End of Year Assessment Report for Programs

Program: Special Education	Semester/year: spring 2018
Contact Person: Lisa Amundson	Submission date:

Program Mission Statement

Preparing teachers to serve in a culturally diverse world.

Program Objectives

Outcome #1: Be able to state the concepts and structure basic to their subject matter specializations articulate instructional outcomes, and use teaching styles, resources, and strategies appropriate for all learners.

Outcome #2: Be able to identify important characteristics of learners stemming from sociological, psychological, and cultural environments at various stages of growth and development, and implement appropriate strategies.

Outcome #3: Be able to create positive learning environments for students from varied cultural milieus.

Outcome #4: Be able to develop and utilize teaching strategies based on tested psychological principles, learning theories, current research, and emerging technology appropriate for various teaching and learning environments.

Outcome #5: Be able to engage students in higher level thinking by using an array of technological and other resources, and a variety of written and communication techniques.

Outcome #6: Be able to use a variety of assessment strategies and techniques to assure positive student development.

Outcome #7: Be able to distinguish among different roles of students, parents, and school officials within diverse social contexts and to create positive learning experiences within school and community environments.

Outcome #8: Be able to state cognitive, affective, and psychomotor goals of education from historical, philosophical, social, cultural, and global perspectives and be able to use these goals in assessing personal attitudes and strategies, learning environments, and the profession.

Outcome #9: Assume responsibility for staying abreast of current professional developments and educational research with regard to theory and best practice.

Outcome #10: Exemplify in planning and demonstrate in practice the dispositions articulated by unit faculty as necessary for all teacher education candidates.

Outcome #11: Be able to communicate effectively in both written and spoken modes with all constituents.

Assessment Methods and Benchmarks – SPRING SEMESTER

Program Objective	Introducing	Developing	Mastering
PO1 concepts and structure	EDUC 355-Interactive math methods journal	EDUC 356-Curriculum planning project EDUC 409-Structure of discipline	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO2 characteristics of learners	EDUC 282-Movie Analysis	EDUC 280-Diverse Learner Presentation	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO3 learning environments	EDUC 333-CMP Tier 1	Clinical seminars-Exit interview prompt #2	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark>=37
PO4 teaching strategies	EDUC 282-Reference document	EDUC 333-CMP Tier 1	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO5 higher level thinking	EDUC 333-CMP Tier 1	EDUC 333-CMP Tier 2	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO6 assessment strategies	EDUC 340-Performance Assessment	Clinical seminars-Exit interview prompt #3	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO7 distinguish roles of stakeholders	EDUC 340-Student led conferences	EDUC 333-FBA-BIP	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO8 goals of education	EDUC 101-Final exam	EDUC 333-Classroom debate	edTPA
	not offered this semester	not offered this semester	Benchmark: >=37
PO9 professionally current	EDUC 101-Best practices presentations	Clinical seminars-Exit interview prompt #1	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO10 articulated dispositions	EDUC 101-Self assessment of dispositions	Field based methods courses-field experience	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37

PO11 communicate effectively	EDUC 280-IEP Simulation	Clinical seminars-Exit interview	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37
PO12 Be a model of hope	Field based methods courses-field experience	Field based methods courses-field experience	edTPA
	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=70%	Benchmark: >=37

Assessment Findings – SPRING SEMESTER

PO1. Concepts and structure
   A. Introducing: EDUC 355-Interactive math methods journal– students document the '**big ideas**' of the target concept. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   B. Developing: **EDUC 356-Curriculum planning project**-Students work on a collegial "grade-level" team to plan a unit on an assigned topic. The unit will incorporate edTPA Task 1. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   C. **EDUC 409-** Students select a unit topic that they will most likely teach future students. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   D. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO2 characteristics of learners
   A. Introducing: Movie Analysis- students write educationally based movie review given instructor created prompts. A rubric is used to assess the assignment. 100% of students met the benchmark. (2/2)
   E. Developing: Diverse Learner presentation. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   F. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO3 learning environments
   A. Introducing: Develop a Classroom Management Plan described through a Positive Behavior Support Tier 1 structure. 100% of students met the benchmark. (1/1)
   B. Developing: Exit interviews not conducted as of this report.
   G. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO4 teaching strategies
   A. Introducing: Create a reference document that provides the key information for the covered in the course. 100% of students met the benchmark. (1/1)
   B. Developing: Develop a Classroom Management Plan described through a Positive Behavior Support Tier 1 structure. 100% of students met the benchmark. (1/1)

H. Mastering: NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO5 higher level thinking
   A. Introducing: Develop a Classroom Management Plan described through a Positive Behavior Support Tier 1 structure. 100% of students met the benchmark. (1/1)
   B.   Developing: Develop a Tier 2 plan, which addresses interventions that will be used for students with diverse behavioral challenges. 100% of students met the benchmark. (1/1)
   I.   Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO6 assessment strategies
   J.   Introducing: Teacher candidates create a Performance Assessment Tool. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   A.   Developing: Exit interviews not conducted as of this report.
   K. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO7 distinguish roles of stakeholders
   L.   Introducing: Teacher Candidates explore the benefits of student led conferences from the various vantage points of stakeholders: students, teachers, parents, and administrators. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   M. Developing: Revise your Data Collection Project and continue the process with creating a Functional Behavior Assessment/Behavior Intervention Plan. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   N. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring

PO8 goals of education
   O. Introducing: Final exam. NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   P.   Developing: Students participated in debate NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   Q. Mastering: edTPA- NA- no Special Education students took this course in the spring
   A.

PO 9 professionally current
   A. Introducing: Students investigate research-based best practices in a particular discipline. 83% of students met the benchmark. (5/6)
   B.   Developing: Exit interviews not conducted as of this report.
   C. Mastering: edTPA- 100% of students met the benchmark (00%)

PO 10 articulated dispositions
   A. Introducing: Students complete the same dispositions form that will be submitted if there are any disposition alerts and use their self-assessment to set goals. 83% of students met the benchmark. (5/6)

B. Developing: Students are evaluated in field placements by cooperative teachers using Likert scale. Expectation of scores increase relative to time spent in program. We do not currently have the capacity to show program totals in this assessment. We examine student performance individually.
C. Mastering: edTPA- 100% of students met the benchmark (00%).

PO 11 communicate effectively
A. Introducing: IEP simulation. 100% of students met benchmark. (9/9)
B. Developing: Exit interviews not conducted as of this report.
C. Mastering: edTPA- 100% of students met the benchmark (00%).

PO 12 Be a model of hope
A. Introducing: Students are evaluated in field placements by cooperative teachers using Likert scale. Expectation of scores increase relative to time spent in program. We do not currently have the capacity to show program totals in this assessment. We examine student performance individually.
B. Developing: Students are evaluated in field placements by cooperative teachers using Likert scale. Expectation of scores increase relative to time spent in program. We do not currently have the capacity to show program totals in this assessment. We examine student performance individually.
C. Mastering: edTPA- 100% of students met the benchmark (00%).

Analysis of Assessment Findings – SPRING SEMESTER

Assessment findings during this semester included course assignment, exit interview, final student teaching evaluations, and edTPA data The School of Education faculty reviewed and analyzed these findings to decide possible programmatic changes. Both professional education courses and specialization courses determine changes in which we were willing to make in order to embed edTPA language and tasks into the courses. One massive curricular effort involved revising our program to a new structure. Faculty members who taught the on-campus version of the course wrote all the courses. This ensured that courses had similar levels of rigor and similar or analogous opportunities to build edTPA-like skills. In addition, a video library for edTPA was created and made available through the edTPA community resource center on D2L, which is the institutional course delivery platform. The Resource Center provided official edTPA documentation, a common edTPA lesson template, and resources to support individuals in completing the performance assessment without faculty/supervisor support. The Resource Center also provided support for new faculty, new mentors, and cooperating teachers who were unfamiliar with the edTPA assessment. Finally, clinical courses, completed the semester prior to student teaching, were revised to provide teacher candidates an opportunity to prepare for student teaching and make gains in the program objectives.

Roles and Responsibilities: As a result of considering the baseline data, other programmatic assessments, and the curricula, the teacher education faculty assumed various responsibilities to implement changes in their courses to accommodate edTPA-related tasks and language. Specifically, each faculty member took on the responsibility to address academic language, which includes language functions, syntax, and discourse into student courses, field experiences, and clinical experiences. Clinical professors were responsible for revising their

courses so that teacher candidates could implement edTPA tasks that would be scored at the local level. This provided the teacher candidates an opportunity to receive feedback on each of the edTPA tasks. The clinical professors were responsible for assigning teacher candidates to mentors that could assist with providing content area-related feedback throughout their implementation of edTPA.

Professional Development and Funding: Four faculty members in the School of Education received training through Pearson to become edTPA scorers. This training assisted the faculty in determining and designing further revisions to their courses. Furthermore, the experience was shared with other faculty members to help the entire School of Education become more aware of the expectations.

Current Change

Influences: The School of Education faculty were well aware that the methods training these candidates received occurred when faculty were still processing the rubric language and expectations. As such, each iteration of courses often involved new changes. Instructors were basing these changes on two primary variables: (1) their own observations on what students were struggling with when they incorporated edTPA-like tasks and (2) recognition of edTPA language and/or prompts that were confusing to School of Education faculty (i.e., "If I struggled with this, I can imagine it will also be difficult for our candidates."). The edTPA data provided an additional source of information for making changes, in particular area(s) that were significantly below the state and national mean. Another influencing factor was the awareness that the cut score would be increasing. While all the teacher candidates passed the edTPA, students who were still in methods courses would eventually be held to higher expectations, so we were particularly interested in responding to the data to strengthen our methods courses.

Assessment: The edTPA data was of particular interest because it offered a much larger pool of participants, who were all motivated to do their best since it was a high-stakes assessment for them. As such, it provided a more accurate picture of where our program is strong and where it needs to be improved. The Elementary Literacy edTPA data was most useful in this regard as it involved the largest pool of data. The total mean score for our Elementary Literacy edTPA participants was 43.5, which was lower than both the state (45.4) and the national (44.8) means. The edTPA is subdivided into 3 tasks (Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning, Assessing Student Learning). Each of these tasks is further sub-divided into 5 categories with associated rubrics. Greenville University performed worse than the state and national mean in all 5 categories of Task 1 (Planning for Literacy Learning, Planning to Support Varied Student Needs, Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning, Identifying and Supporting Language Demands, and Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning). When rubric scores are combined, the GU Task 1 mean was 14.3 in comparison to the state mean of 15.3 and the national mean of 15.1. Task 2 consists of the following sub-categories: Learning Environment, Engaging Students in Learning, Deepening Student Learning, Subject-Specific Pedagogy, and Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness. The Task 2 mean was on par with state and national means (14.8, 14.9, and 14.8, respectively). Our scores on individual categories never varied by more than 0.1 point and exceeded both the state and national means in one category (Subject-Specific Pedagogy). Task 3 consists of the following subcategories: Analysis of Student Learning, Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning, Student Understanding and Use of Feedback, Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning, and Using Assessment to Inform Instruction. The Task 3 data was equal to the national mean and .1 point lower than the state mean in two of the subcategories (Student Understanding and Use of Feedback

and Using Assessment to Inform Instruction). Two of the categories were .1 point lower than the national and .2 points lower than the state mean (Analysis of Student Learning and Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning). GU teacher candidates were significantly lower in one category: Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning (GU had a mean of 2.5 compared to 2.9 and 2.8 for the state and nation, respectively). The mean total for Task 3 was 14.2 for Greenville University Elementary Literacy edTPA, compared to 15.1 for the state and 14.7 for the nation. When looking at all 15 categories of the 2015-2016 Elementary Literacy edTPA data and comparing it to the state data, it is interesting to note that we were .1 point higher in one category, we were .1 or .2 lower in 12 categories, we were the same in 1 category, and we were significantly lower (.4) in Analyzing Student Language Use and Literacy Learning.

The School of Education provides Exit Interview data, each prompt produced consistent data across all teacher candidates. The 5 prompts were revised to focus on 3 areas: Theory/Practice, Learning Environment/Classroom Community, and Assessment.

Curricula: Instructors continued to make revisions to course assignments and/or provide more explicit instruction or models in academic language development in light of the challenges students experienced with these edTPA components. All instructors were also required to ensure that students were members of the edTPA community group and that they used this resource frequently prior to clinicals and student teaching. Furthermore, course instructors revised instructional planning tasks to incorporate the edTPA prompts and a school-developed edTPA lesson template that was designed to familiarize teacher candidates with the expectations and provide multiple opportunities for them to get feedback and improve in meeting these expectations.

Roles and Responsibilities: Faculty members shared in department meetings their efforts to address the concerns with academic language and the resources we had found helpful. For example, Jeff Zwiers' work in this area is cited in the Elementary Literacy edTPA Assessment Handbook, so books he has authored were purchased by department funds for the library. His book *Academic Conversations* includes disciplinary thinking skills that are language-oriented and rubrics for evaluating and giving feedback on oral discourse.

Potential Future Development

Influences: Potential future developments are influenced by the academic year data collection of edTPA scores, national and state averages on the edTPA, and exit interview data. The increase in the cut score for the academic year from 35 to 37 is also influential as the student scores must be increased to meet this threshold. Each of the increases has consequences for our candidates and the program.

Assessment: EdTPA Data results for the previous academic year yielded data that revealed improvements in some areas, as well as areas that require further analysis. The total score mean for the Elementary Literacy rubrics for Greenville University student teachers was 45.8, while the state total mean score was 45.6 and the national total mean score was 45.5. All three of these means showed an increase from the 2015-2016 scores, but GU notably went from the lowest of the means to the highest of the means. GU School of Education faculty noted that the efforts that have been put into place to improve learning outcomes have led to positive results.

While the total mean score for Greenville University student teachers is slightly above both state and national total mean scores, an analysis of the individual rubric averages reveals additional areas where the program can make improvements. The areas where our candidates exceed the state and national mean score in the Planning Instruction and Assessment Task include Planning for Literacy Learning, Planning to Support Varied Student Needs, and Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning. The Identifying and Supporting Language Demands mean score for our candidates is 3, while the state and national mean score is 3.1. The Planning Assessments

to Monitor and Support Student Learning mean score for our candidates is on par with both state and national scores with a mean score of 3. Data from the second task, Instructing and Engaging Students, reveals similar patterns. Greenville University Candidates had a mean score of .10 above the state and national mean score on the Engaging Students in Learning, Deepening Student Learning, and Subject Specific Pedagogy rubrics. While our candidates are .1 below the state and national mean score on the Learning Environment rubric, they are on par with state and national mean score of 2.8 on the Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness rubric. The data from the final task, Assessment of Learning, reveal areas where the improvements are needed. The Providing Feedback to Guide Further Learning rubric reveals candidates scoring at 3.2, while the state and national score mean is at 3.3. The more alarming concerns surround the Student Understanding and Use of Feedback rubric, where candidates have a mean score of .2 below the state and national mean score of 2.9. The other area of concern is the Using Assessments to Inform Instruction rubric where again, candidates have a mean score of .20 below the state and national mean score of 3.2. The Analysis of Student Learning rubric mean score for Greenville University candidates is 3.2, while the state and national mean score is 3.1. The Analyzing Students' Language Use and Literacy Learning rubric mean score for our candidates is consistent with both state and national mean scores at 2.9.

The other data point is from the exit interviews. The process and prompts remained unchanged from the previous academic year, so the data is only minimally useful. Interviewers were free to select any three of the five prompts for the interview with their candidates. Inter-rater reliability was also a significant concern when reviewing the scores. This prompted changes in a training module for interviewers was designed and piloted by one student teaching supervisor. In addition, the department selected three prompts that would be used in all interviews rather than allowing a choice of three from the five prompts. Another item of consideration was how to effectively collect and use the interviewer's comments that provide a rationale for the scores. The fall data for the exit interview revealed a student mean score of 3 on the question regarding theories that contribute to their field of teaching, a student mean score of 2.5 on describing the ideal classroom community that they hope to create, and a student score mean of 2.8 on discussing the link between assessment and instruction.

Sharing and Discussion of Assessment Findings – SPRING SEMESTER

Program assessment results are shared in bi-weekly SOE meetings, bi-annual SOE program assessment meetings, and monthly COTE meetings. State assessment results are shared on the Greenville University website. Curricula: In response to the data several considerations connected to curriculum was discussed. First, it is important that instructors emphasize the intent of 'next steps' when designing instruction that is driven by assessment data. In addition, candidates have not had a wealth of experience or opportunity as students to use feedback in their own learning. In fact, the candidates rarely experience this opportunity in their own learning and this makes it difficult for them to understand the important role of feedback for their own students.

Roles and Responsibilities: As a result of considering the data, other programmatic assessments, and the curricula, the teacher education faculty assumed various responsibilities to implement changes in their courses to address areas of concern. Specifically, faculty members took on the responsibility to consider how they are incorporating opportunities to explore the concept of 'next steps' when responding to student assessment results. In addition, the assessment course was reviewed and strengthened as students were asked to

analyze raw data, determine patterns based on the objectives measured, and determine potential next steps. For the use of feedback area, faculty need to consider how to address this concern in multiple courses as this area of weakness is most likely reflective of the candidates' lack of experience with receiving effective feedback and using that feedback to further their learning in the P-12 years.

Professional Development and Funding: Professional development is needed for faculty that provides examples of both modeling and incorporating projects/activities that will result in strengthened experiences for candidates in the areas of 'next steps' and student use of feedback. In addition, funding for attending edTPA-related state and national conferences is important for faculty as they consider the most effective and efficient approaches to addressing these gaps.

Use of Assessment Findings for Program Improvement (Action Plan) – SPRING SEMSTER

The edTPA featured heavily into this analysis as it represents a significant challenge that must be met in order to ensure that our teacher candidates can fulfill this stated mission. As we consider addressing the challenge of this assessment, we are committed to the following values: (1) Although we will make decisions to improve students' likelihood of passing the edTPA, those changes will be consistent with research-based pedagogy and will support them in being better teachers beyond the edTPA (Inasmuch as the edTPA was created by educational professionals, we believe that good pedagogy can be consistent with solid edTPA preparation); (2) In making changes to methods courses, we will not eliminate vital preparation for future teaching to address short-term edTPA needs; (3) While we must develop common skill sets for edTPA performance, we are not interested in creating cookie-cutter teaching performance. Students will see the many ways in which they can incorporate their justified core beliefs and practices into their teaching style; (4) In our effort to honor the dignity of individuals, we will focus our students' attention on the needs of their learners as a primary consideration for instructional decisions.

One of our efforts to improve our program has been to revise the Exit Interview protocol to collect similar data on all teacher candidates. This will allow for greater comparison of results between candidates and programs. Furthermore, as we collect more data, we should be able to determine whether there is a relationship between the Exit Interview data and edTPA data. If such a relationship exists, it will open up new opportunities to consider how to support our at-risk candidates. In order for the Exit Interview data to be robust enough for such an analysis, it will be necessary to develop inter-rater reliability.

In response to current data, one area the SOE would like to focus on is our Literacy scores on the edTPA. We have set these goals:
1. To raise our Elementary Literacy edTPA scores on Rubric 13 to be on par or above state and national means.
2. To raise our Elementary Literacy edTPA scores on Rubric 15 to be on par or above state and national means.
3. To identify and incorporate more opportunities to analyze students' language use and literacy learning in methods courses.
4. To increase inter-rater reliability on the Exit Interview.
5. To analyze exit interview data and determine the extent to which it provides a useful indicator of edTPA performance.

Project Activities: The following project activities will support the goals noted in the previous section.

1. In a School of Education meeting, have faculty members share current opportunities in which they provide candidates with opportunities to practice giving effective feedback to students. Furthermore, faculty will share how they can revise current assignments to increase this exposure AND how they can follow this up with candidates writing a 'next steps' plan for how students will be expected to use that feedback.
2. During a School of Education meeting, faculty members will study the prompt language and rubric language (as well as the Rubric Progressions language) for Rubric 15 to identify possible sources of student confusion. This will be followed by a dialogue in which faculty share the opportunities they currently offer or plan to offer for students to follow up on assessment analyses with describing an intervention mini-lesson for target learners.
3. During a School of Education meeting, faculty members will examine the prompt language, rubric language, and rubric progressions for Rubric 14. This will be followed up by a dialogue in which faculty share the opportunities they currently offer or plan to offer for students to analyze students' language use in a way that is analogous to the expectations described in the edTPA documentation.
4. Require all exit interviewers to complete the training module to increase inter-rater reliability.
5. Examine all of the exit interview data. In particular, look for correspondences between exit interview data and edTPA data to determine whether the Exit Interview data is a strong predictor of edTPA performance. If it is, brainstorm possible approaches that could be taken to provide proactive interventions for students unlikely to perform well on the edTPA assessment.

Evaluation: The following evaluation tools provide data that will be used to determine if the goals have been met.
1. Compare Rubric 13 scores
2. Compare Rubric 15 scores
3. Compare Rubric 14 scores
4. Examine exit interview data to determine if the inter-rater reliability is improving

Full Year Reflection – FALL/INTERTERM/SPRING TERMS

School of Education faculty reviewed the previous analysis to this current semester. Both semesters were analyzed, the data collection and reporting format, along with the reflecting, completed our assessment strategy. The data from edTPA, the exit interviews along with the course assignments supported our learning objectives for the program. The data was aligned prior to the analysis which lead to our understanding of progress students have made. Our procedures for gathering the information was systematic and streamlined which provided confidence that the data was accurate. Reviewing information was completed at faculty meetings and during assessment meetings in which face to face dialogs was encouraged. Prior response to assessment data had been analyzed during Education Faculty meetings.

Supporting Documents

Supporting data documents can be found at: http://www.greenville.edu/academics/school-of-education/programs-performance.html