

### Undergraduate Curricular Program Assessment Plan

**Program Name:** Integrated Elementary and Special Education (IESE) Teacher Education Program

**Applicable Major(s)/Degree(s):** IESE B.A.Sc.

**Date:** March 19, 2018

#### **Section 1: Program Learning Outcomes and Assessment Methods**

This table summarizes all program learning outcomes and related details for each outcome. Program learning outcomes identify what students will know and do as a result of completing the program. IESE = UMD's Integrated Elementary and Special Education Teacher Education Program. SEP = Minnesota teacher licensure requirement (10 total).

<b>Program Learning Outcome(s)</b>	<b>Campus SLO Alignment</b>	<b>Assessment Year</b>	<b>Assessment Methods/Measures</b>	<b>Performance Indicators</b>
IESE-SEP #1 Competence in Field – Subpart 2: A teacher must understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and strictures of the disciplines taught and be able to create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students	1	2018-19 (Fall 2019 report)	a) Unit plan rubric b) MTLE Content Knowledge Exam	a) 100% at least at Level 1 or 2 b) 80% passing rate
IESE-SEP #7 Planning Instruction – Subpart 8: A teacher must be able to plan and manage instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, students, the community, and curriculum goals.	2	2018-19 (Fall 2019 report)	a) Lesson plan rubric b) Student Teacher Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form c) EdTPA Task 1 (all subparts)	a) 100% at least at Level 1 or 2 b) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item c) 70% passing rate on Task 1
IESE-SEP #2 Student Learning – Subpart 3: A teacher must understand how students learn and develop and must provide learning opportunities that support a student's intellectual, social, and personal development.	3	2019-20 (Fall 2020 report)	a) Lesson plan rubric b) Unit plan rubric c) edTPA Task 2 (all subparts)	a) 100% at least at Level 1 b) 100% at least at Level 1 or 2 c) 70% passing rate on Task 2
IESE-SEP #4 Instructional Strategies – Subpart 5: A teacher must understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage student development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills.	3	2017-18 (Fall 2018 report)	a) Lesson plan rubric b) edTPA Task 2 all subparts	a) 100% at least at Level 1 b) 70% passing rate on Task 2
IESE-SEP #5 Learning Environment – Subpart 6: A teacher must be able to use an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation	3	2018-19 (Fall 2019 report)	a) Student Teaching Cooperating Teacher Feedback	a) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item
IESE-SEP #8 Assessment – Subpart 9: A teacher must understand and be able to use formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continuous intellectual, social, and physical development of the student	4	2017-18 (Fall 2018 report)	a) edTPA Task 3 b) Lesson Plan rubric	a) 70% passing rate on Task 3 b) 100% at least at Level 1

IESE-SEP #9 Reflection and Professional Development – Subpart 10: A teacher must be a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of choices and actions on the learning community, and who actively seeks out opportunities for professional growth	5	2019-20 (Fall 2020 report)	a) Practicum Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form	a) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item
IESE-SEP #6 Communication – Subpart 7: A teacher must be able to use knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	6	2018-19 (Fall 2019 report)	a) Practicum Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form b) Student Teaching Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form	a) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item b) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item
IESE-SEP #3 Diverse Learners – Subpart 4: A teacher must understand how students differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to students with diverse backgrounds and exceptionalities.	7	2017-18 (Fall 2018 report)	a) Lesson Plan Rubric b) Practicum Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form	a) 100% at least at Level 1 b) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item
IESE-SEP #10 Collaboration, Ethics, and Relationships – Subpart 11: A teacher must be able to communicate and interact with parents or guardians, families, school colleagues, and the community to support student learning and well-being.	8	2019-20 (Fall 2020 report)	a) Practicum Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form b) Student Teaching Cooperating Teacher Feedback Form	a) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item b) 90% obtain a rating of at least 3 (meets expectations) on each item
IESE-UMD 6a Writing: Candidates will demonstrate writing at the advanced level for topics and intentions used in communication of educational purposes.	6a	Writ 31xx Assessment Plan	Refer to Writ 31xx Assessment Plan	Refer to Writ 31xx Assessment Plan

## **Section 2: Program Assessment Data Analysis and Results**

In this section, information is provided regarding who conducts the program's assessment, who compiles assessment data, who reviews assessment results, and general ways the program uses assessment results to improve teaching and learning. Information includes ways in which students and individuals/groups outside of the program are involved in the program's assessment process, if applicable.

The Integrated Elementary and Special Education (IESE) program assessment consists of external measures (MTLE Content exam, edTPA, and cooperating teachers' feedback – practicum and student teaching) and internal measures (lesson plan rubric and unit plan rubric). Program faculty as well as the Accreditation Office Personnel conduct the assessment and compile the assessment. The data of the state-related assessments (MTLE and edTPA) are sent to the Accreditation Office, where the Accreditation Director prints reports for the program faculty. The remaining data – cooperating teacher feedback forms, lesson plan rubric data, and unit plan rubric data are submitted to the Accreditation Office via Watermark (a data system). The Accreditation Director then prints reports for the faculty. The analyzed data from the program's assessments are used in the state-level Tier 3 reports, the Education Department's state-level unit report, and the campus-wide assessment report.

Program faculty meet regularly at block-specific meetings and full-program meetings to have informal conversations about student progress. At data-analysis-focused meetings, program faculty review lesson plan data, unit plan trends, cooperating teacher feedback. MTLE Content exam results, and edTPA results, and identify the strengths and challenges indicated by the data. Teachers and administrators also review data from the cooperating teacher feedback forms, MTLE Context exam results, and edTPA and provide observations at advisory meetings (i.e., Community Advisory Council on Teacher Education - CACTE and Administrators' Breakfast). Candidates (students) are involved in the assessment process through their self-assessment of practicum and student teaching experiences as well as participants in actions resulting from data-informed decisions that are implemented during course and edTPA meetings.

Program faculty use the identified strengths and challenges to continually improve the IESE program. When strengths are identified, faculty still examine the items to see whether there is an opportunity for growth. For example, practicum and student teaching feedback form data showed candidates met the performance indicator when receiving a rating of 3 or 4. Since more candidates were rated a 3 than those rated a 4, we identified that some candidates needed more development in effective questioning skills and enhanced the questioning process in our coursework. When challenges are identified, faculty discuss and determine how best we can help candidates meet the challenges. For example, edTPA results determined that candidates needed to improve in using academic language in the planning, instructing, and assessing process. As a result, faculty more purposefully implemented academic language opportunities in courses and edTPA support days meetings (e.g., aligning edTPA language with content-specific language; revisiting and promoting academic language's role in planning, instruction, and assessment).

