



Texas Southern University
Assessment Plan 2010-2013

Unit Assessment Plan

College of Education

Bachelor of Science in Interdisciplinary Studies

Introduction

Texas Southern University's Mission

Texas Southern University is a comprehensive metropolitan university. Building on its legacy as a historically black institution, the university provides academic and research programs that address critical urban issues and prepare an ethnically diverse student population to become a force for positive change in a global society.

In order to achieve this mission, Texas Southern University provides:

- quality instruction in a culture of innovative teaching and learning
- basic and applied research and scholarship that is responsive to community issues
- opportunities for public service that benefit the community and the world.

Texas Southern University's Vision

Texas Southern University will become one of the nation's pre-eminent comprehensive metropolitan universities. We will be recognized by the excellence of our programs, the quality of our instruction, our innovative research, and our desire to be a contributing partner to our community, state, nation, and world.

Accreditation Standards

Accreditation by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS) Commission on Colleges signifies that the institution: (1) has a mission appropriate to higher education, (2) has resources, programs, and services sufficient to accomplish and sustain that mission, and (3) maintains clearly specified educational objectives that are consistent with its mission and appropriate to the degrees it offers, and that indicate whether it is successful in achieving its stated objectives.

Source: The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 5th edition

Goal 1 Assessment Plan 2010-11 to 2012-13

1 Goal Description

Goal 1:

To prepare candidates who are competent educators in their areas of specialization.

2 SLO Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 1.1:

Candidates will demonstrate knowledge of the content in their respective certification areas as measured by the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) Program Tests in the following disciplines:

EC-6 Generalist, EC-6 Bilingual Generalist, 4-8 English, Language Arts & Reading, 4-8 English, Language Arts, Reading & Social Studies, 4-8 Mathematics, 4-8 Science, 4-8 Math/Science, 4-8 Social Studies and EC-12 Special Education.

SLO 1.2:

Candidates will demonstrate pedagogical knowledge and skills foundational to effective teaching and learning in the following Domains:

Domain I â Active, Successful Student Participation

Domain II â Learner-Centered Instruction

Domain III â Evaluation and Feedback on Student Progress

â Domain IV â Management of Student Discipline, Instructional Strategies and Time and Materials

3 Metric

Metric 1.1

TExES (Texas Examination for Educator Standards) Content Examinations in the specified disciplines on the final score report as reported by ASEP (Accountability System for Educator Preparation).

Metric 1.2

Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument with the following ratings for items in each domain:

Exceeds Expectations

Proficient

Below Expectations

Unsatisfactory

4 Target 2010-11

Target 1.1

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the candidates who have completed their programs of study will successfully pass the TExES content licensure exam in their respective certification areas.

Target 1.2

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the candidates will earn ratings of Exceeds or Proficient on items in each of the four domains assessed using the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument

5 Findings 2010-11

Findings 1.1

Findings for completion year 2010-2011 show that 100% of the candidates who took the EC-4 Generalist, EC-6 Bilingual Generalist, 4-8 ELA/Reading, 4-8 Mathematics and 8-12 Mathematics passed these certification examinations, and that the minimum target (75% passage rate) was met for EC-12 Special Education (75%). Findings also showed that only 36% of the candidates taking the EC-6 Generalist test passed.

Findings Data Results

100% pass rate EC-4 Generalist

100% pass rate EC-6 Bilingual Generalist

100% 4-8 ELA/Reading

100% pass rate 4-8 Mathematics

100% 8-12 Mathematics

75% pass rate EC-12 Special Education

36% pass rate EC-6 (N=11)

A closer analysis of the EC-6 Generalist showed that eleven individuals took the test and only four passed. Of the seven who failed, all were candidates who had started in the EC-4 Generalist track which was eliminated by the state. Thus, these individuals had to take the EC-6 Generalist test although their preparation had been in the EC-4 Generalist track. The EC-6 Generalist Examination does test more comprehensive content, especially in mathematics and science. These two areas were also the areas in which the seven who failed the test experienced the most difficulty.

Findings 1.2

Findings showed that the overall ratings for each of the four domains assessed were above the targeted 75%. Specifically, the overall performance of candidates was 91% in Domain I, 90% in Domain II, 88% in Domain III and 84% in Domain IV. However, even though the overall percentages exceeded the target set, further analysis showed that in each of the Domains, there were certain indicators where the percentages were below 75%. These included self-directed learning (72%) in Domain I, value and importance (73%) in Domain II, appropriate assessment (73%) in Domain III and self-discipline and self-directed learning (63%) and equitable and varied characteristics (68%) in Domain IV. Further analyses indicated that in every instance, large numbers of items were not even rated by the assessors. For example, 23% of the assessors did not rank the items self-directed learning or value and importance, and 27% did not rank the items appropriate assessment, self-discipline and self-directed learning, or equitable and varied characteristics. The missing data may also suggest that assessors are not sure what these specific items may be measuring or what behaviors they should look for to determine candidates' proficiency in these areas.

6 Action Plan 2010-11

Based on 2010-11

- (1) Encouraged candidates to take content exams before clinical practice.
- (2) Provided extra support through tutoring and computer-assisted support for those who fail.
- (3) Pilot program to require candidates to pass Representative Forms Test in the content areas prior to enrolling in the second field experience.
- (4) Implement pilot requirement during the Spring 2012 semester.
- (5) Examined what would be needed to add content specialists in math and science to the department faculty.

Based on 2010-11

Continued to evaluate professional development seminars to determine if these seminars are meeting the needs of the clinical practice students, university supervisors and supervising teachers.

Continued to see domains where items were not evaluated. Identified this as an issue to be addressed by the Clinical Practice and Field Based Experiences Committee of the Teacher Education Council. Referred item to this committee and will have recommendations from the committee during the next 2011-2012 academic year. Possible actions may be to (1) revise the instrument for greater clarity of the indicators and (2) create a training video that describes specific behaviors to be observed for assessment indicators.

7 Target 2011-12

Target 1.1

Eighty percent (80%) of the candidates who have completed their programs of study will successfully pass the TExES content licensure exam in their respective certification areas.

Target 1.2

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the candidates will earn ratings of Exceeds or Proficient on items in each of the four domains assessed using the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument

8 Findings 2011-12

Findings 1.1:

For completion year 2011-2012 show that 100% of the 4-8 ELA/RDG, 4-8 Math, 4-8 Science, and EC-12 Special Ed candidates passed their certification examinations above the minimum target (80% passage rate).

Findings also showed that only 64.3% of the candidates taking the EC-6 Gen test passed
 N= 9 of 14
 64.3%

Although this is 29.3% higher than the previous year (36%), it is still 15.7% below the targeted 80% minimum standard to be met.
 Target not met for EC-6 Generalist.

Findings 1.2:

N=13

96% in Domain I, 97% in Domain II, 92% in Domain III and 93% in Domain IV.

9 Action Plan 2011-12

Based on 2010-11

- (1) Encouraged candidates to take content exams before clinical practice.
- (2) Provided extra support through tutoring and computer-assisted support for those who fail.
- (3) Pilot program to require candidates to pass Representative Forms Test in the content areas prior to enrolling in the second field experience.
- (4) Implement pilot requirement during the Spring 2012 semester.
- (5) Examined what would be needed to add content specialists in math and science to the department faculty.

Based on 2011-2012

A detailed Action Plan for addressing this target is in the TEA Action Plan for EC-6.

[2011 2012 FINAL Edited Clinical_Practice_Evaluation_Data_Analysis Tables](#) [PDF 305 KB 5/15/13]

[C and I Assessment Narrative 2011_2012 for Initial Programs](#) [PDF 1,368 KB 5/15/13]

10 Target 2012-13

Target 1.1

Eighty percent (80%) of the candidates who have completed their programs of study will successfully pass the TExES content licensure exam in their respective certification areas.

Target 1.2

Eighty percent (80%) of the candidates will earn ratings of Exceeds or Proficient on items in each of the four domains assessed using the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument

11 Findings 2012-13

Findings 1.1

For completion year 2012-2013 show that 100% of the 4-8 ELA/RDG, 50% 8-12 ELA/RDG (i.e., 2 took exam and only 1 passed) , 66.7% 4-8 Social Studies (i.e., 2 or 3 student passed the exam) 4-8 Math, 4-8 Science, and EC-12 Special Ed candidates passed their certification examinations above the minimum target (80% passage rate).

Findings also showed that 93.8. % of the candidates taking the EC-6 Gen test passed (15 of 16). This is 56.3% higher than the previous year (36%). We have met the state and national goal for passed rate on the Content exam.

Target met for EC-6 Generalist.

(94%) Pass

Overall Pass rate for the Unit

88%

Findings 1.2
Domain I: N=11 F2012/70.30%
N=14 S2013/ 87.30

Domain II. N=11 F2012/76.06
S2013 81.50

Domain III.
N=11 F2012/92.25
S2013 89.5

12 Action Plan 2012-13

Based on 2012-13

- (1) Encouraged candidates to take content exams before clinical practice.
- (2) Provided extra support through tutoring and computer-assisted support for those who fail.
- (3) Require candidates to pass Representative Forms Test in the content areas prior to enrolling in the second field placement
- (4) Fully implement Action Plan Developed during 10-11.

13 Additional Reference Documents

R 1.1

ASEP Results from TExES Exams in the content areas. (Table showing ASEP Scores)

R1.2

Copy of Clinical Practice Instrument

Results from Clinical Practice Evaluations:

Clinical Practice Evaluation Data Analysis Sheet

[2013-InitialASSESSMENT NARRATIVE FOR DEPARTMENT of CURRICULUM](#) [PDF 132 KB 10/28/13]

[Candidate Teacher's Observation Form-Summer 2012](#) [PDF 181 KB 10/28/13]

[Exam Results](#) [PDF 120 KB 10/28/13]

[Revised C and I Initial.for 2012_2013_Prepared on 5.2013 \(1\)](#) [PDF 201 KB 10/28/13]

Goal 2 Assessment Plan 2010-11 to 2012-13

1 Goal Description

Goal 2:

To prepare initial candidates who demonstrate the capacity to problem solve, and to think critically and reflectively about barriers to student achievement that occur in today's classrooms, especially urban classrooms.

(Beginning 2011-2012.)

2 SLO Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives

SLO 2.1:

Clinical practice candidates will use action research methodology to identify a problem in their placement and recommend a possible solution based on critical and reflective thinking.

SLO 2.2:

Clinical Practice candidates will present their Action Research projects to unit faculty in a poster session during the graduation reception at the end of the fall and spring semesters.

(Beginning 2012-2013)

3 Metric

Metric 2.1

Grades earned on the Action Research Project.

Metric 2.2

Participation log listing candidate teachers and their topics who presented their research.

4 Target 2010-11

(Beginning 2011-2012)

5 Findings 2010-11

Findings will be reported in 2011-2012

6 Action Plan 2010-11

- (1) Encouraged candidates to take content exams before clinical practice.
- (2) Provided extra support through tutoring and computer-assisted support for those who fail.
- (3) Pilot program to require candidates to pass Representative Forms Test in the content areas prior to enrolling in the second field experience.
- (4) Implement pilot requirement during the Spring 2012 semester.
- (5) Examined what would be needed to add content specialists in math and science to the department faculty.

A detailed Action Plan for addressing this target is in the TEA Action Plan for EC-6. Please see referenced document.

7 Target 2011-12

Eighty percent of the clinical practice candidates will earn a grade of B or better on the Action Research project.

8 Findings 2011-12

Findings 2.1

Findings showed that the overall ratings for each of the four domains assessed were above the targeted 75%. The overall performance of candidates was 96% in Domain I, 97% in Domain II, 92% in Domain III and 93% in Domain IV. However, even though the overall percentages exceeded the target set, further analysis showed there were three areas where ratings by university supervisors fell below the targeted 75%. These were in Self-directed (67.70%), Relearning & re-evaluation (73.50%), and Equitable & varied characteristics (73.30%). Barely above the 75% was target Self-discipline & self-directed learning at 77.42%. In general,

ratings by the university supervisors were lower than those of the cooperating teachers and the candidate teachers in all domains. It should be noted that university supervisors see candidate teachers for a minimum of four classroom observations while cooperating teachers interact with their candidate teachers on a daily basis. This may explain why such differences in ratings exist.

Findings 2.1:

The minimum criterion for gaging the performance of the candidates on SLO 2.1 is a minimum grade of B (3.0) for the Action Research project. Data indicate that of the 13 candidate teachers completing the Action Research Project, eleven or 84.6% earned 3.0 points on the final project. Similar data was collected for the spring 2012 clinical practice cohort. There were 24 candidates who completed the Action Research Project and all 24 earned scores above 3.0.

Based on the above findings, the target for this objective was met.

Data for SLO 2.2 available after the 2012-2013 academic year.

9 Action Plan 2011-12

Based on 2010-11

Continued to evaluate professional development seminars to determine if these seminars are meeting the needs of the clinical practice students, university supervisors and supervising teachers.

Continued to see domains where items were not evaluated. Identified this as an issue to be addressed by the Clinical Practice and Field Based Experiences Committee of the Teacher Education Council. Referred item to this committee and will have recommendations from the committee during the next 2011-2012 academic year. Possible actions may be to (1) revise the instrument for greater clarity of the indicators and (2) create a training video that describes specific behaviors to be observed for assessment indicators.

Based on 2011-12

Complete revisions of the Clinical Practice Evaluation Instrument for implementation fall 2012.

Based on 2011-2012

A detailed Action Plan for addressing this target is in the TEA Action Plan for EC-6.

[2011 2012 FINAL Edited Clinical_Practice_Evaluation_Data_Analysis Tables](#) [PDF 305 KB 5/15/13]

[C and I Assessment Narrative 2011_2012 for Initial Programs](#) [PDF 1,368 KB 5/15/13]

10 Target 2012-13

Target 2.1

Eighty percent of the clinical practice candidates will earn a grade of B or better on the Action Research project.

Target 2.2

Ninety percent of the clinical practice candidates will participate in the special poster sessions.

11 Findings 2012-13

Findings 2.1

Item I, II, III

N= 26

2012 Cohort

N= 29

2013 Cohort

Average score of Supervising Teacher and ISD Teacher

- I. Efficient Use of Instructional Time (81%)
- II. Instruction (73%)
- III. Personal and Professional Characteristics (87.2%)

Area II. Instruction was the lowest domain. The raw data indicates the university supervising teachers scored the teacher candidates in the average of 60%.

Ratings by the university supervisors were lower than those of the cooperating teachers and the candidate teachers in all domains. It should be noted that university supervisors see candidate teachers for a minimum of four classroom observations while cooperating teachers interact with their candidate teachers on a daily basis. This may explain why such differences in ratings exist.

Findings 2.2

Total=26

(2) Did not participate- repeat clinical practice

N=24

92%

12 Action Plan 2012-13

Based on 2012-13

Continued to evaluate professional development seminars to determine if these seminars are meeting the needs of the clinical practice students, university supervisors and supervising teachers.

The department will continue to monitor the prerequisite classes to further strengthen candidate's ability to implement their instructional design.

Students are able to write designs but need more practice in actual implementation of the lesson.

Based on 2012-13

Clinical Practice Instrument was fully revised and implemented Fall 2012

13 Additional Reference Documents

[2013-InitialASSESSMENT NARRATIVE FOR DEPARTMENT of CURRICULUM](#) [PDF 132 KB 10/28/13]

[Revised C and I Initial.for 2012_2013_Prepared on 5.2013 \(1\)](#) [PDF 201 KB 10/28/13]

