

**Unit Assessment Report: Assessment 3: Ability to Plan Instruction 2011-2012**

**Description of the Assessment:** Although no two programs outside of a discipline use the exact same instruments to assess candidate’s ability to plan instruction, all assessments are built on a 3 point rubric scale with 3 indicating target performance and 1 indicating unacceptable performance. Some of the measures from the Initial Certification programs include the classroom observation evaluation items related to preparation and planning, the Teacher Work Sample Design for Instruction Task that measures learning goals and alignment with standards, use of pre, formative and summative assessment and knowledge of instructional design. Other programs include assessment of the candidate’s ability to plan a unit and develop lesson plans that meet the needs of all students. In the advanced programs the Teacher Work Sample components are used for Reading and Literacy candidates. Educational Leadership candidates create a supervisory plan for classroom instruction while English as Second Language candidates and Instructional Technology candidates create an integrated lesson plan.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial Programs**  | **Mean Score** |
| Elementary Education - Undergraduate | **2.94** |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Field Based | **-** |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | **2.99** |
| Special Education Undergraduate | **2.91** |
| Special Education Graduate | **2.94** |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | **2.72** |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | **3.0** |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | **2.95** |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | **-** |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | **2.64** |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | **2.6** |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | **2.72** |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | **-** |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | **2.9** |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | **-** |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | **2.8** |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advanced programs** | **Mean Score** |
| Educational leadership | **2.73** |
| English as a Second Language | **2.85** |
| Instructional Technology | **2.73** |
| Reading and Literacy | **2.85** |

**Interpretation and Findings:** A review of 2011-2012 data on candidates’ ability to plan instruction or to monitor the instructional plans of others again demonstrates that candidates in the College of Education perform close to the Target level on all measures. Elementary and Special Education candidates hover at or above 2.9 out of 3.0. No data is posted for the Field Based Master’s program in Elementary Education as this program has been shelved due to low enrollment. As was seen in 2010, this may be attributed to the significant amount of coursework and instructional time that is devoted to the skills that are needed to effectively plan for a wide variety of learners. Candidates in the Secondary programs performed slightly better than 2010 as the secondary mean rose from 2.67 to 2.80. Overall, Initial Program candidates demonstrate strong skills in instructional planning across programs and tasks.

Very strong performance is seen among the Advanced Programs. ESL results are slightly improved from 2.71 in 2010 to 2.85 in 2011. This can be attributed to a more deliberate focus on instructional technology through in class demonstration and evaluation of web based materials. With these curricular adjustments more candidates are meeting the Target level for this assessment. In the area of Educational Leadership candidates create a professional development plan that supports the vision for teaching and learning in school. This program notes a very strong performance of candidates and will continue to emphasize supervision and development of effective teaching strategies in order to increase student learning. General findings for the Reading and Literacy program note 31 of 32 candidates with consistent performance in the acceptable and target ranges on all indicators on the rubric. The program report notes improvement through more emphasis on contextual factors that impact a classroom and a school, planning and assessment, and adaptations needed to meet the needs of all learners.

Overall, candidates in both initial and advanced demonstrate a high degree of proficiency on their ability to plan instruction or develop professional development plans to improve the skills of those they supervise.
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