

Key Assessment # 5 – Effects on Student Learning

5-1. Brief description of the assessment and its use in the program.

The Impact on K-8 Student Learning project is assigned in Student Teaching Seminar (EDTE 487) and performed on student teachers during their last semester. The project highlights behaviors that the student teacher and mentor teacher are doing continuously. Once during the 15 weeks of student teaching (usually about week 9) the student mentor pair work formally to document the coaching that happens in this setting. Thus:

1. The mentor teacher suggests a topic to be taught in the near future.
2. The mentor teacher suggests a teaching strategy for this lesson.
3. The student teacher fully prepares this lesson.
4. The student teacher teaches the lesson.
5. The mentor teacher assesses the lesson using Assessment #5.
6. The student teacher writes a formal reflection.
7. The mentor teacher reads the reflection and completes the assessment.

5-2. Description of how this assessment specifically aligns with the standards.

The Impact on K-8 Student Learning evaluation, along with the seminar course EDTE 487 as a whole, incorporates and aligns with NCTE Standards. The evaluation rubric for elementary candidates provides the data showing that candidates meet NCTE Standards 4.6, 4.7, and 4.9, as well as other standards and benchmarks not specified in this report. The Alignment Matrix describes how these Standards are met in the context of the Student Teaching experience. See [Attachment 6](#).

5-3. Brief analysis of the data findings.

The Impact on K-8 Student Learning assessment provides the following candidate data taken from the *LiveText* database, using the rubric summary for elementary candidates for the following semesters: Spring, 2009, Fall, 2009, and Spring, 2010. For Fall, 2008, the same assessment was used but data was not collected through the *LiveText* database; therefore, an analysis is not provided for this term.

For Spring 2009 (n=7), the means for all six sections of the rubric range from 3.714 to 4.286. All seven candidates achieved scores of Satisfactory through Exceptional for Sections 1-5, with the exception of Section 6 where one candidate received a score of Unsatisfactory. For Fall, 2009 (n=2), the means for all six sections of the rubric range from 4.5 to 5.0, with both candidates scoring at the Proficient or Exceptional level for each section of the rubric. For Spring 2010 (n=8), the means for all six sections of the rubric range from 4.125 to 4.375. All eight candidates received scores of Satisfactory through Exceptional for all six sections of the rubric.

5-4. Interpretation of how the data provides evidence for meeting standards.

The data for Spring, 2009 (n=7), show the means for all six sections range from 3.714 to 4.286, indicating the majority of candidates performing at or above the Satisfactory level. For Section 1 (Planning), two candidates scored at Exceptional level, three scored at the Proficient level, with two scoring at the Satisfactory level; for Section 2 (Teaching), one candidate scored at the Exceptional level, five scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at Satisfactory level; for Section 3 (Teacher Materials), one candidate

Key Assessment #5 - Assessment

scored at the Exceptional level, five scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 4 (Student Materials), six candidates scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 5 (Reflection on Student Learning), two candidates scored at the Exceptional level and five scored at the Proficient level; and for Section 6 (Self-Assessment for Growth), two candidates scored at the Exceptional level, three scored at the Proficient level, one scored at the Satisfactory level, and one scored at the Unsatisfactory level. The data show that the majority of candidates for Spring, 2009, scored at or above the Satisfactory level, indicating target performance.

The data for Fall, 2009 (n=2), show the means for all six sections range from 4.5 to 5.0, indicating all candidates performing at or above the Proficient level. For Sections 1 (Planning), 3 (Teacher Materials), 4 (Student Materials), and 6 (Self-Assessment for Growth) all candidates scored at the Exceptional level; for Section 2 (Teaching), one candidate scored at the Exceptional level and one scored at the Proficient level; and for Section 5 (Reflection of Student Learning), one candidate scored at the Exceptional level and one scored at the Proficient level. The data show that all candidates for Fall, 2009, scored at or above the Proficient level, indicating target performance.

The data for Spring, 2010 (n=8), show the means for all six sections range from 4.125 to 4.375, indicating the majority of candidates performing at or above the Proficient level. For Section 1 (Planning), three candidates scored at the Exceptional level, three scored at the Proficient level, and two scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 2 (Teaching), three candidates scored at the Exceptional level, four scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 3 (Teacher Material), four candidates scored at the Exceptional level, three scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 4 (Student Materials), five candidates scored at the Exceptional level, one scored at the Proficient level, and two scored at the Satisfactory level; for Section 5 (Reflection on Student Learning), four candidates scored at the Exceptional level, three scored at the Proficient level, and one scored at the Satisfactory level; and for Section 6 (Self-Assessment for Growth), five candidates scored at the Exceptional level, one scored at the Proficient level, and two scored at the Satisfactory level. The data show that the majority of candidates for Spring, 2010, scored at or above the Satisfactory level, indicating target performance.

In conjunction with data from Assessment #1 (the MTTTC scores) and the Final Student Teaching Evaluation, the above data give an estimate of the candidates' mastery of content knowledge (language arts as well as other content areas) and ability to successfully apply and integrate NCTE Standards 4.6, 4.7, and 4.9 into their teaching practices, using language arts content and skills as part of classroom teaching styles and lesson units.

5-5a. Assessment tool or a rich description of the assessment.

EDTE 487 (Student Teaching Seminar) uses the assessment (Impact on Student Learning K-8) as part of the evaluation of teacher candidates. The assessment and data are provided below:

5-5b. Scoring guide

Scoring Guide: Grading is based on mastery; quality points are awarded on a scale of 1-5 that range from Unsatisfactory to Exceptional for use in ascertaining the teacher candidate's level of competence with regard to curriculum planning.

Exceptional	5	Target performance is assessed with the following scale:	
Proficient	4		
Satisfactory	3	Target	23-25 points
Emerging	2	Acceptable	15-22 points

Key Assessment #5 - Assessment

Unsatisfactory 1 Unacceptable below 15 points

Key Assessment #5 - Assessment

5-5c. Charts of candidate data derived from the assessment

Standards

- MI-AU-TLC-CF.2.B** Implement developmentally appropriate educational practices.
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.A** Implements effective planning to promote learning in the classroom.
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.B** Works effectively with ALL students, parents, teachers, administrators and community members.
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.D** Creates effective learning environments which efficiently manage students, classroom assistants, and classroom resources.
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.A** Communicate effectively in written, verbal, and non-verbal forms
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.B** Use electronic tools effectively for professional communication, teaching, research, and evaluation of student progress.
- MI-AU-TLC-CF.6.A** Demonstrate continuing professional development.

EDTE487 Impact on K-8 Student Learning

	Exceptional (5 pts)	Proficient (4 pts)	Satisfactory (3 pts)	Emerging (2 pts)	Unsatisfactory (1 pt)
Candidate created written Lesson Plan - incorporated all essential elements (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.A					
Supervisor/Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plan Implementation (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.6.A					
Candidate created student materials - pre-lesson, during lesson, post-lesson -original/adapted - appropriate to lesson goal -organized (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.B MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.D MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.B					
Candidate created lesson delivery materials -original/adapted, - visual, - organized (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.B MI-AU-TLC-CF.3.D MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.B					
Candidate written reflection on student baseline data and learning growth (achievement) (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.2.B					
Candidate written reflection of self growth in lesson delivery (1, 16%) MI-AU-TLC-CF.4.A MI-AU-TLC-CF.6.A					

Key Assessment #5 - Assessment

2008-2010 EDTE487 K-8 Impact on Student Learning Rubric									
	Exceptional	Proficient	Satisfactory	Emerging	Unsatisfactory	N	Mean	Mode	SD
	5 pts	4 pts	3 pts	2 pts	1 pt				
Spring 2009									
Candidate created written Lesson Plan incorporated all essential elements	2	3	2			7	4.000		
Supervisor/Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plan Implementation	1	5	1			7	4.000		
Candidate created student materials -pre-lesson, during lesson, post-lesson - original/adapted -appropriate to lesson goal -organized	1	5	1			7	4.000		
Candidate created lesson delivery materials -original/adapted, -visual, -organized		6	1			7	3.857		
Candidate written reflection on student baseline data and learning growth (achievement)	2	5				7	4.286		
Candidate written reflection of self-growth in lesson delivery	2	3	1		1	7	3.714		
Fall 2009									
Candidate created written Lesson Plan incorporated all essential elements	2					2	5.000		
Supervisor/Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plan Implementation	1	1				2	4.500		
Candidate created student materials -pre-lesson, during lesson, post-lesson - original/adapted -appropriate to lesson goal -organized	2					2	5.000		
Candidate created lesson delivery materials -original/adapted, -visual, -organized	2					2	5.000		
Candidate written reflection on student baseline data and learning growth (achievement)	1	1				2	4.500		
Candidate written reflection of self-growth in lesson delivery	2					2	5.000		
Spring 2010									
Candidate created written Lesson Plan incorporated all essential elements	3	3	2			8	4.125		
Supervisor/Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plan Implementation	3	4	1			8	4.250		
Candidate created student materials -pre-lesson, during lesson, post-lesson - original/adapted -appropriate to lesson goal -organized	4	3	1			8	4.375		
Candidate created lesson delivery materials -original/adapted, -visual, -organized	5	1	2			8	4.375		
Candidate written reflection on student baseline data and learning growth (achievement)	4	3	1			8	4.375		
Candidate written reflection of self-growth in lesson delivery	5	1	2			8	4.375		

(Scale: 5-Exceptional; 4-Proficient; 3-Satisfactory; 2-Emerging; 1-Unsatisfactory)