**Undergraduate Academic Assessment Executive Summary**

**Department: (Education). Academic Year: (2014-2015)**

**This summary prepared by: (Ron Bork, Ed.D., Head of Teacher Education)**

1. **Background**: What factors caused you to choose this particular assessment target? If you chose this target because of a perceived problem, please explain.

Lesson planning and presentation are key skills in the success of a teacher. For over a decade a Teacher Work Sample has been required of all teacher education candidates during their student teaching experience. The format and requirements have evolved over time as the department faculty members have reviewed candidate performance and results.

With the addition of the OPS Para-Educator Program we have a new group of unique teacher education candidates who are now completing a parallel program. Our goal was to determine the success of these new candidates when compared with the traditional on-campus candidates.

1. **Question**: What specific question were you attempting to answer through this assessment? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.

How are the teacher education candidates in the OPS Para-Educator program performing on lesson planning and presentation in comparison with our traditional on-campus undergraduate candidates as evidenced in the completion of the Teacher Work Sample?

1. **Methodology**: Briefly explain your assessment methodology. The process used to collect data and the data itself are important pieces. Attach a copy of the assessment tool used.

Candidates in both the traditional on-campus program and the OPS Para-Educator program prepared and taught a Teacher Work Sample. The university supervisors collected the Teacher Work Samples. These were evaluated on a common rubric by university supervisors and Concordia teacher education faculty members.

1. **Summary of results:** Summarize the results of your assessment. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged, but optional.

The number of candidates in the OPS cohort was significantly smaller than those in the on-campus cohort. This small number impacts the conclusions that can be drawn from the data and from comparisons with the traditional on-campus candidates. The same university supervisor evaluated all four OPS candidates while the on-campus candidates were evaluated by 6 different supervisors. Supervisors were oriented to the process but each evaluated based on his/her observations and interpretation of the rubric descriptors.

Overall averages for the two groups were comparable when average scores were considered. This was impacted by the sample sizes of the two groups. An acceptable score for the Teacher Work Sample was 20. All of the on-campus candidates received a score at or above the acceptable score. One candidate from the OPS cohort received a score lower than the acceptable.

Considering the scope and requirements of the Teacher Work Sample it was determined that candidate performance was generally at the acceptable level with 22 of 23 candidates (95.6%) performing at the acceptable level.

Using sub-scores as a determiner of success the candidates were at the acceptable level (4 or 5) on 93.9% of the individual sub-score indicators.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| TWS - Spring 15 | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| On-campus | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | context | pre | unit | post | reflect |  | total |
| A |  | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  | 21 |
| B |  | 5 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 20 |
| C |  | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 22 |
| D |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 |  | 22 |
| E |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| F |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| G |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| H |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| I |  | 5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 |  | 22 |
| J |  | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |  | 22 |
| K |  | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  | 21 |
| L |  | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 23 |
| M |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| N |  | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 5 |  | 23 |
| O |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 3 |  | 21 |
| P |  | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 |  | 22 |
| Q |  | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 24 |
| R |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 5 |  | 24 |
| S |  | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 |  | 22 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| averages | n=19 | 4.89 | 4.11 | 4.63 | 4.37 | 4.58 |  | 22.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| OPS para-educator | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | context | pre | unit | post | reflect |  | total |
| A |  | 5 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 3 |  | 16 |
| B |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 25 |
| C |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 25 |
| D |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| averages | N=4 | 5 | 3.75 | 4.75 | 4.75 | 4.5 |  | 22.75 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Conclusions:** Summarize your conclusions and the implications for teaching and learning in your department. Most importantly answer the following question: What did you learn from this assessment and how will it impact the teaching/learning process in your department?

The ability to plan and present lessons that lead toward student success and learning is a key component for teacher effectiveness. The results of our teacher work sample assignment indicate that our candidates are performing at an acceptable level when evaluated by university supervisors.

1. **Action Plan:** As a result of this assessment, outline what your department will do and what timeline will be followed for making any changes.

In looking at the results and more importantly at the scoring rubric it was determined that a revision needed to be made in order to “weight” the individual sub-scores based on the importance of the task as determined by the teacher education faculty. It was also determined that a greater differentiation needed to be included in the rubric descriptors that would go beyond counting incidences of items.

The rubric used in spring 2015 is included below as well as the revision of the rubric that will be used in fall of 2015 and beyond.

The assessment of lesson planning and presentation as evaluated using the Teacher Work Sample will be the focus of assessment of the effectiveness of candidates in the OPS Para-Educator Program again in 2015-2016. The training of supervisors in using the rubric will be reviewed and consistency of rating determiners will be a goal of the training. Data will be gathered on the OPS cohort members and the on-campus cohort members to provide a comparison of results. Further revisions and training may be done following review and analysis of results.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The Context of Teaching **Teacher Work Sample - Scoring Rubric – Spring 2015**  **Name: Evaluator:** | | | | | |
| *Not evident*  *0 points* | *Novice*  *1 point* | *Developing*  *2 points* | *Basic*  *3 points* | *Expanding*  *4 points* | *Proficient*  *5 points* |
| The TWS does not include the required elements of this piece. | The TWS has only one of the basic elements of grade level, subject area of the unit, and unique characteristics of the class. | The TWS has two of the elements listed. | The TWS includes all three elements: grade level, subject area of the unit, and unique characteristics of the class. | The TWS has the three basic elements as well as either class or individual needs. | The TWS includes the required elements and expands to indicate both specific student learning and behavioral needs present. |
| **The Pre-Assessment Instrument** | | | | | |
| *Not evident*  *0 points* | *Novice*  *1 point* | *Developing*  *2 points* | *Basic*  *3 points* | *Expanding*  *4 points* | *Proficient*  *5 points* |
| The TWS  pre-assessment instrument or process is not included. | The TWS includes a copy of the pre-assessment instrument or process. | The TWS includes a copy of the instrument along with class results. | The TWS includes a copy of the pre-assessment instrument or process along with a individual student results. | The TWS includes a summary of both class and individual results in narrative or table/chart form. | The TWS pre-assessment instrument or process uses authentic assessment that is age/subject appropriate and includes an analysis of results. |
| **The Unit / Lesson Plans** | | | | | |
| *Not evident*  *0 points* | *Novice*  *1 point* | *Developing*  *2 points* | *Basic*  *3 points* | *Expanding*  *4 points* | *Proficient*  *5 points* |
| The TWS unit / lesson plans are not available. | The TWS unit / lesson plans include only one of the essential elements: goals/objectives, methodology, assessment, and evaluation. | The TWS unit / lesson plans include only two of the essential elements. | The TWS unit / lesson plans include three of the essential elements. | The TWS unit / lesson plans include all four of the essential elements. | The TWS unit /lesson plans include all four essential elements and include student and/or cooperating teacher feedback on the plans. |
| **The Post-Assessment Instrument** | | | | | |
| *Not evident*  *0 points* | *Novice*  *1 point* | *Developing*  *2 points* | *Basic*  *3 points* | *Expanding*  *4 points* | *Proficient*  *5 points* |
| The TWS  post-assessment instrument or process is not included. | The TWS includes a copy of the post-assessment instrument or process. | The TWS includes a copy of the instrument along with class results. | The TWS includes a copy of the post-assessment instrument or process along with a individual student results. | The TWS includes a summary of both class and individual results in narrative or table/chart form. | The TWS post-assessment instrument or process includes a comparison of pre- and post- results. |
| Reflection on Changes to be made in the Future | | | | | |
| *Not evident*  *0 points* | *Novice*  *1 point* | *Developing*  *2 points* | *Basic*  *3 points* | *Expanding*  *4 points* | *Proficient*  *5 points* |
| This section of the TWS is not evident. | Limited comments are made on the unit as a whole. | Comments were made on either the content taught or the methodology used. | Comments were made on both the content and the methodology used and how that could be improved next time. | Comments made included a rationale for either content or methodology changes. | The reflection piece included comments by the candidate on content and methodology changes that would be made along with a strong rationale for those changes. |

An acceptable score for the TWS is 20 out of 25.

**Teacher Work Sample – Scoring Rubric – Fall 2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Context of Teaching** | | | | |
| **Consistent - 4** | **Frequent - 3** | | **Occasional - 2** | **Rare - 0** |
| Includes grade level, subject area, and specific information about the class as a whole, including details about individual learning and behavioral needs. | Includes adequate information about grade level, subject area, and specific information about the class as a whole. | | Includes limited information about grade level, subject area, and the class. | Includes little to no information on grade level, subject area, and the class. |
| Comments: | | | | |
| **Stage One** | | | | |
| **Consistent – 11-12** | **Frequent – 7-10** | | **Occasional – 1-6** | **Rare - 0** |
| Comprehensive representation of standards, understandings, essential questions, and knowledge/skills that equip students with understanding as represented in proficient criteria. | Includes standards directly relevant to the unit, articulates overarching and topical understandings, presents overarching and topical essential questions written in “student language,” and identifies key knowledge/skills that equip students with understanding. | | Includes standards relevant to the unit, with limited understandings, essential questions, and knowledge/skills. | No evidence of standards, understandings, essential questions, knowledge or skills. |
| Comments: | | | | |
| **Pre-Assessment** | | | | |
| **Consistent – 9-10** | | **Frequent – 6-8** | **Occasional – 1-5** | **Rare - 0** |
| Authentic Assessment is age/subject appropriate. (Copy of assessment and rubric included). Analysis of results demonstrates whole class and individual results that inform teaching. | | Assessment is age/subject appropriate. (Copy of assessment included). Analysis of results demonstrates whole class and individual results that inform teaching. | Pre-assessment is conducted. (Copy of assessment included). Analysis of whole class results informs teaching. | No pre-assessment is given. |
| Comments: | | | | |
| **Stage Two**  ***If authentic assessment is not feasible in current student teaching setting, see program director to accommodate plans for the TWS*** | | | | |
| **Consistent – 11-12** | | **Frequent – 7-10** | **Occasional – 1-6** | **Rare - 0** |
| Evidence of performance task with rubric, informal assessment of knowledge and skills, and provision for student self-assessment. | | Evidence of a performance task assessed by a rubric, criteria sheet, etc. | Assessment is present, but not authentic or age/subject/developmentally appropriate. | Assessment is not evident throughout the unit. |
| Comments: | | | | |
| **Lesson Plans** | | | | |
| **Consistent – 18-20** | | **Frequent – 12-17** | **Occasional – 1-11** | **Rare – 0** |
| Lesson plans include all listed components with a clear thread from standard to objective to assessment. Students are actively engaged and a variety of methodologies are used. Student teacher and cooperating teacher feedback is evident on plans. Modifications are provided as needed to meet individual student needs. | | Lesson plans include all listed components with a clear connection from standard to objective to assessment. There is evidence of student engagement. Student teacher and cooperating teacher feedback is evident on plans. Modifications are provided as needed to meet individual student needs. | Lesson plans include most of the listed components. There is not a continuous flow from standard to objective to assessment. Little evidence of student engagement in the content. | Incomplete lesson plans that do not contain adequate requirements. |
| Comments: | | | | |
| **Reflection** | | | | |
| **Consistent – 11-12** | | **Frequent – 7-10** | **Occasional – 1-6** | **Rare - 0** |
| Reflection thoroughly and completely answers questions provided. Reflection on BOTH student learning progress and personal professional growth are evident. Multiple specific modifications to content and methodology are addressed in light of the teaching/learning process. | | Reflection substantially answers questions provided. Reflection on BOTH student learning progress and personal professional growth are evident. Some modifications to content and/or methodology are addressed in light of the teaching/learning process. | Reflection partially answers questions provided. Reflection is limited in scope and lacks an analysis of both student and personal learning. | Reflection is not included. |
| Comments: | | | | |