

Degree/Certificate: Bachelor of Arts in Education (BAE)

Major/Option: P-3, Elementary, Secondary, and Dual Special Education Options

Submitted by: Marion Moore and Jan-Olov Johansson

Date: December 9, 2014

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2013-14

Part I – for the 2013-14 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

Teacher candidates in our undergraduate teacher preparation program will:

- use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs (5A1);
- integrate subjects across content areas (5A2);
- use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction (5A3);
- create a safe, productive learning environment (5A4);
- plan and/or adapt curricula for diverse student needs (5A5);
- ensure that students can articulate learning targets and can monitor their own progress toward those targets (5A6);
- plan Standards-driven curricula to develop student capacity for problem-solving strategies in content areas (5A7);
- prepare responsible citizens for a diverse society (5A8);
- ensure cultural competence in teaching (5A9);
- integrate technology into their classroom and/or planning (5A10);
- involve and collaborate with student families and community (5A11);
- utilize feedback and reflection to improve teaching practice (5B1);
- collaborate in and contribute to school improvement (5C1);
- demonstrate knowledge of responsibilities and policies related to the teaching profession (5C2).

Our alignment of the Teacher Preparation Program SLOs with Washington State Standard 5 for Teachers and the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) is outlined below.

The chart below demonstrates an effort to align the EWU Teacher Preparation Program SLOs with Washington’s Standard 5 for teachers and components of the edTPA. The left-hand column contains the 14 criteria that make up our SLOs and Washington State Standard 5 for

teachers. The right-hand column contains the key questions for each of the rubrics of the edTPA.

(Note: Wording differs somewhat from one content area to another, but the essential skills within each rubric are consistent across content areas. The chart below uses wording from the elementary math rubrics.)

Not all elements of our SLOs and Standard 5 have a corresponding edTPA rubric element or elements, which are expected, the edTPA was not designed to be a comprehensive assessment of Standard 5, but components of the edTPA may be applicable to multiple criteria in Standard 5 and components of course content aligned with Standard 5. In addition, “alignment” is always subject to a certain amount of ambiguity and subjective interpretation.

The edTPA is administered by Pearson and candidates submit all required materials online. Each edTPA is evaluated by external reviewers trained by Pearson. The Department of Education receives the scores for its candidates once they are reviewed (usually at the end of each quarter). Candidates are not permitted to receive any feedback from others when completing their edTPA.

The table below outlines this alignment in a two column format where the left column presents our SLOs and Standard 5 criteria and the right column presents the corresponding edTPA rubric(s). edTPA rubrics in red are currently used by the department in an in-depth analysis and discussion (Task 3, Rubrics 13 & 14) while edTPA rubrics in black are used in a summative analysis and discussion. This analysis and discussion may change as we learn more about our edTPA data and WA PESB’s decision regarding a proposed increase in the WA edTPA cutscore from 35 to 41.

Table 1: SLOs, Standard 5 and edTPA Alignment

Note: Based on an analysis of edTPA data during 2013-2014 the Department of Education has chosen to focus on rubrics in red text presented in the table below, to identify teacher candidates’ strengths and challenges and where in our course sequence such information and skills are obtained, practiced and mastered.

SLOs & Standard 5 (WAC 181-78A-270(1))	edTPA Washington rubric
A. Effective teaching	Elem math rubrics are used as examples!
(1) Using multiple instructional strategies, including the principles of second language acquisition, to address student academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	EM 4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key mathematics learning task? EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
(2) Applying principles of differentiated instruction, including theories of language acquisition, stages of language, and academic language development, in the integration of subject matter across the content areas of reading, mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	EM 4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key mathematics learning task? EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
(3) Using standards-based assessment that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies to monitor and improve instruction.	EM 5: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students’ conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and reasoning/problem solving skills? EM 10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied

	<p>learning needs?</p> <p>EM 11: How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 12: What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?</p> <p>EM 13: How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?</p> <p>EM 15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?</p>
(4) Implementing classroom/school centered instruction, including sheltered instruction that is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, and includes knowledge and skills for working with others.	<p>EM 2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?</p> <p>EM 6: How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?</p> <p>EM 7: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understanding of mathematical concepts?</p>
(5) Planning and/or adapting standards-based curricula that are personalized to the diverse needs of each student.	<p>EM 2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?</p>
(6) Aligning instruction to the learning standards and outcomes so all students know the learning targets and their progress toward meeting them.	<p>EM 16: How does the candidate focus student attention on the learning targets?</p> <p>EM 17: How does the candidate support students to access resources for learning and to monitor their own learning progress?</p> <p>EM 18: How does the candidate use student-voice evidence to identify instructional improvements?</p>
(7) Planning and/or adapting curricula that are standards driven so students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	<p>EM 1: How do the candidate's plans build students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 7: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understandings of mathematical concepts?</p> <p>EM 8: How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and develop understanding of mathematical concepts?</p> <p>EM 9: How does the candidate use representations to develop students' mathematical concepts?</p>
(8) Preparing students to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society.	NA
(9) Planning and/or adapting learner centered curricula that engage students in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age	NA

appropriate strategies.	
(10) Using technology that is effectively integrated to create technologically proficient learners.	NA
(11) Informing, involving, and collaborating with families/neighborhoods, and communities in each student's educational process, including using information about student cultural identity, achievement and performance.	NA
B. Professional development	
(1) Developing reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practices through regularly evaluating the effects of his/her teaching through feedback and reflection.	EM 10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs? EM 15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
C. Teaching as a profession	
(1) Participating collaboratively and professionally in school activities and using appropriate and respectful verbal and written communication.	NA
(2) Demonstrating knowledge of professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities and policies.	NA

2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

_____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

___X___ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

_____ SLO met without change required

3. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

In Jan. 2014 the edTPA became consequential for all teacher preparation programs in the State of Washington after extensive field work and testing (see information provided in the part II of this report). Based on previous work Spring 2013-Winter 2014, our department developed an edTPA assessment plan, strategy and evaluation tool.

Our edTPA assessment and evaluation methods included:

1. organization of edTPA data,
2. alignment of rubric scores with SLOs and Standard 5 measures,
3. creation of average rubric scores Winter and Spring 2014,
4. distribution counts and percentages across each rubric scale (1-5), and
5. summative as well as informative statistics.

In addition, we included conditional formatting to our data tables (summary displays) which helps us to visually identify areas of strength and/or challenges using colors that represents a condition for each cell (average rubric score) based on a an average rubric score scale (1-3) and definitions commonly used in the reporting and analysis of edTPA data.

Our approach to assessment and evaluation of our edTPA data allowed us to discuss pass and fail rates, summative results, task results, rubric performance and overall strength/challenge as well as addressing emerging questions through multiple queries and cross-tabulation functions. One such function is the ability to analyze current data by changing the WA cut score of 35 to the proposed national edTPA cut score of 41. Another function is to analyze edTPA data based on “proficiency” categories across time, content area, program type and retakes.

Our edTPA analysis tool also includes an option to display individual student’s results or any group of students based on predetermined selection criteria. This option helps our edTPA Coordinator and members of our CARRT Team (Committee for Admissions, Recruitment, Retention, and Transition) to provide “student-centered” support or consultation to teacher candidates who are in need of guidance, support and/or need to retake their edTPA.

Finally, our edTPA coordinator uses many examples from the use of this evaluation tool and analysis in his information and materials presented to teacher candidates in their edTPA preparation.

4. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
 1. The edTPA summary table below presents results according to our assessment strategy described above. Data representing edTPA scores included in the table are from undergraduate teacher candidates from Winter & Spring 2014.
 - i. Results show that our pass rate was 97% (112/115) for undergraduate teacher candidates with a WA cut score of 35. (Note: Two undergraduate teacher candidates have not completed their retake at this time and six out of seven candidates passed their edTPA retake).
 - ii. Average total Rubric Scores for Rubrics 1-15 was 45.6 (excluded scores from failed tests by candidates who later completed their retakes and passed).
 - iii. Average scores (Rubric Scale 1-5) in the “grand total” column suggest that scores for Task 1: Planning (3.1) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (2.9) and Task 3: Assessment (2.9).

- iv. Average scores for Rubrics 2, 5, and 12 at 3.2 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 13 and 14 at 2.7 were lower.
- v. Results suggested that seven out of 15 rubrics have average scores above 3.0. Level 3 is described and interpreted as a “proficient” score or a score that indicates “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a readiness to teach” among teacher candidates, according to edTPA rubric information. In our table, this is indicated by a “blue” font color. An orange color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a possible readiness to teach” among teacher candidates, while a red color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level” of teacher candidates who are not ready to teach. This is demonstrated by the scores in red and orange in the ‘fail’ test column.

Table 2: edTPA Data (Winter and Spring 2014)

Values	Column Labels		
	Fail	Pass	Grand Total
Count of Candidates	3	112	115
Percent (Candidates)	3%	97%	100%
Count of Test	3	112	115
Percent (Tests)	3%	97%	100%
Average of Total Rubrics 1-15	30.3	46.0	45.6
Average of Planning - Task Average	1.9	3.2	3.2
Average of Planning - Score 1: Planning for subject-specific understanding	1.3	3.2	3.2
Average of Planning - Score 2: Planning to support varied student learning needs	2.0	3.3	3.2
Average of Planning - Score 3: Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning	2.0	3.1	3.0
Average of Planning - Score 4: Identifying and supporting language demands	2.0	3.2	3.2
Average of Planning - Score 5: Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning	2.0	3.3	3.3
Average of Instruction - Task Average	2.1	3.0	3.0
Average of Instruction - Score 6: Learning environment	3.0	3.1	3.1
Average of Instruction - Score 7: Engaging students in learning	1.7	3.0	2.9
Average of Instruction - Score 8: Deepening student learning	2.0	3.0	3.0
Average of Instruction - Score 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - Using representations	1.7	3.1	3.0
Average of Instruction - Score 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness	2.3	2.9	2.9
Average of Assessment, Academic Language, Analyzing Teaching - Task Average	2.1	3.0	3.0
Average of Assessment - Score 11: Analysis of student learning	1.3	3.2	3.1
Average of Assessment - Score 12: Providing feedback to guide learning	3.0	3.2	3.2
Average of Assessment - Score 13: Student use of feedback	2.0	2.7	2.7
Average of Assessment - Score 14: Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning	2.0	2.7	2.7
Average of Assessment - Score 15: Using assessment to inform instruction	2.0	3.0	3.0
Average of Average Rubrics 16-18 Student Voice	1.7	2.8	2.8
Average of Student Voice - Score 16: Eliciting student understanding of learning targets	1.3	2.9	2.9
Average of Student Voice - Score 17: Supporting student use of resources to learn and monitor their own progress	1.7	2.8	2.8
Average of Student Voice - Score 18: Reflecting on student voice evidence to improve instruction	2.0	2.7	2.7

Note: Each edTPA rubric is composed of a scale from 1 – 5.

Based on our analysis and discussion of our results, the department has focused attention on Task 3: Assessment, Academic Language, and Analyzing Teaching, specifically Rubric 13 – Students use of feedback & Rubric 14- Analyzing students’ language use and subject-specific learning. Rubrics 16 -18 are not “consequential” at this time.

An analysis of the distribution of Rubric 13 scores across the rubric scale 1-5 suggested that our teacher candidates' scores were mostly 2's and 3's. In fact, scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 43.5 percent and scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 40.9 percent of all scores among our undergraduate teacher candidates. No teacher candidate produced a score above a 4.0. Rubric 14 scores across the rubric scale 1-5 were mostly 2's and 3's as well. In fact, scores between 2-2.5 accounted for 35.7 percent and scores between 3-3.5 accounted for 55.7 percent of all scores among candidates. No candidate produced a score above a 4. These results are presented in the two tables below.

Table 3a & 3b: Rubrics 13 & 14 Distribution of Scores

Rubric 13		
Program	EDUC	
Row Labels	Count	%
1	2	1.7%
1.5	1	0.9%
2	41	35.7%
2.5	9	7.8%
3	46	40.0%
3.5	1	0.9%
4	15	13.0%
Grand Total	115	100.0%

Rubric 14		
Program	EDUC	
Row Labels	Count	%
1.5	2	1.7%
2	34	29.6%
2.5	7	6.1%
3	64	55.7%
4	8	7.0%
Grand Total	115	100.0%

Interpretation of Rubric 13 & 14 distribution scores suggested that between 54 and 63 percent of our undergraduate teacher candidates demonstrated a level of “proficiency” (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA, while between 37 and 46 percent struggled in providing such evidence.

Scores of 2.5 or lower (Level 2 or lower) suggested that our undergraduate teacher candidates provided “vague” explanations or explanations without evidence for Rubric 13 and provided “descriptions” without or with limited evidence for Rubric 14. Using the “description” provided of these two rubrics and rubric scales we identified the difference in the “quality” of evidence provided to the edTPA by our teacher candidates. See examples from the edTPA Elementary Math Rubrics 13 and 14 below.

EM 13: How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?

Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback

How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Opportunities for applying feedback are not described.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform student learning.</p>	<p>Candidate provides vague explanation for how focus students will use feedback.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how focus students will apply feedback to improve learning related to learning targets.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how s/he will support focus students to apply feedback on their strengths and weaknesses to deepen understandings and skills related to the learning targets.</p>	<p>Level 4 plus: Candidate guides focus students to generalize feedback to future assignments or contexts.</p>

EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?

Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Mathematics Learning

How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate identifies student language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands (function,⁶ vocabulary, and additional demands).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not address students' repeated misuse of vocabulary.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate's description or explanation of language use is not consistent with the evidence submitted.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how students use vocabulary associated with the language function.</p>	<p>Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the language function AND one or more additional language demand(s) (vocabulary, mathematical precision, syntax, discourse).⁷ 	<p>Candidate explains and provides concrete evidence of students' use of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the language function, vocabulary, AND additional language demand(s) (mathematical precision, syntax, discourse) <p>in ways that develop content understandings.</p>	<p>Level 4 plus: Candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for students with varied needs.</p>

- Even if we can provide a summary and an in-depth analysis of edTPA data, our evaluation and analysis of this data is also related to how these edTPA rubrics (13 & 14) align with and can be used as “good” performance measures of our SLOs and Standard 5, specifically SLO # 1, 2 and 3. Table 4 below describes this alignment and Table 5 outlines our results.

Table 4: Alignment of SLOs, Standard 5, and edTPA

SLOs	Standard 5	edTPA Rubric – Task 3: Rubrics 13 & 14	edTPA Rubric 13 & 14 Scale Example
<p>1. Use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs.</p>	<p>(1) Using multiple instructional strategies, including the principles of second language acquisition, to address student academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>14: Analyzing students' language use and content understanding. <i>How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content</i></p>	<p>Levels 1 - 2: Candidate identifies student language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands AND describes how students are introduced to vocabulary associated with the learning experience.</p> <p>Levels 3 - 5: Candidate explains and</p>

		<i>understanding?</i>	provides evidence that student use the vocabulary associated with the learning experience AND explains and provides evidence of how student use the vocabulary to promote understandings related to the learning experience AND explains and provides evidence of vocabulary use and learning related to the learning experience for children at different levels on the developmental continuum.
2. Integrate subjects across content areas.	(2) Applying principles of differentiated instruction, including theories of language acquisition, stages of language, and academic language development , in the integration of subject matter across the content areas of reading, mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	14: Analyzing students' language use and content understanding. <i>How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?</i>	Same as above.
3. Use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction.	(3) Using standards-based assessment that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies to monitor and improve instruction.	13: Student use of feedback. <i>How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?</i>	Levels 1 - 2: Candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform learning AND provides vague explanation for how focus students will use feedback. Levels 3 - 5: Candidate describes how focus students will apply feedback to improve learning related to the learning targets OR describes how s/he will support focus students to apply feedback on their strengths and weaknesses to deepen understandings and skills related to the learning targets AND guides focus students to generalize feedback to future assignment or contexts.

Table 5: Results of SLOs, edTPA and edTPA Rubric Scale

SLOs	edTPA Rubric – Task 3	edTPA Rubric Scale
1. Use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs.	Rubric 14 Average: 2.7 (Scale 1-5) Percent Proficient (Level 3 or higher): 72/115 teacher candidates or 63 percent	edTPA – Rubric 14 Level 1: Candidate identifies student language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands. 1.7 percent (2/115) Level 2: Candidate describes how students are introduced to vocabulary associated with the learning experience. 37.3 percent

		<p>(41/115) Level 3: Candidate explains and provides evidence that student use the vocabulary associated with the learning experience. 55.7 percent (64/115) Level 4: Candidate explains and provides evidence of how student use the vocabulary to promote understandings related to the learning experience. 7.0 percent (8/115) Level 5: Candidate explains and provides evidence of vocabulary use and learning related to the learning experience for children at different levels on the developmental continuum.</p>
2. Integrate subjects across content areas.	<p>Rubric 14 Average: 2.7 (Scale 1-5) Percent Proficient (Level 3 or higher): 72/115 teacher candidates or 63 percent</p>	Same as above.
3. Use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction.	<p>Rubric 13 Average: 2.7 (Scale 1-5) Percent Proficient (Level 3 or higher): 62/115 teacher candidates or 54 percent</p>	<p>edTPA Rubric 13 Level 1: Candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform learning. 1.6 percent (3/115) Level 2: Candidate provides vague explanation for how focus students will use feedback. 43.4 percent (50/115) Level 3: Candidate describes how focus students will apply feedback to improve learning related to the learning targets. 40.9 percent (47/115) Level 4: Candidate describes how s/he will support focus students to apply feedback on their strengths and weaknesses to deepen understandings and skills related to the learning targets. 13.0 percent (15/115) Level 5: Candidate guides focus students to generalize feedback to future assignment or contexts.</p>

Rubrics 13 & 14 provided “**good examples**” of performance measures that can be aligned with for our identified SLOs. However, using Rubric 14 as a performance measure for both SLO 1 & 2 is clearly a limitation and other edTPA Rubrics should be added to strengthen the alignment.

We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 97 percent, undergraduate teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 13 & 14 were not as strong when we looked at the distribution of scores across the rubric scale.

We have discussed supports and strategies that target Task 3, to help our undergraduate teacher candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as provide them with

“good” concrete examples of evidence that will guide their edTPA preparation while in our program.

5. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

- a) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

Our work during 2013-2014 has further developed our curriculum scope and sequence as well as implementation of tools to assess undergraduate teacher candidates' progress and achievements over the course of the program. Presented below are examples of how the department has implemented their strategies related to SLO 1, 2 & 3 in 2013-2014.

Note: This work was started in 2012-2013.

SLO #1: Teacher candidates will use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs. (Standard 5.1 & edTPA Rubrics 4 & 14)

Candidates in **Beginning Application Courses** (EDUC 310 for elementary; 413 for Secondary BAE, and EDUC 457 for P-3) receive specific instruction on differentiating instruction. In EDUC 310 Literacy Methods, candidates write a long range reading plan that must include consideration about language acquisition and language development. In EDUC 413 Secondary Content Area Reading, Management, and Assessment, students are taught how to integrate reading, writing, and communication with secondary content areas. In EDUC 457 Collaborative Reflective Teaching in ECE, candidates write lesson plans that include language development in all content areas.

Candidates in **Practice Content/Skill Courses** (EDUC 338, EDUC 339, EDUC 341, and EDUC 547) continue to hone their ability to differentiate instruction and integrate subject matter by writing and teaching lesson plans that include multiple strategies for integration and language acquisition. In EDUC 339, which is an elementary science/social studies methods course, candidates are required to write a unit plan that integrates science and social studies with other content areas. In addition to integration, candidates must address how they will differentiate each lesson plan.

Because the department has implemented a standard lesson plan template, all candidates address differentiated instruction in every lesson plan they write.

**SLO #2: Teacher candidates will integrate subjects across content areas.
(Standard 5.2 & edTPA Rubrics 4 & 14)**

In EDUC 303, candidates learn about and begin to apply principles of differentiated instruction. For example one assignment allows candidates the opportunity to create a lesson plan at multiple levels of complexity. The level of complexity each student receives is differentiated based on that student's current skills. Candidates' lessons may have as few as two tiers or as many as five based on the learning needs of their students.

Candidates are introduced to various approaches of differentiation, including Marzano's research-based high yield strategies. Students use this information to develop a lesson plan based on the context of the classroom in which they are placed. The lesson plan must address how they achieve differentiation based on individual student needs.

Candidates in **Beginning Application Courses** (EDUC 310 for elementary; 413 for secondary BAE, and EDUC 457 for P-3) receive specific instruction on differentiating instruction (Conceptual Framework, CF1). In EDUC 310 Literacy Methods, candidates write a long range reading plan that must include consideration about language acquisition and language development. In EDUC 413 Secondary Content Area Reading, Management, and Assessment, students are taught how to integrate reading, writing, and communication with secondary content areas. In EDUC 457 Collaborative Reflective Teaching in ECE, candidates write lesson plans that include language development in all content areas.

Candidates in **Practice Content/Skill courses** (EDUC 338, EDUC 339, and EDUC 341) continue to hone their ability to differentiate instruction and integrate subject matter by writing and teaching lesson plans that include multiple strategies for integration and language acquisition (Conceptual Framework, CF1). In EDUC 339, which is an elementary science/social studies methods course, candidates are required to write a Unit Plan that integrates science and social studies with other content areas. In addition to integration, candidates must address how they will differentiate each lesson plan.

SLO #3: Teacher candidates will use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction. (Standard 5.3 & edTPA Rubrics 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, & 15)

Candidates taking foundations courses are introduced to the use of standards-based assessments as tools to monitor student learning, help students develop skills for independent self-assessment, and improve candidate instruction. For example, in EDUC 303 Foundations of Assessment, instructors discuss Lee

Shulman's concept of "A Union of Insufficiencies" which helps candidates understand that having multiple modes of assessment is crucial to accurately measuring student mastery. Another topic addresses how candidates can ensure that the assessments they design are linked with instructional objectives and lesson tasks. Candidate success is measured by creating a lesson plan which includes, objectives, tasks, and assessments that reinforce one another as well as self-assessment.

In EDUC 493 Integrated Early Childhood Practices, candidates learn the processes of planning, implementing, and assessing, using authentic assessment strategies to gauge learning outcomes. The culminating assignment is a portfolio with a section devoted to assessment, including self-assessment.

In EDUC 500, candidates learn about assessment needs, types, and processes and do a group presentation on what they have learned (self-assessment). A summative exam at the end of the quarter tests candidates' over-all knowledge regarding assessment.

In EDUC 310 and 413, candidates continue to learn about assessments and how to modify instruction based on the data. They also begin working with students in their field placement school, during which time they write and teach 4 lesson plans, a section of which is devoted to strategies for the use of formative and summative assessments. In the candidate/supervisor post-conference, candidates reflect on whole-class and individual student patterns identified by their assessments. They also discuss what the assessments tell them about their own teaching and how to use the data to drive future instruction.

Candidates in EDUC 338, 339 and 341 continue to learn about, practice, and reflect upon their use of assessment. Candidates continue working in their field placement school, creating and teaching at least eight (8) lessons. They also continue to meet with their supervisors for post-lesson reflection and self-assessment conferences.

BAE candidates in EDUC 420 complete a portfolio as their culminating assignment and include an artifact that shows how they have met Standard 5.A.3 (Conceptual Framework, CF1). During student teaching, conversations with Mentor Teachers and Supervisors increasingly focus on the use of multiple assessments, including self-assessment, and the need to use the data gathered to adjust current instruction and plan for future lessons.

During student teaching, candidates complete the edTPA. This allows them to demonstrate their skill and capacity to assess students' learning by collecting, analyzing and reflecting on evidence of student learning.

- b) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

According to our department assessment plan adopted in 2013-2014 we assess progress on implementation and program changes each quarter, we are planning an annual evaluation to be conducted during Summer Quarter 2015 as part of our program approval process and in the process utilize data from the edTPA assessment and other measures identified above.

Table 6: Results of SLOs, edTPA and edTPA Rubric Scale

Quarter By the end of ...	SLOs and edTPA	Curriculum Scope and Sequence	Teacher Candidate Support
Fall 2014	Preliminary analysis with additional rubrics. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Identify “key” assessment in Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (Science, Math, Music)	Distribution of edTPA Handbooks. Discussion of use by faculty to target Rubrics 13 & 14. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support (preparation, individual and group).
Winter 2015	Analysis and alignment with other data – Lesson Observation Tool. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Provide “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (English and other content areas)	Faculty support examples Rubrics 13 & 14 utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support.
Spring 2015	Analysis and alignment with other data – PVA & Mid-Term & Final Evaluation Tool Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Align “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses with edTPA and other evaluation tools. Cross-campus edTPA report.	Faculty support examples for other Rubrics utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support.
Summer 2015	Evaluation of 2014-2015 edTPA data, analysis and implementation – What have we learned?	Evaluation of alignment and “key” course assessments. Evaluation of results. Feedback from cross-campus efforts.	Evaluation of support examples and teacher candidate edTPA support.

6. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

Results from Rubrics 13 & 14 provided a **good example** of using edTPA data as performance measures for our identified SLOs. We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 97 percent, teacher candidates’ scores on Rubrics 13 & 14 can be

improved by helping our candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as guide their edTPA preparation with concrete examples of quality evidence.

We learned that edTPA Rubrics 13 & 14 can be used as performance measure for our identified SLOs, but we need to be cautious, because they do not capture the broad definition of each SLO and Rubric 14 was used for both SLO 1 & 2. Additional edTPA rubrics and measures are needed to better measure each of the SLOs.

We are looking at a combination of additional rubrics from the edTPA aligned with each SLO and data from additional data sources, listed below and that have been aligned with Standard 5 and edTPA. Data from selected items of the following sources would provide a better assessment and evaluation of our SLOs:

- Mid-term and Final Evaluations in field experience
- Performance Verification Assessments (PVAs) in core courses
- Lesson Observation evaluation from field experience

Starting Fall Quarter 2014, we will use data from our new Field Experience Lesson Observation assessment tool (aligned with Standard 5 and edTPA Rubrics). However, we recognize challenges with data entry and data management related to our Mid-term and Final Evaluation and PVA assessment tools. We are working on changing this data collection process and hoping we can start collecting data Spring 2015 using a web-based application.

We have improved our alignment process, evaluation and analysis of these SLOs to identify “how” we can better help our teacher candidates in their development of knowledge and skills in our courses, field experiences and “student-centered” learning opportunities as described in this report.

We are implementing strategies in 2014-2015 that have and will provide faculty with more edTPA information and support, and providing examples of quality “pedagogy” evidence for their edTPA test in their preparation as well as individual teacher candidate support. In addition, like other programs across the state, we need to strengthen the process of *when* and *how* we provide feedback and identify clear examples of high quality edTPA evidence.

This process and analysis has helped us identify what is needed in utilizing edTPA data for program improvement, candidate support and reporting and we will continue our focus on how we can improve our process, collaboration, analysis and reporting utilizing edTPA data.

Degree/Certificate: **Master in Teaching (MIT)**

Major/Option: **Education (Elementary and Secondary)**

Submitted by: **Marion Moore and Jan-Olov Johansson**

Date: **December 9, 2014**

Part I – Program SLO Assessment Report for 2013-14

Part I – for the 2013-14 academic year: Because Deans have been asked to create College-Level Summary Reports annually, the template has been slightly modified for a) clarity for Chairs and Directors, and b) a closer fit with what the Deans and Associate Deans are being asked to report.

7. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.

Teacher candidates in our MIT teacher preparation program will:

- use multiple instructional strategies to address individual student needs (5A1);
- integrate subjects across content areas (5A2);
- use a variety of assessments to monitor and improve instruction (5A3);
- create a safe, productive learning environment (5A4);
- plan and/or adapt curricula for diverse student needs (5A5);
- ensure that students can articulate learning targets and can monitor their own progress toward those targets (5A6);
- plan Standards-driven curricula to develop student capacity for problem-solving strategies in content areas (5A7);
- prepare responsible citizens for a diverse society (5A8);
- ensure cultural competence in teaching (5A9);
- integrate technology into their classroom and/or planning (5A10);
- involve and collaborate with student families and community (5A11);
- utilize feedback and reflection to improve teaching practice (5B1);
- collaborate in and contribute to school improvement (5C1);
- demonstrate knowledge of responsibilities and policies related to the teaching profession (5C2).

Our alignment of the Teacher Preparation Program SLOs with Washington State Standard 5 for Teachers and the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) is outlined below.

The chart below demonstrates an effort to align the EWU Teacher Preparation Program SLOs with Washington’s Standard 5 for teachers and components of the edTPA. The left-hand

column contains the 14 criteria that make up our SLOs and WA State Standard 5. The right-hand column contains the key questions for each of the rubrics of the edTPA.

(Note: Wording differs somewhat from one content area to another, but the essential skills within each rubric are consistent across content areas. The chart below uses wording from the elementary math rubrics.)

Not all elements of our SLOs and Standard 5 have a corresponding edTPA rubric element or elements, which are expected, the edTPA was not designed to be a comprehensive assessment of Standard 5, but components of the edTPA may be applicable to multiple criteria in Standard 5 and components of course content aligned with Standard 5. In addition, “alignment” is always subject to a certain amount of ambiguity and subjective interpretation.

The edTPA is administered by Pearson and candidates submit all required materials online. Each edTPA is evaluated by external reviewers trained by Pearson. The Department of Education receives the scores for its candidates once they are reviewed (usually at the end of each quarter). Candidates are not permitted to receive any feedback from others when completing their edTPA.

The table below outlines this alignment in a two column format where the left column presents our SLOs and Standard 5 criteria and the right column presents the corresponding edTPA rubric(s). edTPA rubrics in red are currently used by the department in an in-depth analysis and discussion (Task 3, Rubrics 13 & 14) while edTPA rubrics in black are used in a summative analysis and discussion. This analysis and discussion may change as we learn more about our edTPA data and WA PESB’s decision regarding a proposed increase in WA edTPA cutscore from 35 to 41.

Table 1: SLOs, Standard 5 and edTPA Alignment

Note: Based on an analysis of edTPA data during 2013-2014 the Department of Education has chosen to focus on rubrics in **red text** presented in the table below, to identify teacher candidates’ strengths and challenges and where in our course sequence such information and skills are obtained, practiced and mastered.

SLOs & Standard 5 (WAC 181-78A-270(1))	edTPA Washington rubric
A. Effective teaching	Elem math rubrics are used as examples!
(1) Using multiple instructional strategies, including the principles of second language acquisition, to address student academic language ability levels and cultural and linguistic backgrounds.	EM 4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key mathematics learning task? EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
(2) Applying principles of differentiated instruction, including theories of language acquisition, stages of language, and academic language development, in the integration of subject matter across the content areas of reading, mathematical, scientific, and aesthetic reasoning.	EM 4: How does the candidate identify and support language demands associated with a key mathematics learning task? EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?
(3) Using standards-based assessment that is systematically analyzed using multiple formative, summative, and self-assessment strategies to monitor and improve instruction.	EM 5: How are the informal and formal assessments selected or designed to monitor students’ conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and reasoning/problem solving skills? EM 10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students’ varied

	<p>learning needs?</p> <p>EM 11: How does the candidate analyze evidence of student learning of conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 12: What type of feedback does the candidate provide to focus students?</p> <p>EM 13: How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?</p> <p>EM 15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?</p>
(4) Implementing classroom/school centered instruction, including sheltered instruction that is connected to communities within the classroom and the school, and includes knowledge and skills for working with others.	<p>EM 2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?</p> <p>EM 6: How does the candidate demonstrate a respectful learning environment that supports students' engagement in learning?</p> <p>EM 7: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understanding of mathematical concepts?</p>
(5) Planning and/or adapting standards-based curricula that are personalized to the diverse needs of each student.	<p>EM 2: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to target support for students to develop conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 3: How does the candidate use knowledge of his/her students to justify instructional plans?</p>
(6) Aligning instruction to the learning standards and outcomes so all students know the learning targets and their progress toward meeting them.	<p>EM 16: How does the candidate focus student attention on the learning targets?</p> <p>EM 17: How does the candidate support students to access resources for learning and to monitor their own learning progress?</p> <p>EM 18: How does the candidate use student-voice evidence to identify instructional improvements?</p>
(7) Planning and/or adapting curricula that are standards driven so students develop understanding and problem-solving expertise in the content area(s) using reading, written and oral communication, and technology.	<p>EM 1: How do the candidate's plans build students' conceptual understanding, procedural fluency, and mathematical reasoning/problem solving skills?</p> <p>EM 7: How does the candidate actively engage students in developing understandings of mathematical concepts?</p> <p>EM 8: How does the candidate elicit responses to promote thinking and develop understanding of mathematical concepts?</p> <p>EM 9: How does the candidate use representations to develop students' mathematical concepts?</p>
(8) Preparing students to be responsible citizens for an environmentally sustainable, globally interconnected, and diverse society.	NA
(9) Planning and/or adapting learner centered curricula that engage students in a variety of culturally responsive, developmentally, and age	NA

appropriate strategies.	
(10) Using technology that is effectively integrated to create technologically proficient learners.	NA
(11) Informing, involving, and collaborating with families/neighborhoods, and communities in each student's educational process, including using information about student cultural identity, achievement and performance.	NA
B. Professional development	
(1) Developing reflective, collaborative, professional growth-centered practices through regularly evaluating the effects of his/her teaching through feedback and reflection.	EM 10: How does the candidate use evidence to evaluate and change teaching practice to meet students' varied learning needs? EM 15: How does the candidate use the analysis of what students know and are able to do to plan next steps in instruction?
C. Teaching as a profession	
(1) Participating collaboratively and professionally in school activities and using appropriate and respectful verbal and written communication.	NA
(2) Demonstrating knowledge of professional, legal, and ethical responsibilities and policies.	NA

8. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** Indicate whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.

_____ SLO is met after changes resulting from ongoing assessments, referencing assessment results from the previous year to highlight revisions;

___X___ SLO is met, but with changes forthcoming;

_____ SLO met without change required

9. **Strategies and methods:** Description of assessment method and choices, why they were used and how they were implemented.

In Jan. 2014 the edTPA became consequential for all teacher preparation programs in the State of Washington after extensive field work and testing (see information provided in the part II of this report). Based on previous work Spring 2013-Winter 2014, our department developed an edTPA assessment plan, strategy and evaluation tool.

Our edTPA assessment and evaluation methods included:

1. organization of edTPA data,
2. alignment of rubric scores with SLOs and Standard 5 measures,
3. creation of average rubric scores Winter and Spring 2014,
4. distribution counts and percentages across each rubric scale (1-5), and
5. summative as well as informative statistics.

In addition, we included conditional formatting to our data tables (summary displays) which helps us to visually identify areas of strength and/or challenge using colors that represents a condition for each cell (average rubric score) based on a an average rubric score scale (1-3) and definitions commonly used in the reporting and analysis of edTPA data.

Our approach to assessment and evaluation of our edTPA data allowed us to discuss pass and fail rates, summative results, task results, rubric performance and overall strength/challenge as well as addressing emerging questions through multiple queries and cross-tabulation functions. One such function is the ability to analyze current data by changing the WA cut score of 35 to the proposed national edTPA cut score of 41. Another function is to analyze edTPA data based on “proficiency” categories across time, content area, program type and retakes.

Our edTPA analysis tool also includes an option to display individual student’s results or any group of students based on predetermined selection criteria. This option helps our edTPA Coordinator and members of our CARRT Team to provide “student-centered” support or consultation to teacher candidates who are in need of guidance, support and/or need to retake their edTPA.

Finally, our edTPA coordinator uses many examples from the use of this evaluation tool and analysis in his information and materials presented to teacher candidates in their edTPA preparation.

10. **Observations gathered from data:** Include findings and analyses based on the strategies and methods identified in item #3.
 1. The edTPA summary table below presents results according to our assessment strategy described above. Data included in the table are “consequential” edTPA “MIT” teacher candidate data from Winter & Spring 2014.
 - i. Results show that our pass rate was 100 percent (18/18) for MIT teacher candidates with a WA cut score of 35.
 - ii. Average total Rubric Score for Rubrics 1-15 was 48.2.
 - iii. Average scores (Rubric Scale 1-5) in the “grand total” column suggest that scores for Task 1: Planning (3.4) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (3.2) and Task 3: Assessment (3.3).

- iv. Average scores for Rubrics 1, 5, 11 and 12 at 3.5 to 3.6 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 10, 13 and 14 at 2.9-3.0 were lower.
- v. Results suggested that 13 out of 15 rubrics have average scores above 3.0 or at or above Level 3, described and interpreted as a “proficient” score or a score that indicates “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a readiness to teach” among MIT candidates, according to edTPA rubric information. In our table, this is indicated by a “blue” font color. An orange color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a possible readiness to teach” among MIT candidates, while a red color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level” of MIT candidates who are not ready to teach.

Table 2: edTPA Data (Winter and Spring 2014)

Values	Column Labels Pass	Grand Total
Count of Candidates	18	18
Percent (Candidates)	100%	100%
Count of Test	18	18
Percent (Tests)	100%	100%
Average of Total Rubrics 1-15	48.2	48.2
Average of Planning - Task Average	3.4	3.4
Average of Planning - Score 1: Planning for subject-specific understanding	3.5	3.5
Average of Planning - Score 2: Planning to support varied student learning needs	3.1	3.1
Average of Planning - Score 3: Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning	3.4	3.4
Average of Planning - Score 4: Identifying and supporting language demands	3.4	3.4
Average of Planning - Score 5: Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning	3.5	3.5
Average of Instruction - Task Average	3.2	3.2
Average of Instruction - Score 6: Learning environment	3.4	3.4
Average of Instruction - Score 7: Engaging students in learning	3.4	3.4
Average of Instruction - Score 8: Deepening student learning	3.2	3.2
Average of Instruction - Score 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - Using representations	3.1	3.1
Average of Instruction - Score 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness	2.9	2.9
Average of Assessment, Academic Language, Analyzing Teaching - Task Average	3.3	3.3
Average of Assessment - Score 11: Analysis of student learning	3.5	3.5
Average of Assessment - Score 12: Providing feedback to guide learning	3.6	3.6
Average of Assessment - Score 13: Student use of feedback	2.9	2.9
Average of Assessment - Score 14: Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning	3.0	3.0
Average of Assessment - Score 15: Using assessment to inform instruction	3.2	3.2
Average of Average Rubrics 16-18 Student Voice	3.1	3.1
Average of Student Voice - Score 16: Eliciting student understanding of learning targets	3.2	3.2
Average of Student Voice - Score 17: Supporting student use of resources to learn and monitor their own progress	3.2	3.2
Average of Student Voice - Score 18: Reflecting on student voice evidence to improve instruction	2.9	2.9

Note: Each edTPA rubric is composed of a scale from 1 – 5.

Based on our analysis and discussion of our results, the department has focused attention on Task 3: Assessment, Academic Language, and Analyzing Teaching, specifically Rubric 13 – Students use of feedback & Rubric 14- Analyzing students’ language use and subject-specific learning. Rubrics 16 -18 are not “consequential” at this time. In addition, Rubric 10 and other results were discussed with the Director of the MIT Program.

An analysis of the distribution of Rubric 13 scores across the rubric scale 1-5 suggested that our MIT candidates' scores were mostly 3's. In fact, a score of 3 accounted for 55.6 (10/18) percent among our MIT candidates. No teacher candidate produced a score above a 4.0. Rubric 14 scores across the rubric scale 1-5 were mostly 3's as well. In fact, a score of 3 accounted for 55.6 percent. No candidate produced a score above a 4.

Interpretation of Rubric 13 & 14 distribution scores suggested that 72 percent (13/18) of our MIT teacher candidates demonstrated a level of "proficiency" (Level 3 or higher) in providing information and evidence for the edTPA, while between 28 percent (5/18) struggled in providing such evidence. See examples from the edTPA Elementary Math Rubrics 13 and 14 below.

EM 13: How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?

Rubric 13: Student Use of Feedback

How does the candidate provide opportunities for focus students to use the feedback to guide their further learning?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Opportunities for applying feedback are not described.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate provides limited or no feedback to inform student learning.</p>	<p>Candidate provides vague explanation for how focus students will use feedback.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how focus students will apply feedback to improve learning related to learning targets.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how s/he will support focus students to apply feedback on their strengths and weaknesses to deepen understandings and skills related to the learning targets.</p>	<p>Level 4 plus: Candidate guides focus students to generalize feedback to future assignments or contexts.</p>

EM 14: How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?

Rubric 14: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Mathematics Learning

How does the candidate analyze students' use of language to develop content understanding?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate identifies student language use that is superficially related or unrelated to the language demands (function,⁶ vocabulary, and additional demands).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not address students' repeated misuse of vocabulary.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate's description or explanation of language use is not consistent with the evidence submitted.</p>	<p>Candidate describes how students use vocabulary associated with the language function.</p>	<p>Candidate explains and provides evidence of students' use of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the language function AND one or more additional language demand(s) (vocabulary, mathematical precision, syntax, discourse).⁷ 	<p>Candidate explains and provides concrete evidence of students' use of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the language function, vocabulary, AND additional language demand(s) (mathematical precision, syntax, discourse) <p>in ways that develop content understandings.</p>	<p>Level 4 plus: Candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for students with varied needs.</p>

- Our evaluation and analysis of this data is related to how these edTPA rubrics (13 & 14) align with and can be used as "good" performance measures of our SLOs and

Standard 5, specifically SLO # 1, 2 and 3. However, with an n=18 we will not provide the same level of analysis as reported for our undergraduate program.

Rubrics 13 & 14 provided “**good examples**” of performance measures that can be aligned with for our identified SLOs. However, using Rubric 14 as a performance measure for both SLO 1 & 2 is clearly a limitation and other edTPA Rubrics should be added to strengthen the alignment.

We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 100 percent, MIT candidates’ scores on Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 were not as strong when we looked at the distribution of scores across the rubric scale.

We have discussed support and strategies, targeting Task 3, currently in place that can be improved and additional ways we can help our MIT candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as provide them with “good” concrete examples of evidence that will guide their edTPA preparation while in our MIT program.

11. **What program changes will be made based on the assessment results?**

- c) Describe plans to improve student learning based on assessment findings (e.g., course content, course sequencing, curriculum revision, learning environment or student advising).

Our work during 2013-2014 has further developed our MIT program to assess MIT candidates’ progress and achievements over the course of the program. Presented below are examples of how the department has implemented their strategies related to SLO 1, 2 & 3 in 2013-2014. MIT candidates take many of the same courses as our undergraduate teacher candidates. This information is the same as reported for our undergraduate program. See above.

Note: This work was started in 2012-2013.

- d) Provide a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year.

According to our department assessment plan and the MIT Program assessment plan adopted in 2013-2014 we assess progress on implementation and program changes each quarter, we are planning an annual evaluation to be conducted during Summer Quarter 2015 as part of our program approval process and in the process utilize data from the edTPA assessment and other measures identified above. This information is the same as reported for our undergraduate program.

Table 3: Results of SLOs, edTPA and edTPA Rubric Scale

Quarter By the end of ...	SLOs and edTPA	Curriculum Scope and Sequence	Teacher Candidate Support
Fall 2014	Preliminary analysis with additional rubrics. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Identify “key” assessment in Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (Science, Math, Music)	Distribution of edTPA Handbooks. Discussion of use by faculty to target Rubrics 13 & 14. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support (preparation, individual and group).
Winter 2015	Analysis and alignment with other data – Lesson Observation Tool. Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Provide “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses. Cross-campus edTPA data discussion (English and other content areas)	Faculty support examples Rubrics 13 & 14 utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support.
Spring 2015	Analysis and alignment with other data – PVA & Mid-Term & Final Evaluation Tool Provide edTPA examples for review related to Rubrics 13 & 14.	Align “key” assessment evidence and results from Practice Content/Skill courses with edTPA and other evaluation tools. Cross-campus edTPA report.	Faculty support examples for other Rubrics utilizing edTPA Handbooks. Continued teacher candidate edTPA support.
Summer 2015	Evaluation of 2014-2015 edTPA data, analysis and implementation – What have we learned?	Evaluation of alignment and “key” course assessments. Evaluation of results. Feedback from cross-campus efforts.	Evaluation of support examples and teacher candidate edTPA support.

12. Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed and an evaluation of the assessment plan/process itself.

Results from Rubrics 13 & 14 provided a **good example** of using edTPA data as performance measures for our identified SLOs. We learned that even if our edTPA pass rate is 100 percent, MIT candidates’ scores on Rubrics 10, 13 & 14 can be improved by helping our candidates identify information, develop knowledge and hone their skills in our courses and field experiences as well as guide their edTPA preparation with concrete examples of quality evidence.

We learned that edTPA Rubrics 13 & 14 can be used as performance measure for our identified SLOs, but we need to be cautious, because they do not capture the broad definition of each SLO and Rubric 14 was used for both SLO 1 & 2. Additional edTPA rubrics and measures are needed to better measure each of the SLOs.

We are looking at a combination of additional rubrics from the edTPA aligned with each SLO and data from additional data sources, listed below and that have been aligned with Standard 5 and edTPA. Data from selected items of the following sources would provide a better assessment and evaluation of our SLOs:

- Mid-term and Final Evaluations in field experience
- Performance Verification Assessments (PVAs) in core courses
- Lesson Observation evaluation from field experience

Starting Fall Quarter 2014, the MIT Program will use data from our new Field Experience Lesson Observation assessment tool (aligned with Standard 5 and edTPA Rubrics). However, we recognize challenges with data entry and data management related to our Mid-term and Final Evaluation and PVA assessment tools. We are working on changing this data collection process and hoping we can start collecting data Spring 2015 using a web-based application.

We have improved our alignment process, evaluation and analysis of these SLOs to identify “how” we can better help our teacher candidates in their development of knowledge and skills in our courses, field experiences and “student-centered” learning opportunities as described in this report.

We are implementing strategies in 2014-2015 that have and will provide faculty with more edTPA information and support, and providing examples of quality “pedagogy” evidence for their edTPA test in their preparation as well as individual teacher candidate support. In addition, like other programs across the state, we need to strengthen the process of *when* and *how* we provide feedback and identify clear examples of high quality edTPA evidence.

This process and analysis has helped us identify what is needed in utilizing edTPA data for program improvement, candidate support and reporting and we will continue our focus on how we can improve our process, collaboration, analysis and reporting utilizing edTPA data.

NEW: PART II – CLOSING THE LOOP

FOLLOW-UP FROM THE 2012-13 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT REPORT

In response to the university's accrediting body, the [Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities](#), this section has been added. This should be viewed as a follow up to the previous year's findings. In other words, begin with findings from 2012-13, and then describe actions taken during 2013-14 to improve student learning along, provide a brief summary of findings, and describe possible next steps.

Working definition for closing the loop: *Using assessment results to improve student learning as well as pedagogical practices. This is an essential step in the continuous cycle of assessing student learning. It is the collaborative process through which programs use evidence of student learning to gauge the efficacy of collective educational practices, and to identify and implement strategies for improving student learning.* Adapted 8.21.13 from <http://www.hamline.edu/learning-outcomes/closing-loop.html>.

This report covers both the Department of Education's Undergraduate and MIT programs.

1. Student Learning Outcome(s) assessed for 2012-13

See above.

2. Strategies implemented during 2013-14 to improve student learning, based on findings of the 2012-13 assessment activities.

In 2012-2013 and Fall 2013 Washington State started the implementation of the edTPA for teacher preparation programs. EWU Department of Education participated in this process and provided access to teacher candidates that participated in the field test of the edTPA. A total of 198 undergraduate and MIT teacher candidates participated and completed the edTPA during this period.

We learned that:

- edTPA is the first nationally available, educator-designed performance assessment for teachers entering the profession.
- It provides a measure of teacher candidates' readiness to teach that can inform program completion, licensure, and accreditation decisions, while supporting candidate learning and preparation program improvement.
- edTPA is a subject-specific assessment, which includes versions for 27 different teaching fields.

- The assessment systematically examines an authentic cycle of teaching aimed at specific learning goals, using evidence about 1) planning, 2) instruction, and 3) student assessment derived from candidates' practice in their student teaching or internship placement.
- Evidence includes lesson plans, instructional materials, student assignments and assessments, feedback on student work, and unedited video recordings of instruction.
- Assessed through these three tasks are candidates' abilities to develop academic language and to analyze teaching.
- edTPA is aligned with the newly revised Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) standards for beginning teacher licensing, as well as the Common Core State Standards.
- edTPA also shares key points of alignment with the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards.
- Modeled after the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' assessments of accomplished veteran teachers, edTPA was created with input from teachers and teacher educators across the country in a process led by Stanford University's Center for Assessment, Learning and Equity and supported by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- More than 1,000 educators from 29 states and the District of Columbia and more than 430 institutions of higher education participated in the design, development, piloting, and field testing of edTPA.
- An additional 650 teachers and teacher educators have served as scorers of the assessments for the 12,000 plus candidates who participated in the field tests.
- Scorers must be P-12 or higher education educators with significant pedagogical content knowledge in the field in which they score, as well as experience in working as instructors or mentors for novice teachers.
- In the field test, about half of the scorers were teacher educators and about half were practicing classroom teachers, many of whom are National Board certified.

Faculty and staff participated in meetings and received edTPA information, training and reports during this time. Each institution in the state was required to have a designated edTPA coordinator position (FTE) and a process in place that would support the implementation of the edTPA.

The department held multiple meetings and had edTPA information and results presented to them during this time. Preliminary findings and state results were distributed and an initial draft plan for assessment, analysis and reporting was developed and facilitated by the edTPA Coordinator and the Assessment Coordinator.

3. **Summary of results** (may include comparative data or narrative; description of changes made to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery, etc.): Describe the effect of the changes towards improving student learning and/or the learning environment.

1. The edTPA summary table below presents results according to our assessment strategy described above. Data included in the table are “consequential” edTPA “teacher” candidate data from the field test period 2012-2013.

- i. Results show that our pass rate was 85 percent (168/198) teacher candidates with a WA cut score of 35.
- ii. Average total Rubric Score for Rubrics 1-15 was 42.1.
- iii. Average scores (Rubric Scale 1-5) in the “grand total” column suggest that scores for Task 1: Planning (2.9) were slightly higher than Task 2: Instruction (2.8) and Task 3: Assessment (2.7).
- iv. Average scores for Rubrics 1 & 6 at 3.15 were slightly higher than other rubric scores and average scores for Rubrics 13 and 14 at 2.7 were lower.
- v. Results suggested that only two out of 15 rubrics have average scores above 3.0 or at or above Level 3, described and interpreted as a “proficient” score or a score that indicates “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a readiness to teach” among teacher candidates, according to edTPA rubric information. In our table, this is indicated by a “blue” font color. An orange color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level demonstrating a possible readiness to teach” among teacher candidates, while a red color suggests a score indicating “a knowledge and skill level” of teacher candidates who are not ready to teach. This is demonstrated by the scores in red and orange in the “fail” test column.

Table: edTPA Data (Winter and Spring 2014)

Values	Column Labels		
	Fail	Pass	Grand Total
Count of Candidates	30	168	198
Percent (Candidates)	15%	85%	100%
Count of Test	30	168	198
Percent (Tests)	15%	85%	100%
Average of Total Rubrics 1-15	30.5	44.1	42.1
Average of Planning - Task Average	2.2	3.1	2.9
Average of Planning - Score 1: Planning for subject-specific understanding	2.3	3.2	3.1
Average of Planning - Score 2: Planning to support varied student learning needs	2.2	3.1	2.9
Average of Planning - Score 3: Using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning	2.2	3.0	2.9
Average of Planning - Score 4: Identifying and supporting language demands	2.3	3.0	2.9
Average of Planning - Score 5: Planning assessments to monitor and support student learning	2.2	3.1	3.0
Average of Instruction - Task Average	2.0	2.9	2.8
Average of Instruction - Score 6: Learning environment	2.5	3.1	3.0
Average of Instruction - Score 7: Engaging students in learning	1.9	3.0	2.8
Average of Instruction - Score 8: Deepening student learning	1.9	3.0	2.8
Average of Instruction - Score 9: Subject-specific pedagogy - Using representations	1.8	2.9	2.7
Average of Instruction - Score 10: Analyzing teaching effectiveness	1.9	2.7	2.6
Average of Assessment, Academic Language, Analyzing Teaching - Task Average	1.9	2.8	2.7
Average of Assessment - Score 11: Analysis of student learning	1.8	3.0	2.8
Average of Assessment - Score 12: Providing feedback to guide learning	2.1	3.1	3.0
Average of Assessment - Score 13: Student use of feedback	1.8	2.6	2.4
Average of Assessment - Score 14: Analyzing students' language use and subject-specific learning	1.9	2.6	2.5
Average of Assessment - Score 15: Using assessment to inform instruction	1.7	2.8	2.7
Average of Average Rubrics 16-18 Student Voice	1.9	2.7	2.6
Average of Student Voice - Score 16: Eliciting student understanding of learning targets	2.0	2.9	2.7
Average of Student Voice - Score 17: Supporting student use of resources to learn and monitor their own progress	2.1	2.6	2.6
Average of Student Voice - Score 18: Reflecting on student voice evidence to improve instruction	1.7	2.6	2.4

Note: Each edTPA rubric is composed of a scale from 1 – 5.

Early analysis and discussion of these results suggested that attention to Task 3: Assessment, Academic Language, and Analyzing Teaching results were needed and that Rubric 13 – Students use of feedback & Rubric 14- Analyzing students’ language use and subject-specific learning were areas in which our candidates struggled.

4. What **further changes to curriculum, pedagogy, mode of delivery**, etc. are projected based on closing-the-loop data, findings and analysis?

Our work during 2012-2013 started the assessment and re-designed of parts of our curriculum scope and sequence as well as implementation of tools to guide, support and assess teacher candidates’ progress and achievements over the course of the program. Further, this work became a starting point and an integral part of the evidence developed and collected in 2013-2014 for our current program approval process. The start of the program approval process provided an opportunity to focus on our curriculum scope and sequence as aligned with Standard 5 and guided us through an assessment of our past and current level of practice. It has helped us identify areas of needed program support, improvement and alignment.

Definitions:

1. **Student Learning Outcome:** The student performance or learning objective as published either in the catalog or elsewhere in your department literature.
2. **Overall evaluation of progress on outcome:** This checklist informs the reader whether or not the SLO has been met, and if met, to what level.
3. **Strategies and methods used to gather student performance data,** including assessment instruments used, and a description of how and when the assessments were conducted. Examples of strategies/methods: embedded test questions in a course or courses, portfolios, in-class activities, standardized test scores, case studies, analysis of written projects, etc. Additional information could describe the use of rubrics, etc. as part of the assessment process.
4. **Observations gathered from data:** This section includes findings and analyses based on the above strategies and methods, and provides data to substantiate the distinction made in #2. For that reason this section has been divided into parts (a) and (b) to provide space for both the findings and the analysis of findings.
5. **Program changes based on the assessment results:** This section is where the program lists plans to improve student learning, based on assessment findings, and provides a broad timeline of how and when identified changes will be addressed in the upcoming year. Programs often find assessment is part of an ongoing process of continual improvement.
6. **Description of revisions to the assessment process the results suggest are needed.** Evaluation of the assessment plan and process itself: what worked in the assessment planning and process, what did not, and why.

Some elements of this document have been drawn or adapted from the University of Massachusetts' assessment handbook, "Program-Based Review and Assessment: Tools and Techniques for Program Improvement" (2001). Retrieved from http://www.umass.edu/oapa/oapa/publications/online_handbooks/program_based.pdf