

ISEE (ADC) GELO Assessment Data

ISEE GE Learning Outcome:

Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking: Students will be able to examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions.

Outcome Measure:

***Outgoing Measure:** Teaching Performance Assessment Task 1 (each year). *TPA format and administration changed at the State level in 2018. The new TPA was piloted and calibrated to align with the old version.

^Incoming Measure: Teaching Performance Assessment Step 3 Reflect Rubric 1.7 Analyze & describe the impact of planning, teaching and assessment of student learning (TPA 1.7).

Criteria for Success (if applicable):

***Outgoing Criteria:** Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-4 with 1 being low) on TPA task 1.

^Incoming Criteria: Average score for the group is 3.0 or higher (on a scale of 1-5 with 1 being low) on TPA 1.7.

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (circle one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning, and
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

	Target: Average Score for the Group is 3.0 or higher				
	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	Jan 2019*	Jun 2019^
Outcome 1d. Critical Thinking	2.74	3.0	3.03	3.0 (3.0)*	NA^

*TPA changed in Fall 2018 both old and (new) format averages were 3.0 in 2018.

^In June 2019 only one student completed the new TPA. There was a second TPA submitted in the format but it was invalid. This score is suppressed to protect their identities.

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Target score is suppressed. The June 2019 number of participants for this indicator is very small (N=1). This low N is a product of a testing gap as SOE and our students adjust to TPA administration occurring later in the instructional program. As we move through the transition to the new indicator and collect more data we will have perspective on its value.

Candidates historically score at or above the proficient level (3.0) in the area of “examine, critique and synthesize information in order to arrive at reasoned conclusions”. We expect that to be the case going forward.

For the incoming assessment, part of the new two-part Teaching Performance Assessment (TPA), students submit a sample lesson where they teach to a class of students while also focusing in on three “focus” students who each represent diverse teaching needs: one social-emotional, one English learner, and a student with special needs. Our adherence to a structured course sequence where learning is developmental and scaffolded by drives this competency.

As noted above, the indicator for this outcome changed in Fall 2018. This State-level change has resulted in a testing gap as SOE and students adjust to students participating in TPA later in their program. The State undertook an extensive piloting and refinement process as it developed the new test, concluding the new test was comparable to the old. We will look to confirm this within SOE as scores come in over the next reporting cycles. Accordingly, as we move further into the transition we will gain perspective on its value as an indicator.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We are not making curricular adjustments based on June 2019 TPA data. Instead we are looking back seeing this score has been stable for the last three years. To further increase it in the year to come, and help students adjust to the new TPA formate we are focused on getting students additional experience and feedback in case study analysis. We piloted and are now implementing video technology that will streamline this process. This technology provides faculty and supervisors access to student instructional footage and expedites the feedback process as they work toward TPA.

Rubric Used

Step 3 Rubric

Rubric 1.7 — Step 3: Reflect

Essential Question: How does the candidate analyze and describe the impact of their asset and needs-based lesson planning, teaching, and assessment of student learning and provide next steps to advance instruction for this group of students?				
Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
<p>Candidate’s reflection provides no connection between student assets and needs and impact on their planning, teaching, and monitoring of student learning.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Candidate does not describe next steps for instruction.</p>	<p>Candidate’s reflection demonstrates a minor or narrow understanding of what was learned about planning, teaching, AND/OR monitoring student learning in regard to students’ assets or needs.</p> <p>Candidate describes next steps for instruction that are unconnected to what was learned about students.</p>	<p>Candidate connects the importance of knowing students’ assets and needs to student learning, and analyzes and describes how knowing this information can lead to the development of instruction that is engaging, challenging, and motivating to learners.</p> <p>Candidate provides next steps for instruction, citing evidence of student learning assessed during the lesson.</p>	<p>All of Level 3, plus:</p> <p>Candidate provides a clear rationale for how and why adaptations to instruction were or were not made during the lesson to meet whole class, group, and/or individual student needs.</p>	<p>All of Levels 3 & 4, plus:</p> <p>Candidate demonstrates a clear understanding of the principles of UDL regarding the development of flexible learning environments that can support individual learning differences, allowing for an inclusive classroom, and applies that understanding to an analysis of the planning and implementation of this lesson.</p>
<p>TPEs and Elements: TPE 1, Element 1; TPE 6, Element 1</p> <p>Primary Source of Evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written Narrative: Reflection on What You Learned 				