showed that Teacher Preparation students were deemed competent or higher in professionalism. In addition, no student was rated as below emerging in any component of that domain. However, a closer analysis of responses in the components of this area did show that over 5% of students received scores below competent in the area of "Relates to families" and "Accepts feedback." As a result, a guest speaker was brought in during the summer term to address ways of working with families. Also, a technology communication tool was

explored during the Management class. In terms of the second area, ways to deal with feedback will be specifically addressed during a seminar during the student teaching internship.

B. Second Means of Assessment/Criteria for Success

The second means of assessment is the portfolio. The portfolio was completed by 53 out of 53 students during the student teaching semester. It was submitted for review to the university supervisor only (because of time constraints, it could not be submitted additionally to a content area teacher, as had been proposed.) The rubric used to assess the portfolio is based on program goals. Criteria for assessment: the professionalism section will be rated as satisfactory or above by both raters for 100% of program completers. These high criterion measure was arrived at by the steering committee of the Teacher Preparation Council, who felt that because of the multiple opportunities to demonstrate professionalism through the portfolio, and because supervisors gave feedback which allowed for revision, that all students should have demonstrated competency in professional components.

1. Assessment Results: The summary evaluation for the Professionalism domain as analyzed through LiveText are as follows:

Rubric: Portfolio Assessment

	Excellent (4 pts)	Good (3 pts)	Fair (2 pts)	Poor (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Professional Responsibilities	<u>65</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	3.75	4	0.58

2. Interpretation and Use of Results: Criteria appear not to have been met, as two portfolios were rated as poor. It is difficult to assess from this report why the professionalism aspect was rated as poor; it is not clear whether it was insufficiency of documentation or poorly presented documentation and/or reflection on the documentation. In addition, the number of scores reported (81) does not match the number of portfolios submitted (53). Thus, the two marks of “poor” could have been given on draft submissions. This is the first time that the electronic portfolio was used, so it may be too early to use it for program evaluation. The Teacher Preparation Council will reconsider this measure to determine its effectiveness as a measurement tool for this outcome. It may be that a newly adopted measure, the first-year follow-up administrator evaluation, can better assess this goal area.