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See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) Student Outcome, b) Background, c) Questions(s), d) Methodology.

Analysis of artifacts:

1. PERFORMANCE CRITERIA\* - How was data analyzed? (Attach rubrics/scoring tools if used.

Rubric for Evaluation

A rubric was developed (attachment “EDAsmt1”) to evaluate five different criteria on the 43 lesson plans selected at random for evaluation. The criteria are:

1. Ability to identify an appropriate standard and corresponding goal.
2. Ability to write an objective in the proper format.
3. Ability to develop a hook, transitions, coherent procedure, and closure within the instructional sequence.
4. Ability to include appropriate appropriate modifications and adaptations.
5. Ability to utilize proper assessment.

Scoring Procedure

A lesson plan was selected at random from the sample and each scorer individually rated that lesson plan on the identified criteria using the rating scale specified in the rubric. The group discussed the variations in scoring and addresses some of the large scale differences that were seen in the evaluations of the sample.

Scorers were divided into teams (two teams of two and one team of three) and each team received approximately one third of the sample plans to score. Each team scored by consensus using discussion to resolve differences.

When all of the plans from the sample had been scored each team passed its set of plans to another team for a second scoring of the plan (Team A passed to Team B, Team B passed to Team C and Team C passed to Team A.) Teams then scored the new set of lesson plans again. Because rubrics were collected as scoring progressed, scoring teams were not aware of the scores awarded to a plan in the first round.

Time commitments dictated that, especially during the second round of scoring, certain individuals had to leave because of other commitments. Team memberships shifted to ensure that each plan was scored by at least two individuals and that no plan was scored twice by the same individual.

Data Analysis

Using Excel for Microsoft Office, data was entered into a spreadsheet and the following values determined:

Average scores for each criterion in Score set 1(SS1) , Score Set 2 (SS2) , and the average of SS1 and SS2.

The value of the discrepancy between the average score on all criteria for each plan between SS1 and SS2 was calculated.

Inter-Rater Reliability was determined by running a simple correlation between SS1 and SS2 criteria scores on all plans.

Criteria average scores (SS1 averaged with SS2) were disaggregated by the course from which the plan was selected. (See graph “ED Disaggregated Scores”)

Data files are attached as “EDdata1”

Summary of Results:

1. Restate the assessment question (from the assessment plan):

Upon program completion (Student Teaching), can students write an effective lesson plan that includes standards, learning goals and instructional objectives?

Are students in the Education Program making developmental progress in this skill as they proceed through their course of study?

2. Summarize the Assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

 Average scores for each criterion were below the desired value of 3.0 (Proficient: Meets at least minimal expectations for program completers for the Standard/Goal (2.99), Objectives writing(2.83), Lesson Planning (2.88) and Assessment (2.50) criteria. The average score for the Modifications criteria (1.73) was below the “Developing: Reasonable, but does not meet several expectations for program completers.”

Scores were disaggregated by the course that produced the lesson plan. Those average scores are presented in the table and graph below.

Graph 1: Average Criteria Scores Disaggregated by Source

Table 1: Average Criteria Scores Disaggregated by Source

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | S/G | Obj | Les | Mod | Assmt |
| EDPS210 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 2.4 |
| ED424 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 2.8 | 2.5 |
| ED461/470 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 1.9 | 3.1 |
| ST | 3.0 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 2.1 |

Score Discrepancies between SS1 And SS2

The average discrepancy between SS1 and SS2 scores was 0.01 that was determined not to have statistical significance.

To determine Inter-rater Reliability, a Pearson correlation (r) and Coefficient of Determination (r2) were calculated between SS1 and SS2 scores for all criteria on all selected plans.

 Criterion r r2

Standard/Goal .17 0.028

Objectives Writing .33 *(p> .95)* 0.108

Lesson Planning .17 0.028

Modifications .63 *(p> .99)*  0.396

Assessment .18 0.032

Plan Average Score .27 *(p> .90)*  0.072

3. Interpretation- Discuss how the results answer the assessment question.

*Are students in the Education Program making developmental progress in this skill as they proceed through their course of study?*

Even though the source of the lesson plan was redacted from the plans reviewed, Table 1 and Graph 1 indicate a definite developmental progression in the skills evaluated IF the values for Student Teaching are removed from consideration. Values from the earliest class (EDPS210) are the lowest, followed by ED424 and then the highest scores are seen in ED460/471, the courses taken by early childhood and elementary candidates (ED461) and middle level and secondary candidates (ED 470) in the term immediately before student teaching.

Also worth noting is that the highest scores for successful modification for diversity comes from the students in ED424 where modification of planning to account for student diversity is a major emphasis for the class.

The high correlation (r = .63, *p>.99)* on the Modifications scale is a bit misleading. Modification of lesson plans to account for special needs is not currently included in the lesson plan written for the EDPS210 course. Students are given specific instruction that they are not required to do that for the assignment, as modification of instruction is not addressed in the course. Therefore there was a high level of agreement among scorers that when modifications were absent that a score of “1” would be given. 40% of the lesson plans scored were from EDPS210. There were also many other plans that simply did not include specific modifications. That artificially inflated the correlation value.

*Upon program completion (Student Teaching), can students write an effective lesson plan that includes standards, learning goals and instructional objectives?*

We believe the low scores received by the student teachers on almost all criteria are more of a situational phenomenon rather than an indication of a lack of skill. To test this hypothesis, data from the past three semesters of student teaching evaluations related to Nebraska state standards for Student Diversity (Standard 2), Assessment (Standard 6), Planning (Standard 7) and Lesson Delivery (Standard 8). On all criteria for all three semesters for which data is available (201410, 201420, and 201510) 90% or more of Concordia student teachers were rated 3 or higher, the level determined to indicate required minimum competence for this study. This data, combined with narrative data in the form of supervisor and co-op comments indicate that CUNE student teachers are quite successful in all of these areas.

So, why are their scores so low? Discussion among the faculty in the Education Program has brought us to believe that the writing of a formal lesson plan is a very, very low priority for the student teachers and for all involved in the assessment of student teachers. In student teaching, the most critical matter is performance in the classroom. Many of the cooperating teachers have not written a formal lesson plan since college and do not use them in their day-to-day instructional practice.

We have come to the conclusion that formal lesson planning is a developmental skill taught to teacher candidates to help them learn to THINK like teachers. A college instructor uses the formal lesson plan as a tool to see what a candidate is thinking about as he or she plans the lessons they may someday teach. There is no way that every candidate can actually teach a lesson in each of the classes which address lesson planning, and even if they could, teaching to a peer group is unrelated to the reality of an early childhood, elementary, middle or high school classroom. It is also true that when student teaching, some candidates are faced with as many as five or six different lessons per day. To expect them to write formal lesson plans that conform to standards used in their now-completed education classes would be burdensome and impractical.

However, the single most important value determined in evaluating the data was the correlation for Inter-rater Reliability (r=.27, *p>.90)*. The low correlation value and lack of statistical significance of that item calls all of the results of this process into question. This means that there is at least a one-in-ten possibility that the values obtained are due to chance meaning that any analysis of values can only be very tentative.

Sharing of Results:

When were the results shared: Via email on 1/9/15 (Bork, Tonjes, Opfer, Geidel, Pester, Oliver, Uffelman, Anderson, Robson) Supplemental discussion 1/13/15 with Dean Nancy Elwell, and Dr. Judy Preuss, Dean *emeritus)* Discussed in Education Program meeting on January 14, 2015 (Bork, Tonjes, Opfer, Geidel, Pester, Oliver, Uffelman, Anderson, Robson)

Discussion of results: ACTION- Summarize your conclusions including:

*1.How will what the department learned from the assessment POTENTIALLY impact the teaching/learning process in your department starting the next academic year?*

Future assessment results have no credibility unless the IRR problem is addressed.

Because the scorers are also the teachers of lesson planning, a lack of inter-rater reliability is a clear indication of a lack of consistency in the instruction of topics related to the items assessed in this study.

Addressing these problems has the potential to clarify teaching of lesson planning in the department with the possible result in increased success on the part of the students.

*2. How will the program POTENTIALLY use the results to improve student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

Our plan at this time is to address issues of inter-rater reliability during the second semester of this year (201520) and complete a successful evaluation of the questions posed for the initial study. Curriculum changes for the coming year already in process will be directly impacted by the results of this study. The faculty of the Education Program have been involved in extensive discussions about when and how to teach lesson planning skills. Lesson planning is a critical developmental skill for teacher candidates that helps them learn to think like a teacher. Increased skill and confidence in planning will result in even stronger graduates. The results of this study will help guide those curriculum decisions.

*If action is taken – it is recommended that the same plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*

FEEDBACK\* - Reassess outcomes if ACTION\* has been taken.

*What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?*

Submitted by: Bernie Tonjes

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 2/16/15

Department chair notified/additional action needed: na

Date posted to Assessment site: 2/16/15