

# Quincy University - School of Education

## Secondary Education 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*
<b>1. Professional Teaching Standards Rubric</b>	Checklist of 33 professional teaching elements with 4-point scale	Final evaluation of student teaching experience	CK, CE, IPD, ASL, D
<b>2. Disposition Rubric</b>	Checklist of 25 disposition elements with 3-point scale	During each pre-professional course, and conclusion of student teaching experience	D
<b>3. Content Test</b>	State test	Prior to student teaching	CK
<b>4. Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT)</b>	State test	Prior to licensure	IPD, ASL
<b>5. Clinical Observation of Teaching Rubric</b>	Checklist of 16 elements of lesson	During each of three clinical placements prior to student teaching	CK, CE, IPD, ASL, D
<b>6. Unit Plan</b>	Unit plan completed in the Understanding by Design format	Once during student teaching	CK, IPD, ASL
<b>7. Lesson Plans</b>	Two Universal Design lesson plans	Once during each student teaching placement	CK, IPD, ASL
<b>8. Portfolio</b>	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 Secondary Education

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

Illinois Professional Teaching Standards	Average Scores			
	All QU N=44	All Sec. Ed. n=8	Trad Sec. Ed. n=5	MSE Sec. Ed. n=3
<b>1. Teaching Diverse Students</b>				
A. Selects resources and strategies to meet a range of individual needs	3.43	3.09	3.20	2.90
B. Teaches to individual learning abilities	3.36	3.00	3.20	2.67
C. Holds high expectations for learning and achievement	3.55	3.50	3.60	3.33
<b>2. Content/Pedagogical Knowledge</b>				
A. Possesses content knowledge	3.39	3.44	3.70	3.00
B. Integrates knowledge into instructional objectives	3.48	3.38	3.60	3.00
C. Engages students in meaningful learning	3.53	3.31	3.50	3.00
D. Identifies resources that support student learning	3.47	3.19	3.50	2.67
<b>3. Planning for Differentiated Instruction</b>				
A. Plans for long and short term instruction	3.28	2.81	3.20	2.17
B. Prepares learning activities based on essential skills, state standards, and district curriculum	3.36	3.00	3.20	2.67
C. Differentiates instruction	3.18	2.81	3.10	2.33
<b>4. Learning Environment</b>				
A. Establishes intrinsic motivation and positive climate	3.57	3.12	3.20	3.00
B. Establishes expectations for behavior	3.47	3.38	3.60	3.00
C. Monitors and responds to student behavior	3.35	3.12	3.20	3.00
D. Manages materials and technology, time, pace, and transitions	3.40	3.00	3.30	2.50
<b>5. Instructional Delivery</b>				
A. Demonstrates multiple teaching strategies	3.25	3.12	3.20	3.00
B. Adjusts for individual needs	3.43	3.05	3.30	2.63
C. Uses appropriate role of the teacher for each instructional activity	3.46	3.42	3.50	3.30
<b>6. Reading/Writing/Oral Communication</b>				
A. Assesses and implements strategies to meets students' literacy needs	3.31	3.12	3.20	3.00
B. Uses a variety of materials/strategies to teach vocabulary, comprehension, and fluency	3.21	2.98	3.00	2.93
C. Teaches appropriate content area writing	3.25	3.25	3.40	3.00
D. Plans for effective oral communication	3.36	3.35	3.40	3.27
<b>7. Assessment</b>				
A. Uses a variety of formal and informal assessment strategies	3.26	3.20	3.40	2.87
B. Uses assessment in lesson planning	3.25	2.88	3.20	2.33
C. Evaluates criteria and provides feedback	3.23	2.88	3.00	2.67
D. Records and monitors assessment data	3.37	3.00	3.40	2.33
<b>8. Collaborative Relationships</b>				
A. Promotes a positive school climate	3.78	3.69	4.00	3.17
B. Collaborates with school personnel to benefit student learning and behavior	3.57	3.25	3.60	2.67
C. Communicates with families	3.36	2.62	3.20	1.67
D. Knows and accesses community resources	3.36	2.75	3.17	2.33
<b>9. Professionalism/Leadership/Advocacy</b>				
A. Models professional behavior	3.79	3.44	3.80	2.83
B. Reflects on teaching to identify paths for professional growth	3.53	3.19	3.60	2.50
C. Communicates effectively	3.57	3.12	3.40	2.67
D. Participates in professional development opportunities	3.62	3.43	3.75	3.00

## **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.

Overall, the unit is pleased with Secondary candidates' scores on the rubric. Candidates generally score at the "3-Meets" level. That is an appropriate level of performance for novice teachers.

Yet, there are some areas for consideration. The rubric contains 33 items. Secondary candidates perform more poorly on all but 2 of those items compared to their Elementary Education peers who are scored with the same rubric. This overall negative difference may be attributed to the low number of Secondary Education candidates that come through a program at QU. Of the 29 score differences, 24 are significantly less, when "significant" is considered .15 points or more above or below the comparison score.

In 2 instances however, the average of Secondary candidates was better than or equal to the average of their Elementary peers. On "2. *Content/Pedagogy Knowledge: A. Possesses content knowledge*" Secondary candidates averaged .05 points better than their Elementary counterparts. This is likely due to Secondary Education candidates deeper preparation in a single content area as opposed to Elementary candidates taking less deep coursework in a larger number subject areas.

Elementary and Secondary candidate averages were even in the area of "6. *Reading/Writing/Oral Communication: C. Teaches appropriate content area writing.*" This may be attributable to the fact that both elementary and secondary candidates take the same course in reading and writing across the curriculum from the same instructor. While this is true in several other courses as well, there may be some correlation.

## **Planned Changes Based upon Analysis**

In truth, no curricular changes are necessary. While the evidence demonstrates that Secondary candidates do not perform to the same level as their peers, Secondary candidates do score sufficiently well to be considered meeting expectations.

One area for change is to explore the possibility of changes Secondary Education candidates from a major in the content area with coursework leading to licensure to a major in Secondary Education with coursework in the content area sufficient to meet state licensing and academic standards requirements.

This will be explored in 2015-2016.

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 Secondary Education

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

Disposition Elements	Avg. Score			
	All QU n= 44	All Sec. Ed. n=8	Trad Sec. Ed. n=5	MSE Sec. Ed. n=3
<b>Servant Leadership</b>				
1. Practices active listening	2.70	2.38-	2.40	2.33
2. Accepts individual differences	2.72	2.38	2.40	2.33
3. Distinguishes between the behavior and the person	2.68	2.50	2.60	2.33
4. Uses methods other than coercion to lead	2.78	2.62	2.80	2.33
5. Maintains positive outlook	2.88	2.75	3.00	2.33
<b>Reflective Decision-making</b>				
6. Seeks constructive feedback from others	2.88	2.12	2.40	1.67
7. Makes changes based on feedback	2.63	2.25	2.60	1.67
8. Recognizes personal limitations	2.63	2.43	2.50	2.33
9. Seeks to enhance personal strengths	2.66	2.38	2.40	2.33
10. Seeks to compensate for or overcome personal limitations	2.69	2.50	2.60	2.33
<b>Commitment to Ethical Standards</b>				
11. Displays honesty in interactions with others	2.80	2.62	2.80	2.33
12. Models ethical behavior of a professional	2.82	2.75	2.80	2.67
13. Maintains confidentiality	2.89	2.88	3.00	2.67
14. Respects others	2.84	2.62	2.80	2.33
15. Is trustworthy	2.84	2.75	2.80	2.67
<b>Success for All</b>				
16. Provides constructive feedback	2.66	2.62	2.80	2.33
17. Implements strategies to meet the needs of all	2.60	2.25	2.20	2.33
18. Helps all achieve	2.70	2.50	2.60	2.33
19. Uses diversity as a strength when working with others	2.65	2.25	2.40	2.00
<b>Professionalism</b>				
20. Dresses appropriately	2.77	2.38	2.60	2.00
21. Follows through on commitments	2.73	2.25	2.60	1.67
22. Communicates without an intent to deceive	2.84	2.26	2.80	2.33
23. Attends all expected meetings	2.79	2.50	2.60	2.33
24. Works collaboratively with others	2.80	2.50	2.60	2.33
25. Is punctual	2.76	2.25	2.40	2.00

### 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.

Overall, Secondary candidates do not score as well compared to their peers. On all 25 items, Secondary candidates' scores were lower on average than School of Education scores.

A closer analysis reveals only 5 instances where Secondary candidates did not score significantly differently than did their peers ("significant" is considered .15 points or more above or below the comparison score). Nonetheless, in each of the 5 instances, Secondary candidates' scores were significantly *less* than their peers.

<b>Servant Leadership:</b> 5. Maintains positive outlook	-.13
<b>Commitment to Ethical Standards:</b> 12. Models ethical behavior of a professional	-.07
<b>Commitment to Ethical Standards:</b> 13. Maintains confidentiality	-.01
<b>Commitment to Ethical Standards:</b> 15. Is trustworthy	-.09
<b>Success for All:</b> 16. Provides constructive feedback	-.04

### **Planned Changes based Upon Analysis**

No specific changes are required. Secondary education candidates in both the traditionally prepared and graduate licensure tracks score between "Meets Expectations" and "Exceeds Expectations" on the Dispositions Assessment. Secondary candidates having an academic home outside the School of Education may explain their overall lower scores. Since they do not interact as extensively with School of Education faculty, they may not have an equal opportunity to experience public teacher-like dispositions in action as often as do their Elementary and Special Education counterparts.

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 Secondary 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
Math	115	2	2	100%
English	111	1	1	100%
History	114	3	2	66.6%
Biology	105	NA	NA	NA
<b>OVERALL PASS RATE QU SoE Content Test Takers</b>		<b>61</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>90.1%</b>

#### 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.

Two content test results meet the state mandated minimum pass rate: Mathematics and English; however, History does not meet the minimum given the data provided within the reporting period for this report (June 1, 2014-May 31, 2015); however, the reporting period for ISBE is September 1, 2014-August 31, 2015. Within that reporting period, the one student who did not pass the exam on the first two attempts did earn a passing score on the third attempt. ISBE stipulates that a candidate who attempts an exam multiple times and eventually passes the exam within a reporting window is considered a single test taker/test passer for reporting purposes.

#### Planned Changes Based Upon Analysis

No changes to curriculum are needed based upon analysis of the exam scores.

However, ILTS reports sub-scores on content tests, and 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 Secondary 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	8	8	100%
APT K-12 (Old)	104	5	5	100%
APT 6-12	103	1	1	100%
<b>OVERALL PASS RATE All QU SoE - APT</b>		<b>51</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>90.1%</b>

#### 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 Secondary Education candidates on the pedagogy exam meets the state mandated minimum, so no plan for improvement is needed.

#### 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 Secondary 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
<b>Clinical Field Experience I (EDU 290)</b>			
Traditional Secondary-English (n=1)	100	90.2	83.3
Traditional Secondary-History (n=1)	79.6	NA*	66.7
Traditional Secondary-Math (n=5)	84.2	80.4	69.4
Traditional Secondary-Science (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
<b>Clinical Field Experience II (EDU 291)</b>			
Traditional Secondary-English (n=1)	97.3	83.5	74.1
Traditional Secondary-History (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Traditional Secondary-Math (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Traditional Secondary-Science (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
<b>Clinical Field Experience III and Seminar (EDU 390/391)</b>			
Traditional Secondary-English (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Traditional Secondary-History (n=2)	87.5	83.4	67.4
Traditional Secondary-Math (n=2)	94.6	88.2	66.9
Traditional Secondary-Science (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
<b>Clinical Experience – Graduate Licensure (MSE 590)</b>			
Graduate Secondary-English (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Graduate Secondary-History (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Graduate Secondary-Math (n=0)	NA	NA	NA
Graduate Secondary-Science (n=1)	100	93.4	62.7

\*No data is available as the candidate's cooperating teacher did not submit a lesson assessment to the clinical experience instructor.

### Historical Data

	English Language Arts		History		Mathematics		Science	
	US Lesson	CST Final	US Lesson	CST Final	US Lesson	CST Final	US Lesson	CST Final
<b>Clinical I (ELE 290)</b>								
2013-2014	100	71.8	78.5	65	89.5	53	na	na
2012-2013	na	na	85.2	67.8	81.5	68.4	na	na
2011-2012	85.4	90.6	na	na	67.6	85.4	na	na
<b>Clinical II (ELE 291)</b>								
2013-2014	na	na	79.3	79	86.1	73	na	na
2012-2013	91.4	73.3	87	77.8	100	96.1	na	na
2011-2012	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
<b>Clinical III (ELE 390/391)</b>								
2013-2014	na	na	na	na	na	na	na	na
2012-2013	na	na	87.9	66.6	98	na	97.5	95.1
2011-2012	na	na	na	na	86.7	81.9	98	na

## **Analysis of Assessment Results**

Because of the low number of candidates enrolled in Secondary Education programs, the data do not provide much depth of information. Across all sections of clinical experiences, a mere 13 candidates participated and contributed to the data set. In addition, the candidates are spread across the four available content areas such that, in some cases, an  $n$  of one candidate is the entirety of the data.

As was previously mentioned in the analysis of Elementary Education candidate data of clinical experiences, one item of note in the Secondary Education data is the often-seen 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. 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. This same difference is found in Elementary Education data as well. 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 Secondary 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 Secondary n=8	Traditional Secondary N=5	MSE Secondary N=3
2014-2015	15.70	14.88	14.20	16.00

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 data show only a 1.8-point difference between all Secondary candidates and the School of Education unit average. The unit plan template is used across the unit in a variety of courses, so all candidates, both elementary and secondary, 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 Secondary 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 Secondary n=8	Traditional Secondary N=5	MSE Secondary N=3
1 <sup>st</sup> eight weeks	10.40	9.50	9.20	10.00
2 <sup>nd</sup> eight weeks	10.40	10.00	10.00	10.00

Historical Data Secondary	First 8-Week Placement	Second 8-Week Placement
2013-2014	10.00	10.00
2012-2013	10.30	10.30
2011-2012	10.30	10.94

### Analysis of Assessment Results

Secondary Education teacher candidates do not write as many lesson plans as do their Elementary Education peers. Secondary candidates do not take as many content-area methods courses, so they are not as proficient. This is evidenced in the data presented above. However, the overall difference is not considerable. And, as is to be expected, graduate licensure candidates perform slightly better than traditional undergraduate students. It is interesting to note the improvement in average scores for traditional candidates in the second 8-week placement that is absent from the graduate licensure candidates.

### 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 Secondary Education

Student teaching is the capstone experience for Secondary 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.

edTPA Rubric Descriptor	All QU SoE n=26	All Sec. Ed. n=7	Trad. Sec. Ed. n=5	Grad. Sec. Ed. n=2
<b>Rubric 1</b> Planning for <Content Area> Understandings	3.08	3.17	3.00	3.50
<b>Rubric 2</b> Planning to Support Varied Student Learning Needs	3.00	3.00	3.00	3.00
<b>Rubric 3</b> Using Knowledge of Students to Inform Teaching and Learning	2.69	3.17	3.00	3.50
<b>Rubric 4</b> Identifying and Supporting Language Demands	2.35	2.50	2.25	3.00
<b>Rubric 5</b> Planning Assessments to Monitor and Support Student Learning	2.88	2.83	2.75	3.00
<b>Rubric 6</b> Learning Environment	3.27	3.33	3.25	3.50
<b>Rubric 7</b> Engaging Students in Learning	2.38	2.67	2.50	3.00
<b>Rubric 8</b> Deepening Student Learning	2.54	3.00	3.00	3.00
<b>Rubric 9</b> Subject-Specific Pedagogy	2.73	3.00	3.00	3.00
<b>Rubric 10</b> Analyzing Teaching Effectiveness	3.04	3.00	3.00	3.00
<b>Rubric 11</b> Analysis of Student Learning	3.00	3.17	3.25	3.00
<b>Rubric 12</b> Providing Feedback to Guide Learning	2.19	2.33	2.25	2.50
<b>Rubric 13</b> Student Use of Feedback	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
<b>Rubric 14</b> Analyzing Students' Language Use and English Language Arts Learning	2.42	2.50	2.50	2.50
<b>Rubric 15</b> Using Assessment to Inform Instruction	2.96	3.17	3.25	3.00
<b>Overall Average</b>	<b>40.54</b>	<b>42.83</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>44.50</b>

**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 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 Secondary Education candidates were slightly better overall than their peers in Elementary Education; however, like their Elementary peers, lower scores were seen in the Assessment task in the areas of "Rubric 12 Providing Feedback to Guide Learning" and "Rubric 13 Student Use of Feedback."

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 Secondary 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 for Secondary 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 clinical experience assessment rubric to be used by university supervisors and classroom supervising teachers for all clinical experiences so that growth can be measured.
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.
5. Develop a new class for secondary education majors to be taught by the faculty of the School of Education. This class will include instruction in lesson planning (Universal Design), unit planning (UbD), differentiated instruction, instructional strategies.
6. Explore changing secondary education program from the current full content major with professional education coursework which results in total credit hour requirements between 139 and 158 to secondary education major with content preparation to meet state licensure standards and requirements. This will lead to a decreased credit hour requirement of approximately 130 maximum credit hours in all secondary licensure areas and result in a better alignment between state standards, content test expectations, and required QU coursework.