

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s):	B.Ed., undergraduate teacher education	
Department:	Educational Studies	
College/School:	School of Education	
Date:	December 8, 2017	
Primary Assessment Contact:	Joseph Nichols	joseph.nichols@slu.edu

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The School of Education hosted its *Moving Forward Day* on October 13, 2017. The purpose of our *Moving Forward Day* was to kick-off our assessment review and continuous improvement cycle. During this year’s cycle, the undergraduate teacher education faculty reviewed the following learning outcome:

- The preservice teacher will explain the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the teaching discipline.

Because our undergraduate teacher education programs lead to teacher certification, this student learning outcome accounts for the following state requirements:

- MEES Standard 1: Content knowledge, including varied perspectives, aligned with appropriate instruction. The teacher understands the central concepts, structures, and tools of inquiry of the discipline(s) and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful and engage for students.
- MoSPE Standard 1: Academics: Candidates demonstrate knowledge and application of general education, content knowledge, and pedagogy.
- MoSPE Standard 3: Field and Clinical Experiences: Field and clinical experiences, offered in collaboration with PK-12 schools, support the development of educators.
- MoSTEP 1.2.1: The preservice teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) within the context of global society and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

- Portfolio artifacts – The portfolio is embedded throughout the program. Students complete artifacts specific to this learning outcome in the following courses:
 - EDI 3300/3500 – Secondary/middle school curriculum and methods of teaching English.
 - EDI 3310/3510 – Secondary/middle school curriculum and methods of teaching science.
 - EDI 3320/3520 – Secondary/middle school curriculum and methods of teaching mathematics.
 - EDI 3340/3540 – Secondary/middle school curriculum and methods of teaching social studies.
 - EDI 3350 – Curriculum and methods of teaching world language.
 - EDI 4250 – School curriculum for PK-6 teachers.
 - EDI 4480/4490 – Integrated early childhood education curriculum.

One example portfolio artifact is
- MOCA – The MOCA is a content assessment that is required for licensure in each student’s specific teaching field. For example, the English MOCA—which our students take during the semester in which they are graduating—examines reading literature and information texts, writing and researching, speaking and listening, and language and conventions.
- MoPTA – The MoPTA is a performance examination that our students complete during student teaching. The MoPTA requires that students complete four tasks.
 - Task 1: Knowledge of students and the learning environment.
 - Task 2: Assessment and data collection to measure and inform student learning.

- [Task 3](#): Designing instruction for student learning.
- [Task 4](#): Planning, implementing, analyzing, and adjusting instruction to promote student learning.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

We reviewed the data for this student learning outcome on *Moving Forward Day*. The faculty divided into three working groups—one for each assessment measure (portfolio, MOCA, MoPTA). The assessment coordinator charged each faculty group with the following questions:

- What does the learning outcome mean?
- Does the assessment measure actually measure the student learning outcome?
- What does the data tell us about our students and program—especially relating to the outcome?

To answer each question and review our data, the faculty used the School of Education’s assessment dashboard—which houses summary and analysis reports for all assessment measures (for three cycles).

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

- The MOCA measures our students’ content knowledge. One finding from our analysis of this data is that our elementary education students struggle most with the social studies section of the exam. For example, students from the 2016-2017 academic year scored 240 on the social studies MOCA—compared with 248 on English language arts; 255 on science; and 264 on mathematics. This pattern is consistent across several cycles of data. The MOCA group pointed out that this trend might tell us something about our students’ course selections. Do students who pass the social studies section of the MOCA take certain classes as opposed to those who don’t pass the MOCA? Should we advise students into certain classes? Are there classes that these students need that they aren’t getting?

The MOCA group suggested that we take a deeper look at the data. The social studies MOCA evaluates content knowledge in history, geography, and government and economics. One faculty member pointed out that our students might need additional support in one or more of these areas. As such, the group suggested that we analyze our students’ sub-scores against their pass-rates to develop a better picture for what’s happening here.

- The portfolio needs improvement. We learned that the portfolio is haphazardly implemented across certification areas (e.g., early childhood education, secondary biology, etc.) and is inconsistently managed from faculty to faculty. The group pointed out that:
 - Portfolio artifacts don’t translate well across faculty and that there’s no guarantee or hope that the artifact will consistently meet the outcome.
 - There isn’t a full-time faculty member monitoring the whole process.
 - Student work was “frighteningly inadequate”—probably because don’t manage the process appropriately and it seems like a check the box exercise.

- None of the assessment measures we reviewed (portfolio artifacts, MOCA, MoPTA) address the inquiry component of the student learning outcome. For example, the group that reviewed the MoPTA noted that the assessment asks students to articulate content knowledge, organize the content for teaching, and teach it. However, they argued that the MoPTA doesn’t really focus on tools of inquiry—whatever that means.

One faculty member pointed out that “it’s ironic that inquiry is tied to SLU’s mission and we don’t even measure it.” Another faculty member argued that “there’s always confusion about what inquiry is... inquiry based learning, inquiry into your teaching, inquiry that’s true to your discipline.” We learned that we need to define what we mean by “inquiry” and, then, develop a signature assignment to measure it.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

One of the gaps in the School of Education’s assessment system is that we rely to heavily on DESE delivered assessments (e.g., MOCA, MoPTA). Even though these assessments provide meaningful data about our program, they aren’t specific to our program. Because they are designed and delivered by DESE, the assessments measure student progress on the Missouri teacher standards (which all teacher preparation programs in Missouri must do)—not our institutional mission.

At the same time, the portfolio—where our signature assessments should be housed—needs revision. Because each faculty group found that no assessment evaluates the “tools of inquiry” component of the learning outcome, we agreed that we need to develop a signature assessment focused on this area. This work will form the foundation of rebuilding and fixing the issues with the portfolio.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

Moving Forward Day is a new process for the School of Education. We implemented the *Moving Forward Day* procedures this year to address the problems we have had closing the loop.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.