

Quality Assurance Review of EPP Created Assessment

Assessment: **Student Teacher Work Sample**

Date of program review:

Date of QA Workgroup review: December 2021 and April 2022

Recommendations:

Rubric work:

- Refinement of work from cycle 2 to cycle 3 was assessed using reliability analysis which showed an increase in reliability as assessed through Cronbach alpha statistics. Next steps--run reliability analyses with Spring 2022 data to conduct second assessment of reliability on the STWS-R
- Review the language in the rubric used to describe the proficiencies/ indicators to gain perspectives about the required use/levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, and apply).

Administration and Purpose	
Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The time/point at which the assessment is administered during the preparation program is explicit. ● The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decision on progression are specified and appropriate. ● Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous. ● The basis for judgment is made explicit for candidates. ● Evaluation categories or assessments are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional and state standards. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Purpose: The TWS is a performance based assessment to evaluate the planning, instruction and assessment of teacher candidates' teaching and integration into the professional community of their student teaching school placement during the semester prior to program completion. ● Submission of their final TWS occurs prior to program completion. ● Instructions have been revised based on candidate and university supervisor feedback during pilot phases. ● An evaluation rubric is included to describe expectations for each TWS criteria. ● Clear alignment to national, professional and state standards is observed.
Content of Assessment	
Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Indicators assess explicitly aspects of CAEP and InTASC Standards, in addition to national, professional, or state standards. ● Indicators reflect the degree of difficult or level of effort described in the standards. ● Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated. ● When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators required levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The TWS has multiple sections which include indicators for the explicit assessment of criteria reflective of CAEP, InTASC, and state standards. ● Tasks and associated indicators address varied levels of intellectual behaviors such as use, analyze, reflect, evaluate, list, create, plan, design, etc. ● Most indicators focus teacher candidates on planning for, implementing and evaluating teaching to improve all student learning,

<p>and apply).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most indicators required observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiency in the standards. 	<p>including a focus on small, whole and individual student learners when applicable per program.</p>
--	---

Scoring	
----------------	--

Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The basis for judging candidate performance is well-defined. Each proficiency level descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by specific criteria aligned with indicators. PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (providing raters with explicit guidelines to evaluate candidate performance and giving candidates explicit feedback on their performance). Feedback provided to candidates is actionable - it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate. Proficiency level attributes are defined in actional, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. If a less actional term is used such as “engaged”, criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tasks are defined and aligned to rubric criteria. Criteria is operationalized using three main categories (not met, partially met, met) with a fourth category to capture items not completed. There is “space in between” these three main categories where raters may have leeway with assigning a final score; in other words instead of defining 1, 2 or 3 to match the three leveled categories, raters may assign a 1.5 or 2.75. Raters are provided guidelines for evaluating candidates' performance from level to level. Proficiency level attributes are defined with

Data Reliability	
-------------------------	--

Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., inter-rater, internal consistency, consensus building activities with documentation) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment. Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented. The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability. 	<p>Recommendation-- each smaller program receive 1-2 deidentified STWS to review from the semester during a designated time period (due to procedures)-- larger programs review 5; this will get us to at least 10% inter-rating; it would be most beneficial if the reviewers were USups;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have evidence of training of scorers. We NEED evidence of inter-rater agreement (discussed plan for training sessions and calibration/inter rater agreement test; teacher work sample inter-rater agreement plan using two inter-raters and gaining reliability coefficients)

Data Validity	
----------------------	--

Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A description or plan is provided that details 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use Historical timeline and re-adoption of the

<p>steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive) and how they were established.• If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted.• The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment.• The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of data from an assessment.	<p>TWS to describe the development -- expert review; mapping to standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Content validity -- origin; theoretical framework; expert feedback;• Compare TWS scores with the MEES• Describe the revised, re-adopted tool with the new pilot info, etc.• Describe process for analyzing and interpreting results ----PEF, Advisory boards review the results and provide feedback; (do we look at the right information? Do we put them to good use?)
--	--

Quality Assurance Review of EPP Created Survey

Assessment: Student Teacher Exit Survey

Date of QA Workgroup review: February 11, 2022

Recommendations: The survey as it is now administered collects the certification area of the completer. It does not collect demographic data. The QA recommends discussion with the PEF about revising the survey to collect this additional information to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the data collected

Administration and Purpose	
Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The point or points when the survey is administered during the preparation program are explicit. ● The purpose of the survey and its use are specified and appropriate. ● Instructions provided to survey respondents about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous. 	<p>The survey is administered using a Google form in April for spring student teachers and November for fall student teachers. The directions to completers inform them the survey data will be used to make changes to better prepare future educators. The instructions describe the type of questions and the form of the responses to be provided. The directions are clear and informative.</p>
Survey Content	
Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Questions or topics are explicitly aligned with aspects of the EPP's mission as well as CAEP, InTASC, national, professional, or state standards as appropriate. ● Individual items have a single subject; language is unambiguous. ● Leading questions are avoided. ● Items are stated in terms of behaviors or practices instead of opinions, whenever possible. ● Surveys of dispositions make clear to candidates how the survey is related to effective teaching. 	<p>The Student Teaching Exit Survey consists of 39 closed-questions followed by two open-ended questions. The items on the exit survey mirror those on the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Survey of First Year Teachers. The first 37 items are organized by Missouri Teacher Standard with one additional question about technology included. The items are clear and are stated in the form "I was prepared to.....". The final closed-questions asks completers to rate the overall quality of the teacher preparation program completed. Two open-ended questions at the end allow candidates to provide the context for their responses and provide additional, valuable information to the EPP.</p>
Data Quality	
Sufficiency Criteria	Findings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ratings scale choices must be clear and have balanced keying (same number of positive and negative options in Likert scale). ● Feedback provided to the EPP is actionable. 	<p>The rating scale choices use a 5-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Both the closed-questions and open-ended questions provide actionable feedback to the EPP. The questions mirror those of the state-administered Survey of First Year Teachers and the Technical Manual associated</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• EPP provides evidence that questions are piloted to determine that respondents interpret them as intended and modifications are made as needed,	with this survey provides information about how the items were developed and piloted.
---	---