

Undergraduate Academic Assessment Executive Summary

Department: (Education). Academic Year: (2013-14)

This summary prepared by: (Bernard Tonjes, Ph.D.)

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

II.

The College of Education has received mandated standards for assessment of student teaching that come from the Nebraska Department of Education. These state standards were developed with considerable input from CUNE education faculty and so have a direct relationship with the Conceptual Framework that serves as the philosophical foundation for teaching and learning in the College of Education.

To create a unified system of assessment, all assessments of teacher education candidates used prior to student teaching have also been developed using the Conceptual Framework and the standards and descriptors developed by the state of Nebraska. This is called the TAD system (Teacher Assessment Data) and used to execute a unified system of assessment that allows for assessment of current outcomes, but also allows for longitudinal tracking of individual student growth over time. Data can also be disaggregated by program, subject area emphasis, or any number of factors included in our student data base.

III. 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 students performing in their various education classes and in student teaching according to criteria related to the Concordia University Conceptual Framework?

IV. 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.

Students are assessed in three different ways:

Instructor Evaluation of Students (InSTEOS). Using the curriculum guide developed by the faculty of the College of Education, students in Education

Core Courses (ED101, ED201, EDPS210, Psy324, ED424, ED461 or ED470) are evaluated by instructors on outcomes designated for assessment in the curriculum guide. Some of these characteristics are evaluated on the basis of specific student assignments while others are more holistically evaluated based on the professional opinion of the instructor. InSTEOS criteria for each course are attached.

Core Course Field Experience Evaluations. All students in the education program are required to complete at least 100 hours of Preprofessional Field Experiences as part of most of the Core Courses (ED101, EDPS210, Psy 324, ED424, ED461 or ED470). In each of these field experiences, the cooperating teacher is asked to evaluate student performance over the course of the classroom experience. Again, the conceptual framework and the curriculum of each of the Core Courses is used to derive the evaluation criteria. Evaluation for each course are included.

Student Teaching Assessments: During the course of the student teaching experience, student teachers are formally evaluated at least 8 different times:

- 1) Quick Evaluation before the end of Week 2 by Student Teaching 1 cooperating teacher(s).
- 2) Mid-term evaluation by Student Teaching 1 cooperating teacher(s).
- 3) *Final Evaluation Student Teaching 1 by cooperating teacher(s).
- 4) *Final Evaluation Student Teaching 1 by university supervisor.
- 5) Quick Evaluation before the end of Week 2 by Student Teaching 2 cooperating teacher.
- 6) Mid-term evaluation by Student Teaching 2 cooperating teacher(s).
- 7) *Final Evaluation Student Teaching 2 by cooperating teacher(s).
- 8) *Final Evaluation Student Teaching 2 by university supervisor.

The data from the four summative evaluation's (*) is included in the TAD data.

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

Because of the newness of the TAD system, as of June 25, 2014 we have only received data reports back from our first cohort of students from semester one. This means we have usually one evaluation from a single semester for each student. Cumulative reports indicate that students are performing at a very high level, with scores averaging 3.6/4.0 across all criteria. Only four areas show scores with means less than 3.5.

TK1: Student Development = 3.490
TS2: Planning for Instruction= 3.396
TS4: Motivation and Management= 3.482
LDK1: Content Pedagogy= 3.498

VI. 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?

At this time, we are awaiting data from Semester 2 which will allow us to begin to assess data from a longitudinal perspective and to see if high/low trends are stable or if they fluctuate from semester to semester. Areas which produce consistently lower scores can be targeted for change by adding emphasis in the area to other classes, changing the emphasis in a specific class or by a combination of the two.

Data for individual students was used for “problem intervention” for this first semester. Students in preprofessional field experiences who received 2 or more scores of 2 or lower were met with on an individual basis by the course instructor and reasons for the low assessment were discussed. In some cases specific remediation was suggested at the discretion of the instructor.

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

At the start of the next academic year, individual scores from 2013-14 will be screened for patterns of low scores. Individuals who demonstrate a pattern of low scores will receive consideration for a specific personal development plan designed to assist with teacher candidate with development of specific skills related to the assessment criteria.

Aggregate data from TAD will be evaluated each semester and as the data accumulates, it will be evaluated for high and low scores and upward and downward trends for specific areas in the conceptual framework. In addition, disaggregation reports will be designed during semester 2 of the coming year that will allow segments of the population of teacher candidates to be evaluated and compared to the total population of teacher education candidates.