

Quincy University - School of Education

Elementary Teacher Licensure Program Report

July 2015

Quincy University Mission Statement

Quincy University stands as a Catholic, independent, liberal arts institution of higher learning in the Franciscan tradition. Inspired by the spirit of Francis and Clare of Assisi, we respect each person as a sister or brother with dignity, value, and worth. We work for justice, peace and the integrity of creation. We prepare men and women for leadership and for the transformation of the world by educating them to seek knowledge that leads to wisdom. We welcome and invite all to share our spirit and our life.

School of Education Mission Statement

Embracing the Franciscan values of respect for the individual and service toward others, the Quincy University School of Education will personalize the development of servant-leaders. These inspiring and collaborative professionals will be responsive and reflective decision makers throughout their careers, committed to the academic and personal success of all, particularly the marginalized.

Teacher Licensure Program Mission Statement

The teacher licensure program prepares teachers to use reflective decision-making to improve their instruction. As servant leaders, these aspiring teachers will use both content knowledge and pedagogical skills to give all students, particularly those most at-risk, the skills and knowledge to be successful learners. They will model the ethical and professional norms of education and be true examples of life-long learners.

Teacher Education Program Outcomes

The following outcomes are directly connected to Illinois State Board of Education requirements for programs that prepare teachers to work in Illinois public schools.

- A. Content Knowledge (CK)
 - Teacher education graduates will demonstrate competence in the content they teach by meeting minimum required grade point averages (GPAs) and passing state-mandated content exams.
- B. Clinical Experiences (CE)
 - Teacher education graduates will perform at a level expected of beginning teachers in classrooms clinical and student teaching experiences based on rubrics administered during clinical experiences.
- C. Instructional Planning and Delivery (IPD)
 - Teacher education graduates will develop instructional plans that meet the needs of all learners including instructional strategies that recognize the differences among children.
- D. Assessment of Impact on Student Learning (ASL)
 - Teacher education graduates will demonstrate competence in development, application, and analysis of appropriate assessments that gauge the impact of instruction on student learning.
- E. Dispositions (D)
 - Teacher education graduates will exhibit appropriate dispositions in all interactions with all persons they encounter as part of their professional education courses, field work, clinical experiences, and student teaching.

Description of the Methods of Program Assessment

The following chart indicates key assessments in the teacher licensure program. A variety of assessment formats is included: portfolios, disposition rubrics, professional teaching standard rubrics, and state licensure tests.

Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	When the Assessment is Administered	Program Outcomes Assessed*
1. Professional Teaching Standards Rubric	Checklist of 33 professional teaching elements with 4-point scale	Final evaluation of student teaching experience	CK, CE, IPD, ASL, D
2. Disposition Rubric	Checklist of 25 disposition elements with 3-point scale	During each pre-professional course, and conclusion of student teaching experience	D
3. Content Test	State test	Prior to student teaching	CK
4. Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT)	State test	Prior to licensure	IPD, ASL
5. Clinical Observation of Teaching Rubric	Checklist of 16 elements of lesson	During each of three clinical placements prior to student teaching	CK, CE, IPD, ASL, D
6. Unit Plan	Unit plan completed in the Understanding by Design format	Once during student teaching	CK, IPD, ASL
7. Lesson Plans	Two Universal Design lesson plans	Once during each student teaching placement	CK, IPD, ASL
8. Portfolio	Electronic compilation of teaching artifacts, rationales, and public presentation	End of program	CK, CE, IPD, ASL, D

*CK: Content Knowledge; CE: Clinical Experiences; IPD: Instructional Planning and Delivery; ASL: Assessment of Student Learning; D: Dispositions

Results of Assessment #1

Student Teaching Candidate Professional Teaching Standards Assessment

Rating Scale: 1-Unsatisfactory; 2-Developing; 3-Meets; 4-Exceeds

Illinois Professional Teaching Standards	Average Scores			
	All QU N=44	All Eled n=18	Trad Eled n=14	MSE Eled n=4
1. Teaching Diverse Students				
A. Selects resources and strategies to meet a range of individual needs	3.43	3.50	3.50	3.50
B. Teaches to individual learning abilities	3.36	3.32	3.33	3.25
C. Holds high expectations for learning and achievement	3.55	3.55	3.50	3.75
2. Content/Pedagogical Knowledge				
A. Possesses content knowledge	3.39	3.21	3.13	3.50
B. Integrates knowledge into instructional objectives	3.48	3.50	3.37	4.00
C. Engages students in meaningful learning	3.53	3.55	3.57	3.50
D. Identifies resources that support student learning	3.47	3.55	3.50	3.75
3. Planning for Differentiated Instruction				
A. Plans for long and short term instruction	3.28	3.37	3.33	3.50
B. Prepares learning activities based on essential skills, state standards, and district curriculum	3.36	3.39	3.37	3.50
C. Differentiates instruction	3.18	3.13	3.17	3.00
4. Learning Environment				
A. Establishes intrinsic motivation and positive climate	3.57	3.68	3.73	3.50
B. Establishes expectations for behavior	3.47	3.50	3.50	3.50
C. Monitors and responds to student behavior	3.35	3.39	3.37	3.50
D. Manages materials and technology, time, pace, and transitions	3.40	3.50	3.43	3.75
5. Instructional Delivery				
A. Demonstrates multiple teaching strategies	3.25	3.32	3.33	3.25
B. Adjusts for individual needs	3.43	3.50	3.50	3.50
C. Uses appropriate role of the teacher for each instructional activity	3.46	3.53	3.60	3.25
6. Reading/Writing/Oral Communication				
A. Assesses and implements strategies to meets students' literacy needs	3.31	3.34	3.37	3.25
B. Uses a variety of materials/strategies to teach vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency	3.21	3.21	3.27	3.00
C. Teaches appropriate content area writing	3.25	3.26	3.20	3.50
D. Plans for effective oral communication	3.36	3.37	3.40	3.25
7. Assessment				
A. Uses a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies	3.26	3.32	3.33	3.25
B. Uses assessment in lesson planning	3.25	3.45	3.43	3.50
C. Evaluates criteria and provides feedback	3.23	3.32	3.33	3.25
D. Records and monitors assessment data	3.37	3.61	3.57	3.75
8. Collaborative Relationships				
A. Promotes a positive school climate	3.78	3.76	3.77	3.75
B. Collaborates with school personnel to benefit student learning and behavior	3.57	3.58	3.53	3.75
C. Communicates with families	3.36	3.50	3.42	3.75
D. Knows and accesses community resources	3.36	3.37	3.32	3.50
9. Professionalism/Leadership/Advocacy				
A. Models professional behavior	3.79	3.82	3.83	3.75
B. Reflects on teaching to identify paths for professional growth	3.53	3.63	3.53	4.00
C. Communicates effectively	3.57	3.74	3.67	4.00
D. Participates in professional development opportunities	3.62	3.68	3.60	4.00

Analysis of Assessment Results

The Illinois Professional Teaching Standards Rubric is one of the major assessments for students enrolled in the teaching licensure program. Overall performance on all standards is good. Analysis reveals some slightly lower areas that will receive attention by the University Supervisors as they observe the candidates' teaching.

Comparing the Elementary candidates' scores to all QU teacher candidates reveals 3 instances where Elementary candidates scored significantly differently than did their peers ("significant" is considered .15 points or more above or below the comparison score).

2. Content/Pedagogical Knowledge A. Possesses content knowledge

All QU candidates averaged 3.39 whereas Elementary Ed candidates averaged 3.21, a difference of -.18. While there is no ready explanation for the difference in the scores between the all candidates and Elementary candidates, it may be attributable to the wide variety of content coursework in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies that elementary candidates are responsible for versus the more specific content responsibilities of their secondary and special license (music education, physical education) peers.

Traditionally prepared candidates scored well below their graduate licensure peers on this standards by a difference of -.37 (3.13 vs. 3.50). The large difference between elementary traditionally prepared candidates and graduate licensure candidates may be attributable to the fact that graduate licensure candidates generally have significant life experience prior to the onset of the program of study. Many graduate licensure candidates have work experience as para-professionals or other support staff in public schools where they become more familiar with elementary school content.

Standard 7: Assessment, Item B. Uses assessment in lesson planning

On this item, elementary education candidates scored significantly better than did their peers across the School of Education by a difference of +.20 (3.45 versus 3.25). Again, there is no ready explanation for the difference. One plausible explanation is the greater number of methods classes that elementary education candidates are required to take in language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies where their secondary education peers take a single content-area methods course.

There is no significant difference on this item between traditionally prepared and graduate licensure candidates.

Standard 7: Assessment, Item D. Records and monitors assessment data.

Elementary candidates score better than their peers on this item as well demonstrating a difference of +.24. Again, this difference is likely attributable to the greater number of professional education courses elementary education candidates take versus their peers.

The difference between traditionally prepared and graduate licensure candidates (grad license candidates scored better by .18) may be attributable to the overall greater life experience that grad licensure candidates bring to the classroom. They may be more comfortable managing data in all aspects of their life with translates to skills useable in the classroom.

Planned Changes Based upon Analysis

In 2015, the School of Education was required by Illinois State Board of Education (as were all teacher preparation programs in Illinois) to submit a revised Elementary Education program protocol to demonstrate compliance with a variety of rule changes that had become effective over the past few years. One aspect of the revised program is an increase in the number of "content preparation" courses elementary education major will be required to take including additional science and social studies courses. It is hoped these additional classes will result in better ratings of content knowledge by university supervisors and classroom supervising teachers.

In addition, as the unit better implements LiveText throughout the unit assessment system, we should see an improvement in the quality of data used to compile reports.

Results of Assessment #2

Student Teaching Candidate Disposition Assessment Elementary

Scored: 0=Unacceptable; 1=Needs Improvement; 2=Meets Expectations; 3=Exceeds Expectations

Disposition Elements	Avg. Score			
	All QU n= 44	All Elem n=18	Trad Elem n=14	MSE Eled n=4
Servant Leadership				
1. Practices active listening	2.70	2.89	2.87	3.00
2. Accepts individual differences	2.72	2.82	2.77	3.00
3. Distinguishes between the behavior and the person	2.68	2.74	2.67	3.00
4. Uses methods other than coercion to lead	2.78	2.87	2.83	3.00
5. Maintains positive outlook	2.88	2.97	2.97	3.00
Reflective Decision-making				
6. Seeks constructive feedback from others	2.88	2.84	2.87	2.75
7. Makes changes based on feedback	2.63	2.76	2.70	3.00
8. Recognizes personal limitations	2.63	2.86	2.82	3.00
9. Seeks to enhance personal strengths	2.66	2.74	2.67	3.00
10. Seeks to compensate for or overcome personal limitations	2.69	2.81	2.75	3.00
Commitment to Ethical Standards				
11. Displays honesty in interactions with others	2.80	2.89	2.93	2.75
12. Models ethical behavior of a professional	2.82	2.89	2.93	2.75
13. Maintains confidentiality	2.89	2.95	2.93	3.00
14. Respects others	2.84	2.95	2.93	3.00
15. Is trustworthy	2.84	2.95	2.93	3.00
Success for All				
16. Provides constructive feedback	2.66	2.68	2.80	2.25
17. Implements strategies to meet the needs of all	2.60	2.66	2.63	2.75
18. Helps all achieve	2.70	2.79	2.80	2.75
19. Uses diversity as a strength when working with others	2.65	2.76	2.70	3.00
Professionalism				
20. Dresses appropriately	2.77	2.95	3.00	2.75
21. Follows through on commitments	2.73	2.95	3.00	2.75
22. Communicates without an intent to deceive	2.84	2.95	2.93	3.00
23. Attends all expected meetings	2.79	2.89	2.93	2.75
24. Works collaboratively with others	2.80	2.95	2.93	3.00
25. Is punctual	2.76	2.95	2.93	3.00

Analysis of Assessment Results

The disposition rubric is the second major assessment of teaching competence. Dispositions are defined by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation as “Professional attitudes, values, and beliefs demonstrated through both verbal and non-verbal behaviors as educators interact with students, families, colleagues, and communities. These positive behaviors support student learning and development. . . . Based on their mission and conceptual framework, professional education units can identify, define, and operationalize additional professional dispositions.” The School of Education has identified and defined its dispositions and regularly assess candidates’ dispositions both informally and formally.

Informally, candidates are expected to demonstrate suitable dispositions at all times in all they do and say as Quincy University students and representatives of the School of Education. At any time a faculty member or other supervisor identifies behavior contrary to the expected dispositions, a *Dispositions Alert* form may be submitted to the Dean of the School of Education. The Dean tracks and monitors incoming forms and takes

action if 2 or more alerts are filed on any given candidate. In 2014-2015, a total of four (4) disposition notices were filed in the Dean's office, none of which were repeat alerts for any of the candidates identified.

Formally, candidate dispositions are assessed as part of the student teaching experience. It is in this high-stakes environment that a candidate's true personality can be best assessed by university supervisors and classroom supervising teachers who collaboratively complete the dispositions assessment.

Comparing the Elementary candidates' scores to all QU teacher candidates reveals 5 instances where Elementary candidates scored significantly differently than did their peers ("significant" is considered .15 points or more above or below the comparison score). In each of the 5 instances, Elementary candidates' scores were significantly *better* than their peers.

Servant Leadership: 1. Practices active listening	+ .19
Reflective Decision-making: 8. Recognizes personal limitations	+ .23
Professionalism: 20. Dresses appropriately	+ .18
Professionalism: 21. Follows through on commitments	+ .22
Professionalism: 24. Works collaboratively with others	+ .15

Planned Changes based Upon Analysis

No specific changes are required. Elementary education candidates in both the traditionally prepared and graduate licensure tracks score well on the Dispositions Assessment. It speaks to the caliber of candidate enrolling in the Teacher Education Program at Quincy University and the overall quality of the QU's student body.

In addition, as the unit better implements LiveText throughout the unit assessment system, we should see an improvement in the quality of data used to compile reports.

Results of Assessments #3

Illinois Licensure Testing System Content Test Results June 1, 2014-May 31, 2015 Elementary Education

Content tests administered by the Illinois Licensure Testing System are standardized, multiple choice exams that assess candidates knowledge of the content that is taught in elementary school classrooms. There is no specific, prescribed point in a candidate's preparation where the unit expects candidates to sit for the content exam. Candidates register and sit for the exam at a point where they perceive they are sufficiently prepared to pass the exam. Thus, the number of test takers may not equal the number of program completers in a given academic year.

Name of Test	Test Number	Total Number of Test-takers	Total Number Passing Test	Passing Percentage
Elementary/Middle School	110	12	11	91.6%
OVERALL PASS RATE QU SoE Content Test Takers		61	55	90.1%

Analysis of Assessment Results

Illinois State Board of Education requires that teacher preparation programs reach a minimum pass rate of 80% on all state-mandated tests. Failure to meet the minimum pass rate of 80% automatically requires programs to implement a plan for improvement for the program and test that is below expectation.

The pass rate for Elementary Education majors on the content exam meet the state mandated minimum, so no plan for improvement is needed. The single candidate no passing the exam is one who has taken the exam five times and failed to meet the minimum score. The candidate is in the graduate licensure track, and has scored between 5 points and 18 points below the state-mandated cut score. Whether or not the candidate chooses to retake the exam again is up to the candidate; however, it should be noted that ISBE does not set a maximum number of attempts.

It should also be noted that the exam covers content expected of elementary classroom teachers. Candidates who cannot pass the exam would likely struggle with the content they would be expected to teach to children. Such a scenario does not instill confidence in candidates' capabilities.

Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

As noted previously, In 2015, the School of Education was required by Illinois State Board of Education (as were all teacher preparation programs in Illinois) to submit a revised Elementary Education program protocol to demonstrate compliance with a variety of rule changes that had become effective over the past few years. One aspect of the revised program is an increase in the number of "content preparation" courses elementary education major will be required to take including additional science and social studies courses. It is hoped these additional courses will result in an even higher pass rate on the state content exam.

Additionally, ILTS reports sub-scores on content tests. Future reports will include these sub-scores so as to better understand the categories in which candidates are excelling and those where an increased emphasis is needed.

Results of Assessment #4

Illinois Licensure Testing System Assessment of Professional Teaching Results June 1, 2014-May 31, 2015 Elementary Education

The Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) is a multiple choice exam that assess candidates' pedagogy knowledge. As with the content tests, there is no specified point in a candidate's preparation where the unit prescribes the Assessment of Professional Teaching. Candidates are aware of the state requirement for passing scores prior to licensure and most candidates take the exam in the latter half of the student teaching experience.

Candidates prior to Fall 2014 took different version of the APT depending on the license they were seeking. Since Fall 2014, all candidates in all fields are required to take APT K-12 #188.

Name of Test	Test Number	Total Number of Test-takers	Total Number Passing Test	Passing Percentage
APT K-12 (New)	188	16	14	87.5%
APT K-12 (Old)	104	5	5	100%
APT K-9	102	1	1	100%
OVERALL PASS RATE All QU SoE - APT		51	46	90.1%

Analysis of Assessment Results

Illinois State Board of Education requires that teacher preparation programs reach a minimum pass rate of 80% on all state-mandated tests. Failure to meet the minimum pass rate of 80% automatically requires programs to implement a plan for improvement for the program and test that is below expectation.

The pass rate for Elementary Education majors on the content exam meet the state mandated minimum, so no plan for improvement is needed. The two candidates who have not met the state-mandated cut score have completed all requirements for graduation from Quincy University; however, they are not eligible for a license until a passing score is achieved.

Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

No program changes will be made based upon the data provided.

Beginning Fall 2015, APT is no longer required for licensure in the state of Illinois. ISBE has transitioned to requiring candidates to successfully pass the edTPA portfolio assessment. Future reports will reflect that change in data collection and analysis.

Results of Assessment #5

Clinical Observations of Teaching Assessments Elementary Education

Illinois State Board of Education requires candidates undertake 120 hours of clinical experiences in classroom prior to the start of student teaching. The School of Education has divided the required 120 hours into 3 clinical experience classes: EDU 290, 291, and 390/391 (a combined field and seminar series).

In the clinical experiences, candidates are assigned to a classroom in the public schools and have a list of required tasks to complete.

The most important tasks center around lesson planning and instruction of children. These teaching experiences are evaluated by a university supervisor and the classroom supervising teacher. In addition, the classroom supervising teacher completes a final assessment of the candidates overall capabilities.

Scores indicate the percentage of points earned of the total points possible on the rubric.

	University Supervisor Lesson Assessment	Cooperating Teacher Lesson Assessment	Cooperating Teacher Final Assessment
Clinical Field Experience I (EDU 290)			
Traditional Elementary Majors (n=7)	93.4	76.4	64.0
Graduate Licensure Elementary (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Clinical Field Experience II (EDU 291)			
Elementary Majors (n=6)	89.4	88.6	62.1
Graduate Licensure Elementary (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Clinical Field Experience III and Seminar (EDU 390/391)			
Elementary Majors (n=4)	93.5	93.1	76.3
Graduate Licensure Elementary (n=0)	NA	NA	NA

Historical Data

	University Supervisor Assessment of Lesson	Cooperating Teacher Final Assessment
Clinical I (ELE 290)		
2013-2014	78.8%	76.4%
2012-2013	85.5%	87.4%
2011-2012	91.5%	77.4%
Clinical II (ELE 291)		
2013-2014	97.6%	87.2%
2012-2013	92.3%	90.6%
2011-2012	85.8%	94.8%
Clinical III (ELE 390/391)		
2013-2014	97.1%	70.4%
2012-2013	96.9%	92.0%
2011-2012	91.8%	84.0%

Analysis of Assessment Results

Data have not been aggregated to make a comparison between peer groups because the work of Elementary teachers is considerably different from that of Secondary teachers. That is generally evident in these early field experiences where candidates are first exploring the action of teaching.

One item of note in the presented data is the stark contrast between the classroom supervising/cooperating

teacher's assessment of candidates lesson planning and instruction versus the classroom supervising/cooperating teacher's overall assessment of candidates' work in the teacher's classroom. In 2014-2015, the differences were 12.4 percentage points in Clinical I, 26.5 percentage points in Clinical II, and 16.8 percentage points in Clinical III. When such evidence presents itself, Ms. Lacinda Mena makes contact with individual classroom supervising teachers (CSTs) to ask why their scores were so different. Often times, CSTs admit they didn't realize their scores were so different, and provide anecdotal evidence as to the teacher candidates success in various activities and tasks in the classroom.

Also of note is the difference in scores of the university supervisor and classroom supervising teacher in Clinical I. It is believed by program staff that the difference lies in the classroom teacher miscalculating expectations for a very novice teacher candidate. Clinical I occurs even before a candidate is admitted to the Teacher Education Program. Admission to TEP is prerequisite for basic methods courses, so Clinical I teacher candidates should be expected to perform at a very novice level.

Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

These assessments reflect both the university supervisor's and the cooperating teachers' assessment of lessons planned and delivered by teacher candidates.

One needed change is to provide adequate training for classroom supervising teachers to better understand both School of Education and the teaching profession's expectations for novice teacher candidates as the progress through a teacher preparation program.

In addition, scores reported above do not convey the rich depth of information available from documentation of clinical experiences. However, there is no commonality of rubrics across the three clinical experience courses. While the experiences are considered "growth" experiences and candidates are expected to perform differently as they grow through the program, there is needed some common rubrics across all three experiences so that growth can be better documented.

Lastly, as the unit better implements LiveText throughout the unit assessment system, we should see an improvement in the quality of data used to compile reports.

Results of Assessment #6

Understanding by Design Unit Plan Elementary Education

The Understanding by Design Unit Plan is a common unit plan template and rubric set used in a variety of courses across the Teacher Education Program. During student teaching, the rubric is applied to a unit and scores tabulated.

Understanding by Design Unit Plan (18 points possible)	ALL QU SoE n=44	All Elementary n=18	Traditional Elementary n=14	MSE Elementary n=4
2014-2015	15.70	16.00	15.67	17.25

Historical Data:	All QU SoE
2013-2014	16.00
2012-2013	15.60
2011-2012	15.94

Analysis of Assessment Results

Candidates score fairly well on the unit plan rubric as do their peers. The unit plan template is used across the unit in a variety of courses, so all candidates are familiar with the template when it is assessed during student teaching.

Planned Changes based upon Analysis

As we move toward full implementation of edTPA scoring for Fall 2015, additional data on unit planning (and lesson planning) will become available. The rubric scores from edTPA will serve as capstone assessment and will better isolate specific aspects of planning. It is assumed that with richer data, a better understanding of candidate capabilities will be found.

One change in process will be to disaggregate data by individual rubric item. While average performance on the entire rubric is an indicator of satisfactory performance, such a holistic score does not provide adequate information to make specific curricular changes to improve performance.

In addition, as the unit better implements LiveText throughout the unit assessment system, we should see an improvement in the quality of data used to compile reports.

Results of Assessment #7

Universal Design Lesson Plans Elementary Education

The Understanding by Design Unit Plan is a common lesson plan template and rubric set used in a variety of courses across the Teacher Education Program. During student teaching, the rubric is applied to lesson plans and scores tabulated.

Universal Lesson Plan (12 points possible)	All QU SoE N=44	All Elementary n=18	Traditional Elementary N=14	MSE Elementary N=4
1 st eight weeks	10.40	10.47	10.40	10.75
2 nd eight weeks	10.40	10.58	10.73	10.00

Historical Data Elementary	First 8-Week Placement	Second 8-Week Placement
2013-2014	11.00	10.84
2012-2013	10.30	10.30
2011-2012	10.30	10.94

Analysis of Assessment Results

Elementary education teacher candidates write literally hundreds of lesson plans in their preparation to becoming full-fledged teachers. They do so in the many methods courses and also do so in clinical experiences. Thus, it is not surprising that candidates score well on the rubric used to assess lesson plans during student teaching. They perform slightly better than their peers in other preparation programs in the unit. It is notable that MSE Elementary candidates dropped significantly in performance during the 2nd eight-week placement of student teaching. This may be attributable to fatigue and/or life pressures that were originally managed well but have come to be burdensome during the length of the student teaching experience.

Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

The unit is pleased with candidate performance on the lesson planning rubric and no particular changes to curriculum are planned.

One change in process, though, will be to disaggregate data by individual rubric item. While average performance on the entire rubric is an indicator of satisfactory performance, such a holistic score does not provide adequate information to make specific curricular changes to improve performance.

In addition, as the unit better implements LiveText throughout the unit assessment system, we should see an improvement in the quality of data used to compile reports.

Results of Assessment #8

Student Teaching Portfolio Assessment Elementary Education

Student teaching is the capstone experience for Elementary Education teacher candidates. It is a sustained experience lasting 16 weeks divided into 2 8-week segments. Ideally, candidates are placed in two different classrooms each a different developmental level.

The student teaching portfolio is A capstone artifact created as a result of the experience. It is designed to mimic the edTPA portfolio assessment and is scored using edTPA's 15 5-point rubrics. The artifact is scored by a long-serving faculty member teaching the Student Teaching Seminar course.

Data is available only for QU's on-campus candidates; thus, there is a discrepancy in the *n* for this assessment.

Rating Scale: 1-unacceptable; 2-emerging; 3-proficient; 4-accomplished; 5-exemplary. However, it is important to note that ISBE requires, at present, a 32 in order to pass.

edTA Rubric Descriptor	All QU SoE n=26	All Elem. Ed. n=12	Trad. Elem. Ed. n=10	Grad. Elem. Ed. n=2
Rubric 1 Planning for <Content Area> Understandings	3.08	3.00	3.00	3.00
Rubric 2 Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	3.00	2.90	2.90	3.00
Rubric 3 Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	2.69	2.40	2.40	2.50
Rubric 4 Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	2.35	2.30	2.20	2.50
Rubric 5 Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	2.88	2.90	2.90	3.00
Rubric 6 Learning Environment	3.27	3.20	3.10	3.50
Rubric 7 Engaging Students in Learning	2.38	2.20	2.20	2.00
Rubric 8 Deepening Student Learning	2.54	2.30	2.30	2.50
Rubric 9 Subject-Specific Pedagogy	2.73	2.50	2.50	2.50
Rubric 10 Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	3.04	2.90	2.80	3.50
Rubric 11 Analysis of Student Learning	3.00	2.80	2.80	3.00
Rubric 12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	2.19	2.00	1.90	2.50
Rubric 13 Student Use of Feedback	2.00	1.90	1.90	2.00
Rubric 14 Analyzing Students' Language Use and English Language Arts Learning	2.42	2.30	2.30	2.50
Rubric 15 Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	2.96	2.80	2.90	2.50
Overall Average	40.54	38.50	38.10	40.50

Pass Rate: Illinois State Board of Education has set a minimum score of 32 for academic years 2015-16 and 2016-17. Based on that cut score, 100% of student teachers who submitted portfolios mimicking edTPA would have passed. The range of scores for all QU SoE teacher candidates was 32-51.

Analysis of Assessment Results

100% of QU teacher candidates 'passed' the SoE's version of edTPA. While edTPA allows units to use the rubrics and score candidate work with the rubrics, edTPA also requires units to acknowledge that locally scored work cannot be guaranteed to pass when scored by nationally trained/calibrated scorers.

However, we are pleased that those who score candidate work at QU have had a long association with edTPA and have worked diligently to understand the rubrics and the language and expectations contained within them.

The lowest scores on the rubrics for Elementary Education candidates were in the areas of “Rubric 12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning” and “Rubric 13 Student Use of Feedback.” Both of these rubrics are contained within tasks related to assessment.

As we move into Fall 2015 and edTPA becomes “consequential” (that is, candidates will not be licensed until they present a passing score on edTPA), we will begin reporting rubric scores provided by edTPA nationally trained/calibrated scorers. These will be actual scores reported in the same fashion as scores from Illinois Licensure Testing System.

Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

The lowest scores on the rubrics for Elementary Education candidates were in the areas of “Rubric 12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning” and “Rubric 13 Student Use of Feedback.” Both of these rubrics are contained within tasks related to assessment.

Unit faculty already recognized that teacher candidates at both the Elementary and Secondary levels lacked knowledge and skills related to assessment of student learning. In response to that, a new course was developed in Spring 2015 and added to the curriculum for both Elementary and Secondary candidates. The course, EDU 355 Assessments in Education, will first be offered in Spring 2016. While we might not immediately see improvements in Assessment Task scores on edTPA, as more candidates who will have taken the course reach student teaching, confidence in candidates’ ability to assess student learning should rise dramatically.

Goals/Changes for Elementary Education Teacher Licensure Program 2015-2016

1. Meet with university supervisors to discuss scoring of the IL Professional Teaching Standards rubric to more accurately align with current practices in teacher evaluation.
2. Create a common clinical experience lesson rubric and overall assessment rubric to be used by university supervisors and classroom supervising teachers for all clinical experiences.
3. Convert all rubrics used by the Teacher Education Program to the same measurement scale. That is, all rubrics beginning Fall 2015 will use a rating scale of 1-Unsatisfactory; 2-Developing; 3-Meets; 4-Exceeds. This will avoid confusion that can result from varying rating scales and constituents making incorrect direct comparisons between scores on various rubrics.
4. Implement the use of Live Text for all student teaching rubrics for Fall 2015, and all clinical and other unit assessment rubrics in Spring 2016. Training for university supervisors will be scheduled before the end of the first placement. Training for others responsible for assessment will take place in Fall and Spring.