

# **ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR**

Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education/Reading Specialization (BS)  
**Instructional Degree Program**

Spring 2004

**Assessment Period Covered**

June 1, 2004

**Date Submitted**

## **Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:**

### **Institutional Mission Reference:**

Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, is committed to the preparation of students for leadership roles in their chosen profession and in an increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University is a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

### **College/University Goal(s) Supported:**

The mission of the College of Education at Texas A&M International University is to provide a comprehensive and coherent professional development system for educators linking all aspects of the educational profession. Through educational experiences provided by the system, educators will be prepared to provide learner-centered instructional experiences that promote excellence and equity for all students in the field.

## **Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:**

- 1.** Preservice teachers in the educator preparation program will demonstrate an understanding of instructional design and assessment to promote student learning.
- 2.** Student interns in the educator preparation program will demonstrate the skills related to implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment.
- 3.** Students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education/Reading Specialization (BS)  
**Instructional Degree Program**

Spring 2004  
**Assessment Period Covered**

June 1, 2004  
**Date Submitted**

## **Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

***NOTE: There should be one form for each intended outcome listed. The intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.***

  1   Preservice teachers in the educator preparation program will demonstrate an understanding of instructional design and assessment to promote student learning.

## **First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

### 1   a. **Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

The average score of students in the educator preparation program will be 70% or a minimum of 240 on Domain I (Designing Instruction and Assessment to Promote Student Learning) of the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES).

#### **1. a. Summary of Data Collected:**

Out of a population of 57 students, only 54 took the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Test of the new Texas Examination on Educator Standards (TExES) during the Fall term of 2003. The remaining three students either took the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) or had not tested at the time this report was prepared. On average, the students who took the PPR Examination obtained 76.83% of the items correct on Domain I. An analysis of the students' performance on the four competencies comprising Domain I indicated that their two strongest areas were Competency #3 (Understands how to design effective instruction and assessment procedures) with 79.46% accuracy and Competency #2 (Understands and applies concepts related to student diversity) with 78.65% accuracy. On Competency #1 (Understands and applies human developmental processes), students demonstrated 77.3% accuracy and 71.93% accuracy on Competency #4: (Understands and applies learning processes and factors to plan effective instruction and assessment). Despite these differences, students' performance on Domain I and the respective competencies indicates that they exceeded the 70% criterion.

Out of a population of 73 students, only 23 took the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Test of the new Texas Examination on Educator Standards (TExES) during the Spring term of 2004. On average, the students who took the PPR Examination obtained 77.00% of the items correct on Domain I. An analysis of the students' performance on the four competencies comprising Domain I indicated that their two strongest areas were Competency #3 (Understands how to design effective instruction and assessment procedures) with 75.17% accuracy and Competency #2 (Understands and applies concepts related to student diversity) with 79.22% accuracy. On Competency #1 (Understands and applies human developmental processes), students demonstrated 80.04% accuracy and 73.57% accuracy on Competency #4: (Understands and applies learning processes and factors to plan effective instruction and assessment). Despite these differences, students' performance on Domain I and the respective competencies indicates that they exceeded the 70% criterion.

### **\_\_1\_\_a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

Students' performance data were shared with program faculty who agreed that it was important to refine their instructional efforts with respect to Domain I. Additionally, closer inspection of the Fall 2003 and Spring 2004 TExES data revealed that greater attention needs to be given to Domain III of the TExES, since students' average performance on competencies #7 (Communication), #8 (Instructional Practice), #9 (Technology), and #10 (Assessment) did not consistently exceed 75% across two administrations of this exam. Faculty agreed to develop a plan to systematically incorporate these competencies into their courses and will begin implementing the revised courses in the Fall 2004 semester.

### **Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

#### **\_\_1\_\_b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

At the pre-service interview to enter the teaching internship, students in the teacher preparation program will provide evidence of knowledge of instructional design and assessment with a score of 90% or better, as determined by a committee of public school personnel and College of Education Supervising faculty who will use a rubric developed for this purpose.

#### **\_\_1\_\_b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Spring 2004 Block II Data collected from 74 students through the use of the Internship Interview Rubric indicated that 74 (100%) of the students successfully participated in the interview process and were subsequently admitted into the internship experience. During this interview, students demonstrated appropriate knowledge of instructional design and assessment. Of the 74 students interviewed, no more than four (5%) needed to strengthen their understanding of: a) how to successfully work with students having special needs; b) develop a greater understanding of the learner-centered proficiencies; c) authentic assessment; or d) multiple intelligences.

**\_\_\_\_\_b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

Program faculty reviewed the data mentioned above and agreed to continue to refine their courses by placing greater attention on the four areas mentioned and assessing through different means students' understanding of all relevant competencies.

Since students' performance on the Internship Interview Rubric has exceeded expectations, faculty members decided to place a special emphasis on Competency #7 (Communication: The teacher understands and applies principles and strategies for communicating effectively in varied teaching and learning contexts) from Domain III of the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TEXES), especially since students' average performance over the last two TEXES administrations has not been higher than 69%. This competency will be incorporated into the Professional Education courses that preservice teachers take.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education/Reading Specialization (BS)  
**Instructional Degree Program**

Spring 2004  
**Assessment Period Covered**

June 1, 2004  
**Date Submitted**

## **Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

***NOTE: There should be one form for each intended outcome listed. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.***

  2   Student interns in the educator preparation program will demonstrate the skills related to implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment.

## **First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

### 2   a. **Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

The average score of students completing the educator preparation program will be at or near 85% on the Field Performance Evaluations, with no score lower than 65%.

### 2   a. **Summary of Assessment Data Collected**

Data collected from 73 students during the Spring 2004 semester through the use of the Field Performance Evaluations revealed that their scores ranged from 50 to 100 and that the mean for the group was 92.2. Students were particularly capable of maintaining positive rapport with the students and communicating information in an accurate, clear, and logical manner to their students. A trend observed among some students is that they need to make sure that students are attentive before beginning the lesson or giving directions. In addition, they need to question students in a variety of ways to promote critical thinking. Overall, the desired performance standard was exceeded.

## **\_\_2\_\_a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

The data mentioned above will be shared with program faculty to determine how to best incorporate these insights into the educator preparation program. Program faculty will also re-examine and possibly revise the assessment instrument used at this point in the educator preparation program to help them identify program strengths and areas of need.

Since students performance on the Field Performance Evaluations has exceeded expectations, faculty has decided to focus on Competency #10 (Assessment: The teacher monitors students performance and achievement; provides students with timely, high-quality feedback; and responds flexibly to promote learning for all students) from Domain III of the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES).

## **Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

### **\_\_2\_\_b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

At the Portfolio Review, students completing the educator preparation program will provide evidence of their ability to apply principles of instructional design and assessment with a score of 85% or better, as determined by a team of Field Supervisors using a common rubric.

### **\_\_2\_\_b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

During the Spring 2004 term, 70 Block III students prepared and presented their portfolios for evaluation. Seventy-nine percent (55) of the 70 students earned a score of 80% or higher on their portfolios. The average score obtained by the 70 students was 87.17%. As a part of the portfolio presentation, students demonstrated an appropriate understanding of instructional design and assessment.

### **\_\_2\_\_b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

A team of educators working with the educator preparation program will re-examine the rubric used to assess students' performance on their portfolios to determine if any modifications to the rubric and/or program are needed. This team of educators will research different types of rubrics used to assess e-portfolios and will create a rubric to be utilized for e-portfolios with Block I students during the Fall 2004 term, Block II students during the Spring 2005 term, and Block III students during the Fall 2005 term. The rubric will then be used to help educators monitor program strengths and areas of need.

# ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR

Bachelor of Science Degree in Early Childhood Education/Reading Specialization (BS)  
**Instructional Degree Program**

Spring 2004  
**Assessment Period Covered**

June 1, 2004  
**Date Submitted**

## **Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:**

***NOTE: There should be one form for each intended outcome listed. The intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.***

  3   Students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles.

## **First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

### 3   a. **Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

The average score of students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a specialization in Reading on the Generalist EC-4<sup>th</sup> grade, TExES 101 exam, Domain I will be at the passing standard.

### 3   a. **Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Because Early Childhood through 4<sup>th</sup> Grade with a Reading Specialization is no longer an option for students, data are being collected on students pursuing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood – 4<sup>th</sup> Grade teaching certificate. The Language Arts subtest of the EC-4 Generalist TExES exam is the focus of this analysis. Of the 12 students pursuing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood – 4<sup>th</sup> grade teaching certificate who took the TExES exam in the Spring 2004 term, 11 (92%) successfully completed the Language Arts portion with a score above the passing standard. In the Fall 2003, six students pursuing this same teaching credential took the TExES exam, and all six (100%) successfully completed the Language Arts portion of the exam with a score above the passing standard. In effect, of these 18 students, 17 (94%) successfully completed the Language Arts portion of the EC-4 TExES exam by exceeding the passing standard.

### **\_\_\_3\_a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

Reading agreed to refine the curriculum by placing a greater emphasis on issues regarding the "alphabetic principle, oral language, and ways of addressing the literacy needs of English Language Learners, as well as those students experiencing speech and language delays. In a survey, the four students pursuing identified their perceived areas of strength and need. Competencies concerning the alphabetic principle and oral language development will be emphasized in appropriate courses, e.g., EDRD 3309 Teaching Reading in the Schools and EDRD 3303 Teaching Reading and Language Arts to help students acquire a deeper understanding of these concepts and their application. Since literacy concepts associated with English Language Learners are appropriately addressed EDRD 3302 Literacy, curricular modifications will be made during the Fall 2004 to incorporate EDRD 3302 into the required courses for individuals pursuing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education – 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Generalist teaching credential. Finally, ways of addressing the needs of children with speech and language delays will be addressed as part of EDRD 3311 Classroom Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties and in EDSE 3305 Introduction to Special Education. It is anticipated that this change will be implemented on or before the Spring 2005 semester.

### **Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

#### **\_\_\_3\_\_\_b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**

On the Questionnaire for Early Childhood Students, students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles with an average score of 3 on a Likert scale of 1 – 4 on their knowledge of TExES exam 101, Domain I competencies

#### **\_\_\_3\_\_\_b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**

Four students who completed Block III in the Spring of 2004 majored in Early Childhood Education with a specialization in reading. They completed the self-assessment survey measuring their knowledge of the competencies on Domain I of the EC-4 standards.

Mean scores for the competencies ranged from a low of 3.1 to a high of 3.9 on a Likert-type four-point scale with a score of "1" indicating *no knowledge* and a score of "4" indicating *a great deal of knowledge*. The overall mean score was 3.49. A score of "3" indicates *adequate knowledge*." Since our objective was that students would have a mean of "3" on these competencies, we did achieve this objective for these students at the end of Block III in the spring of 2004.

#### **\_\_\_3\_\_\_b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**

Although no competency mean score fell below "3," results from the survey allow us to pinpoint potential areas of strength and weakness. Those competencies rated the highest were "literacy development" with a mean of 3.8 and "reading fluency," with a



mean of 3.9. The competencies rated the lowest were "alphabetic principle," with a mean of 3.2 and "oral language," with a mean of 3.1.

In reviewing individual items, these students consistently rated lower those items having to do with differences in instructional methods for English language learners and speech and language delays. Modifications for diverse populations will need to be addressed to a greater extent in all reading courses.

Competencies concerning the alphabetic principle and oral language development will be emphasized in appropriate courses, e.g., EDRD 3309 Teaching Reading in the Schools and EDRD 3303 Teaching Reading and Language Arts to help students acquire a deeper understanding of these concepts and their application. Since literacy concepts associated with English Language Learners are appropriately addressed EDRD 3302 Literacy, curricular modifications will be made during the Fall 2004 to incorporate EDRD 3302 into the required courses for individuals pursuing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education – 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Generalist teaching credential. Finally, ways of addressing the needs of children with speech and language delays will be addressed as part of EDRD 3311 Classroom Diagnosis and Remediation of Reading Difficulties and in EDSE 3305 Introduction to Special Education. It is anticipated that this change will be implemented during the Spring 2005 semester.

Although only four students responded to this Likert scale survey, the questionnaire (see attached copy) will continue to be used in the Fall semester of 2004, since it is difficult to generalize about a program based upon so few responses. The topics covered in the survey are applicable to students pursuing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood – 4<sup>th</sup> Grade Generalist teaching credential.

### **SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION**

<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>LOCATION/Special Instructions</b>
TEExES Summary of Results	
Questionnaire for Early Childhood Students	

**Texas A&M International University**  
**TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAM**

**QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD STUDENTS IN BLOCK III**  
**TEExES Framework: Domain I**

Please take a few moments to respond to the following questions as honestly and openly as possible. **DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THIS PAPER.** This survey will help us to know how well we are teaching this Domain. Your answers reflect your whole program, not one specific professor.

Rate what you consider to be your *current level of knowledge* in each competency from the English Language Arts and Reading Domain of the TEExES Framework by circling the appropriate number based on the scale below.

<b>No knowledge</b>	<b>A little knowledge</b>	<b>Adequate knowledge</b>	<b>A great deal of knowledge</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

<b>Oral language development</b>				
1. Basic concepts (phonemes, semantics, syntax etc.)	1	2	3	4
2. Developmental stages of oral language development	1	2	3	4
3. Speech or language delays and differences	1	2	3	4
4. Relationship between oral language and literacy	1	2	3	4
<b>Phonological and phonemic awareness</b>				
5. Patterns of development in phonemic awareness	1	2	3	4
6. Differences for English language learners	1	2	3	4
<b>Alphabetic principle</b>				
7. Relationship of letters to spoken words	1	2	3	4
8. Patterns of alphabetic skill development	1	2	3	4
9. Differences in alphabetic knowledge for English language learners	1	2	3	4
<b>Literacy development</b>				
10. Development of emergent literacy	1	2	3	4
11. Awareness of environmental print, uses of print	1	2	3	4
12. Understanding that literacy develops in multiple contexts through reading, writing, and speaking	1	2	3	4

<b>Word analysis and decoding</b>				
13. Patterns of development	1	2	3	4
14. Word recognition (decoding, context clues, sight words, orthographic analysis, syllabic analysis, morphemic analysis)	1	2	3	4
15. Procedures for assessing word analysis skills	1	2	3	4
<b>Reading fluency</b>				
16. Understanding of fluency as rate, accuracy and intonation	1	2	3	4
17. Understanding of how fluency affects comprehension	1	2	3	4
18. The development of fluency	1	2	3	4
19. Norms for identifying and monitoring fluency	1	2	3	4
<b>Research and comprehension skills</b>				
20. Locating, retrieving and retaining information from content areas	1	2	3	4
21. Use of text organizers ( headings, table of contents, etc.)	1	2	3	4
22. Summarizing and organizing materials from multiple sources (notetaking, outlining, graphic organizers)	1	2	3	4
<b>Writing conventions</b>				
23. Children’s development through invented spelling	1	2	3	4
24. Relationship between spelling and phonological awareness	1	2	3	4
25. Similarities and differences between spoken and written language	1	2	3	4
<b>Development of written communication</b>				
26. Individual variations in writing development	1	2	3	4
27. Addressing the needs of English language learners	1	2	3	4
28. The difference between first draft writing and writing for publication	1	2	3	4
<b>Assessment</b>				
29. Characteristics of formal and informal assessments	1	2	3	4
30. State standards (TEKS) for reading, writing, listening, and speaking	1	2	3	4
31. How to determine independent, instructional, frustration levels	1	2	3	4
32. How to communicate assessment results with parents	1	2	3	4

Additional comments regarding your level of knowledge in this Domain: