Arkansas State University

College of Education and Behavioral Science

EPP Assessment Day

One-Year Data Reports for 2020-2021

Fall Assessment Day
November 12, 2021

Name of Assessment: Educator Disposition Assessment (midpoint and Capstone)

Year: 2020-2021

Standard #: 3

Disaggregated Data

NI = needs improvement = score of 0

D = developing = score of 1

ME = meets expectations = score of 2

No disaggregated data

Midpoint N = 125; mode = 2 on all indicators; Mean above 1.5 on all indicators; all indicators expect 1 have NI, D and ME scores

Capstone N = 200; mode = 2 on all indicators; Mean above 1.9 on all indicators but 1 (1.85 #8 self-regulated learner); all indicators either D or ME scores

We believe our benchmark should be even at midpoint that all students should assess as at least developing

Data Summary

Overall our candidates show improvement in dispositions from midpoint to capstone. Oral and written communication skills would appear to be strengths to begin with and remain strong. Social emotional learning is a disposition that exhibits the greatest increase in mean score and is the highest percentage of 2 scores at capstone. Self-regulated learning is perhaps the greatest area of concern as it is the lowest mean at both mid-point and capstone and (apart from the communication skills) indicates the smallest change in mean over time.

Insufficient data but see general improvement from mid-point to capstone assessment. Communication skills stay relatively consistently strong from entrance to end of program; social emotional intelligence disposition increases the most during the program. While changes in mean for communication skills (oral and written) are smaller than the change for self-regulated learning, the two also have the least "room for improvement" Self-regulated learning consistently is indicated as scoring low or an area for considered improvement.

It may be written and oral communication skills are some of the easiest to assess, especially for students at the beginning of the program. Self-confidence in work and efficacy as a teacher may explain the increase in social-emotional intelligence. COVID may have had an impact on candidate's self-regulated learning. This would be a trend to watch as (when) the pandemic wanes.

By capstone #1 Oral Communication and #9 social emotional intelligence 98% or more score ME

At midpoint low scoring indicators are #6 diversity and #8 self-regulated learner; both had the lowest number of ME (73%)

At capstone low scoring indicators are #8 self-regulated (85% ME); next lowest was professionalism #3 at 93%

Lack of disaggregated data.

How are NAs coded (maybe not an issue for midpoint and capstone but likely to be for admission)?

Do we feel confident faculty and candidates know and understand the timeline and expectations?

Do we have a clear and good way to do assessments of students at admission who are new to our program? How will screening teams be able to assess students they have just met?

Has there been any "test cases" of using the EDA for issues outside of internship? Does everyone know this process?

What surprises you or jumps out at you?

At midpoint strongest performance was in #2 written communication skills (35 % developing, 65% ME; no NI)

Oral Communication #1 was about next – 2% NI, 30% D and 67% ME.

Demonstrates professionalism is one of the lower scoring indicators on the EDA at capstone yet typically our highest area in Danielson/TESS assessment

Low scores on self-regulated learner

Above stated disconnect with EDA and TESS scores on professionalism

Disconnect between "anecdotal" concerns about candidate communication skills (especially writing) and EDA scores

What are possible causes or contributing factors?

COVID

Inconsistency in how EDA is administered and/or differences in behaviors that can be observed between mid-point and capstone.

Lack of disaggregation of data from programs – is there a difference between ELED/MLED/SPED with more in-depth field experience to use for EDA than secondary?

Team SMART Goal and Action Steps

#1: Increase candidate change in mean score for self-regulated learner

#2 Provide disaggregated EDA data both for program and at least EPP demographics

#3 Correlate data between EDA professionalism and TESS professionalism- are there indicators in TESS more associated with EDA score than others? Then use that data to think about better supporting EDA professionalism

What is "best practice" to achieve this SMART goal?

#1 Need to research considerations for supporting students in self-regulated behavior and how much might be COVID related – need some long-term data to look for trends

#1 Research methods to support candidates in developing self-regulated behavior skills

#2 Assessment Coordinator provides more detailed/disaggregated data to IPAC for review

#3 Investigate behaviors related to EDA and TESS professionalism - are we using the same term to indicate different behaviors?

What steps do we need to take to achieve this SMART goal?

#1 Perhaps this could be a work group of interested faculty to study this idea of self-regulated learners and provide some leadership on implementation ideas?

#2 Work with Assessment Coordinator to clearly identify data needs for disaggregated EDA data

#3 Ask Prathima to provide individual candidate EDA and TESS data for investigation; Joanna/Standard 3 committee will analyze and report back to Standard 3/EPP

Notable performance above expectations across EPP

Oral and written communication at both levels; improvement in social emotional intelligence from mid-point to capstone.

Notable performance below expectations across EPP

Self-regulated learner at both levels; mean for professionalism is second lowest at capstone and about second lowest at midpoint.

Ways to prepare students to perform better/score higher

See above – ways to support candidate self-regulation and how this may be connected to COVID needs to be researched

Needs for faculty development to better support students

Perhaps stronger (more than the EDA calibration) PD related to dispositions and the alignment between EDA, TESS, and candidate performances

Area of greatest need to begin support immediately

Providing support to faculty and candidates related to the Self-regulated learner disposition.

RECOMMENDATIONS/QUESTIONS RELATED TO EDA and CAEP Standard 3

Clear process for implementation of remediation plans outside of internship settings? That needs a process and needs to be maintained/housed outside of PEP.

With new EDA at admission, review data in a cohort from admission to midpoint to capstone to determine if these patterns continue.

How is data provided back to candidates and to what effect? QUESTION – would we want to review at admission self-assessment and EDA on candidates – look for correlations and disconnects? Not really something CAEP expects unless that fits into the realm of sharing data with candidates.