

**Unit Assessment Report: Assessment #3 – Ability to Plan**

**School Year: 2012-2013**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial Programs**  | **Mean Score** |
| Elementary Education - Undergraduate | 3.33 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 3.46 |
| Special Education Undergraduate | 2.96 |
| Special Education Graduate | 2.78 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | 2.93 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 2.79 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | 3.00 |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | 2.95 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | N/A |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 2.96 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 2.93 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 2.93 |
| **Initial Candidates Average** | **2.98** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advanced programs** | **Mean Score** |
| Educational leadership: Principal Preparation  | 2.85 |
| English as a Second Language | 2.96 |
| Instructional Technology | 2.89 |
| Reading and Literacy | 2.87 |
| School Counseling |  |
| **Advanced Programs Average** | **2.89** |

Interpretation and Findings:

As is consistent with results obtained from the last two years of data, candidates at both the initial and advanced levels in the College of Education demonstrate a sound ability to plan instruction with all program averages hovering close to a 3.0. Due to low enrollment in the secondary social sciences no candidates were assessed during the 2012-2013 year.

One will note the change in scale for the initial licensure programs that has now moved to a 4.0 scale with an “exceptional” category for those candidates that exceed the target category. Some concern is noted in the discrepancy between the elementary education programs and other initial licensure programs and the unit will endeavor to discuss the discrepancies and seek some reliability measures to insure that all raters are assessing candidate’s work consistently.

Most of the initial programs have or are moving toward tasks from the edTPA to assess this skill in pre-service teacher candidates. The transition from the Teacher Work Sample to the edTPA has included professional development for faculty and candidates as well as ongoing work to obtain training in collaboration with other colleges and schools of education in the surrounding Chicago land areas. Several Lewis faculty members have taken the lead for their departments to insure that the components of the edTPA are embedded in the curriculum well before the application of this assessment. The candidates measured in this sample may have had limited exposure to the components of the tasks and it is predicted that candidate performance in the special education and secondary programs will improve over time.

Advanced program assessments differ significantly by program and therefore no real comparisons are meaningful. However, as most candidates in advanced licensure programs are already licensed educational professionals the ability to plan effective instruction or create a supportive learning environment may not be challenging as pre-service candidates who are learning the nuances of effective instruction and navigation through a lesson or unit to improve student learning.

Overall, candidates in the College of Education at Lewis University in initial and advanced licensure programs demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to plan for effective instruction or support the learning environment in order to insure student learning.
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