Teacher Education Assessment: How we told our story—how we plan to tell our next story.
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- Presenter:
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    - severson@mnstate.edu
Background Information (1)

- In Fall of 2013 we assumed responsibilities for accreditation with a March 2015 spring on-site visit
Background Information (2)

- This meant that **within 1.5 years:**
  - We had to learn NCATE standards/process
  - We needed to develop understanding of acceptable evidence
  - We needed to identify and analyze data that had been gathered
  - We needed to redefine the assessment process/model
  - We needed to assure P-12 advisory were involved in review of data, continual renew of our programs
In the Spring of 2015 we experienced a **successful** BOT/NCATE/CAEP accreditation visit.
we felt so good...
Teacher Education Program at MSUM

• There are 29 licensures or endorsements
  – 7 graduate licensure programs
  – 4 endorsements (add on) programs
  – 18 initial licensure program

• There are 3 advanced degree programs
  – Curriculum & Instruction
  – Special Education
  – Educational Leadership
How did we tell our story? (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Licensure Programs</th>
<th>Advanced Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>These were the <strong>Key Assessments</strong> we had at hand to share our story:</td>
<td>Signature assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTLE Content Test</td>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation for advanced licensure programs (practicum/P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTLE Pedagogy Test</td>
<td>Dispositions assessment for advanced licensure programs (P).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Research proposal (degree programs/DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating Teacher Disposition Assessment</td>
<td>Written comprehensive exam (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Assignments</td>
<td>Action research project (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edTPA data</td>
<td>Oral Exam (DP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

— What are other options?
We had to redefine the Teacher Education Assessment System (TEAS)

How did we tell our story? (2)
## TEAS - Phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial License</th>
<th>Advanced Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase I: Beginning of Program</strong></td>
<td>Signature Assignment # 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Assignment # 1</td>
<td>(ED 601: Philosophy of Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., CHEM 150L: Safety Exam)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase II: Middle of Program</strong></td>
<td>Signature Assignment # 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Assignment # 2</td>
<td>(e.g., ED 632: Differentiated 5-Day Lesson Plan &amp; RtI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., CHEM 397: Research Report)</td>
<td>Research Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase III: End of Program</strong></td>
<td>Signature Assignment # 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature Assignment # 3</td>
<td>(e.g., ED 613: Political Concepts &amp; Strategies Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.g., CHEM 440: Lesson/Unit/Year/Plan)</td>
<td>Project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Dispositions Assessment</td>
<td>Course Grade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Final Evaluation</td>
<td>Written Comprehensive Examination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>edTPA, MTLE</td>
<td>Oral Examination/Defense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Action Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phase IV: Post Graduation</strong></td>
<td>Nothing available at that time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Survey (1st year of teaching)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to Teaching Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*CT Dispositions Assessment*  
*edTPA*  
*MTLE*  

---
We Reformulated the Teacher Education Assessment Committee

- Broadened the scope
- Broadened the membership
  - Members from the School of Teaching & Learning
  - Members from Secondary/K-12 programs located in the arts and sciences
  - P-12 partners (haven’t achieved this yet)
...and ensured accessibility to all Accreditation Data and Reports

Accreditation/Self Study

Welcome to the MSUM Teacher Education Accreditation Self-Study website. We have created this site to gather and communicate information to administration, faculty, and students. On this site you will find accreditation reports, programmatic data, meeting minutes, course syllabi, rubrics, data, and work samples.

Questions about information on this site should be directed to Dr. Sue Severson, severson@mnstate.edu or Dr. Ximena Suarez-Sousa suarez@mnstate.edu.

News

Ginther and Humphers-Ginther represent MSUM at Kids Plus Pathway to Careers Expo

With support from the College of Education and Human Services, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Office of Admissions, Shawn Ginther (Social Work) and Sue Humphers-Ginther (Sociology and Criminal Justice) represented MSUM at the 2nd Kids Plus Pathway to Careers Expo at the Duluth Entertainment and Convention Center on October 27. Pathway […]
How did we tell our story? (3)

SARTE Process

SARTE — Selective Admittance and Retention in Teacher Education

— Components
  • Grades in foundations courses
  • Basic skills testing
  • Personal initiative

— So, we can describe our students at entry
  • But, this doesn’t provide an evaluation of the effectiveness of our teacher preparation programs
After our Story was Shared: What Did we Learn? (1)

- **During Phase I and Phase II**
  - Minimal data to track candidate performance
  - Data points represented only performance on assignments
  - Data points only reflected faculty evaluations of students

- **Changes/Considerations for the Future**
  - Use data from early field experience evaluations to inform program evaluation
  - Make changes in data management system to monitor individual and group candidate performance over time
What did we Learn? (2)

• **Phase III Exit**
  – Three state approved measurements
    • edTPA, MTLE Content & Pedagogy
  – One measurement measurement that is aligned to InTASC standards
    • Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation
  – A measure of dispositions

• **Changes/considerations for the future**
  – Create measure of disposition assessment for advanced candidates
  – Assure that we are measuring the 10 InTASC standards
What did we Learn? (3)

• Phase IV: Follow-up
  – One data point on completers after first year of teaching

• Changes/considerations for the future
  – Gather more comprehensive data on teaching effectiveness for candidates during initial years of teaching
  – Create/administrate exit survey with advanced candidate completers
  – Create/administrate Employer Survey for advanced candidate completers
Reliability & Validity of Assessments

• **Strengths:**
  – Studies have been completed on some measurements (e.g., edTPA, Employer Survey)
  – Some measures have been aligned to InTASC standards and/or SEP standards
    • We’ve aligned edTPA to SEP standards
    • We’ve aligned cooperating teacher final evaluation to InTASC standards

• **Future Direction:**
  – Establish methodology for studying other key assessments
Reclaiming the Profession

• Assessment that identifies how we are ‘profession ready’
  – The question is—What do we want to know? How do we gather data on what we want to know?

• Process we are using—
  – Talking to our P-12 partners
  – Examining how practicing teachers are evaluated (ND & MN)
  – Review CAEP Standards (especially Standard 4)
    • Not just examining this to meet a CAEP standard
    • We want to know how our graduates perform as teachers
Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP)

**Standard 4—Program Outcomes**

- Component 4.1—**P-12 student learning and development**;
- Component 4.2—completer’s teaching knowledge and skills, based on observations and/or **P-12 student surveys**;
- Component 4.3—**employer satisfaction** with the completer’s preparation and also completer’s retention, promotion or transfer; and
- Component 4.4—**completer satisfaction** with preparation.
Mutual Benefit Model

Synergic Relationship

How can this relationship be mutually beneficial?

CAEP Standard 2

Teacher Performance Data: How do our graduates perform as teachers & can you support us in gathering teacher effectiveness data?

CAEP Standard 1

Informs teacher education programming:

MSUM Graduates teaching in local P-12 schools: Pilot

MSUM Graduates