

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: B.Ed., Undergraduate Teacher Education

Department: Educational Studies

Program

Degree or Certificate Level: BA;

College/School: School of Education

EC/ECSC/ELEM/SPED/MIDDLE/SEC

Date (Month/Year): December 2020

Primary Assessment Contact: Jessica A. Leonard;

Jessica.leonard@slu.edu

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 19-20

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? Annually

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

During this year's cycle (Fall 2019-Spring 2020), the following learning outcome was identified to be reviewed. **The preservice teacher will explain the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the teaching discipline.**

Since the School of Education's undergraduate teacher education program leads to teacher certification, this student learning outcome aligns with the following state requirements:

The preservice teacher will model effective communication strategies in educational contexts.

MEE Standard 6 The teacher models effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques with students, colleagues and families to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

The preservice teacher will use reflection to analyze teaching.

MEE Standard 8 Professionalism. The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually assesses the effects of choices and actions on others. The teacher actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally in order to improve learning for all students.

The preservice teacher describes how relationships with students, families, school colleagues, and community members affects teaching and learning.

MEE Standard 9 Professional collaboration. The teacher has effective working relationships with students, families, school colleagues, and community members.

### 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

These courses are only offered on Frost campus, however due to COVID many of the courses were offered as a hybrid. MEE standards 6, 8, 9 were used. These scores came from the cooperating educator and the university supervisor evaluation.

EDSP 4380 Student Teaching in EC Inclusive Classroom

EDSP 4850 Student teaching in Elem Inclusive Classroom

EDI 4810 Obs and Student Teach EC

EDI 4820 Obs and Student teach Elem Sch  
EDI 4830 Obs and Student teach Middle Sch  
EDI4840 Obs and Student Teach Sec Sch

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

The survey was analyzed by averaging the scores. Verbal responses to interview prompts were analyzed using a qualitative content analysis method. The purpose was to identify themes and categorize them in related areas (e.g. course work, field work, etc.). The analyses of the focus group data included the program director and staff from the field office. The results of these analyses were brought to the January, 2020, undergraduate faculty meeting in the School of Education and shared. During this meeting we discussed the findings and brainstormed solutions. The conversation about what to do with this information included the entire undergraduate faculty. The conversation led to a discussion about realigning the program portfolio with the student teaching performance assessment (Missouri Educator Evaluation System, MEES). This follow-up work was completed by a smaller group of faculty members.

The university supervisor and cooperating educator work collaboratively through the student teaching semester to monitor the progress of the student's level of performance for each MEES indicator. At the conclusion of the student teaching semester, the artifacts which include the formative questionnaire are completed from the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor.

For the summative assessment regarding each MEES standard the cooperating teacher, student and university supervisor discuss progress toward the level of meeting performance.

### 4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

#### MEES 6

The fall of 2019 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3.1666/4.0 on MEES standard 6. 4 out of the 6 students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester

The other 2 students scored a 3.5, indicating the exceeding the expected level of performance.

The Spring 2020 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3.58/4.0 on MEES standard 6. 6 out of the 18 students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester.

3 out of the 18 received a 3.5 indicating the exceeding the expected level of performance.

9 out of 18 received a 4.0 which also indicated exceeding the level of performance which is the highest level achieved.

#### MEES 8

The fall of 2019 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3.25/4.0 on MEES standard 8. 4 out of the 6 students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the

necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester

One student scored a 3.5/4.0, indicating the exceeding the expected level of performance.

One student received a 2.5/4.0, indicating developing levels of performance.

The Spring 2020 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3.64/4.0 on MEES standard 8. 5 out of the 18 students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester.

3 out of the 18 received a 3.5 indicating the exceeding the expected level of performance.

10 out of 18 received a 4.0 which also indicated exceeding the level of performance which is the highest level achieved.

#### MEES 9

The fall of 2019 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3/4.0 on MEES standard 9. 100% of the students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester

The Spring 2020 data, from the assessment indicated an average of 3.53/4.0 on MEES standard 9. 7 out of the 18 students scored a 3 on the rubric which indicated that they are skilled teachers that are able to articulate the necessary knowledge and effectivity demonstrate in performance. This is the expected performance of the student teaching semester.

3 out of the 18 received a 3.5 indicating the exceeding the expected level of performance.

8 out of 18 received a 4.0 which also indicated exceeding the level of performance which is the highest level achieved.

## 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Our students on average from the fall and spring semester exceeded the expected level of performance For MEES standard 6 which indicated effective communication. This indicated that our students effectively model verbal, non-verbal, and media communication techniques with students, colleagues, and families, to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

For MEES standard 8 we also learned our students exceeded the expected level of performance for professionalism. Specially, our students are reflective practitioners who continually assess the effects of choices and actions on others.

For MEES standard 9 we learned that our students exceeded the expected level of performance regarding their professional collaboration. Our student develops effective working relationships with students, families, and colleagues and community members.

Although our students' scores indicate mastery of these three student learning outcomes, we know as reflective practitioners we must look deeper into our curriculum and instructional practices both at the university and the placements during student teaching.

We have learned to ask what will it take to have our students exceed the expected performance level rather than meet the performance level. Most of our students score 3's, how can we push them to receive 4's? We are asking how can we improve our program to insure the highest quality of teacher preparation.

## 6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

- A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

**Assessment is** reviewed annually during department meetings (two meetings per academic year) with action items determined, responsibility assigned for follow-up

The field office director presents the data and faculties a discussion regarding the strengths and leaning gaps in the data. This provided faculty an opportunity to review curricular and pedagogy changes that may increase student learning. Minutes are kept from meetings for follow-up and documentation for external audiences.

**B.** How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

This data is helping to inform the decision regarding student teaching, portfolio development, course content, and teaching techniques as we redesign our undergraduate program. The portfolio course has changed due to the fact we want our students to take ownership in their learning outcomes.

As a full faculty, we recognize we can improve our whole program by conducting a deeper analysis of the MEES data.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

## 7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

**A.** What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

Our analysis informed meaningful change by providing insight into how faculty could better serve our preservice students in preparing them for fieldwork, including student teaching. We used the analyzed data to align the program portfolio process (Portfolio I, II, and III) with the state performance instrument, MEES. Currently, student work on performance tasks are aligned with the MEES instrument. In addition, undergraduate teacher education program faculty members are reviewing program portfolios in teams to provide rich meaningful feedback to students to prepare them for fieldwork, including student teaching. As a result of faculty reflection, we identify successful student achievement of outcomes and associated strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

**B.** How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

Due to the change of assessing the portfolio, the teacher undergraduate program has experienced the student's ownership and pride their development as a professional teacher.

**C.** What were the findings of the assessment?

We have a richer and more developed and meaningful collection of student portfolios. Students have indicated that this aided in the hiring process.

**D.** How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We continue to have conversation about assessment. We do not have it down to a fine science, but are willing to put in the efforts for our students to become exceeding performance levels.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.**