2.4.e – Examples of significant changes made to courses, programs, and the unit in response to data gathered from the assessment system

Overview

The reaffirmation process for the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) led to a new data-driven model of assessing student learning outcomes (SLO’s) in degree programs annually. Each degree program is required to assess five SLO’s using direct and indirect measures and using programmatic data to drive pedagogical and curricular improvements. This new policy and process has led to significant changes across the institution, the EPP, and all degree programs at ECU.

Sample reports from the EPP highlight the regular and systematic analysis of student learning. Each report includes data from AY’s 2011-12, 2012-13, and 2013-14:

- Birth-kindergarten Education, MAED
- Counselor Education, MS
- Elementary Education, BS
- History Education, BS
- Instructional Technology, MAED
- School Administration, MSA
- School Health Education, BS

Initial Teacher Preparation Programs

The original Electronic Evidences Portfolio (EEP) was launched in fall 2010. It consists of ten categories of evidence:

- Evidence 1 – Transcript
- Evidence 2 – Evidence of content knowledge
- Evidence 3 – Planning instruction
- Evidence 4 – Certificate of Teaching Capacity
- Evidence 5 – Impact on student learning
- Evidence 6 – Leadership
- Evidence 7 – Home, school and community relations
- Evidence 8 – Early experiences reflective essay
- Evidence 9 – Instructional technology
- Evidence 10 – Internship (including progress reports and final evaluation)

Evidences 1-7 are required by the NCDPI; evidences 8, 9 and 10 are requirements of the unit. Teacher candidates created their portfolios as part of the early experience course. As the candidate progressed through his or her preparation program, other course-embedded evidences were submitted to the EEP for final evaluation. Table 1 illustrates the alignment of the NCDPI required
evidences and their alignment to North Carolina Professional Teaching Standards (NCPTS) and NCATE Standards.

After the successful pilot of the edTPA in spring 2011, the Director of Assessment and Accreditation recognized the alignment of the assessment tasks with the evidences, and petitioned NCDPI to substitute edTPA for Evidences 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7. Provisional permission was granted. As a result, the electronic evidences were reorganized to better meet the needs of faculty and teacher candidates. Meetings were conducted with each program area to discuss the changes in the portfolio. In 2013, the EEP was restructured into four smaller portfolios, which were more focused and precise: Early Experience, Internship, edTPA, and the Signature Assessments for Initial Licensure portfolio (SAIL). The new portfolio structure was launched in fall 2013. Table 1 also illustrates changes in the EEP following the edTPA pilot and subsequent data analysis.

TPA Overview and Expansion presentation

Table 1: Electronic Evidence Portfolio Alignments and Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2009 Approved Blueprints</th>
<th>NC PTS Alignment</th>
<th>NCATE Alignment</th>
<th>2012 Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 1 – Transcript</td>
<td>3b.1</td>
<td>St. 1.a</td>
<td>Maintained for NCDPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 2 – Evidence of content knowledge</td>
<td>3b.1</td>
<td>St. 1.a</td>
<td>Moved to SAIL Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 3 – Planning instruction</td>
<td>1a.2, 2b.3, 2d.1, 3a.1, 3c.1, 3c.2, 3d.1, 4a.1, 4a.2, 4b.1, 4c.1, 4d.1, 4e.1, 4f.1, 5c.1</td>
<td>St. 1.b, 1.c, 1.d, 1.e, 1.g All St. 3</td>
<td>edTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 4 – Certificate of Teaching Capacity</td>
<td>1a.1, 1a.3, 1a.4, 1d.1, 1e.1, 2a.1, 2b.1, 2b.2, 2c.1, 2d.1, 2d.2, 3a.2, 3b.2, 3d.1, 4a.1, 4d.1, 4e.1, 4f.1, 4g.1, 4g.2, 4h.1, 4b.2, 5a.1</td>
<td>All St. 1</td>
<td>Maintained for NCDPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 5 – Impact on student learning</td>
<td>1a.1, 4b.1, 4h.1, 4h.2, 5a.1</td>
<td>St. 1.b, 1.c, 1.d, 1.e, 1.g All St. 3</td>
<td>edTPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 6 – Leadership</td>
<td>1b.1, 1b.2, 1b.3</td>
<td>St. 1.d, 1.g</td>
<td>Moved to SAIL Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 7 – Home, school and community relations</td>
<td>1c.1, 1c.2, 2e.1, 5b.1</td>
<td>St. 1.c, 1.d, 1.g</td>
<td>Moved to SAIL Portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence 8 – Early</td>
<td>2.b.3, 2.b.4, 5.a.1</td>
<td>St. 1.b, 1.c, 1.g</td>
<td>Early Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Early Experience portfolio contains evidences collected during the Early Experience courses that are common to all program areas, including Dispositions Survey A and the reflective essay (see exhibit 1.4.d). All evidences related to the internship (evidences 4 and 10) were moved into a separate portfolio. Most of these evidences are performance assessments of candidates’ teaching ability. Candidates are enrolled into the appropriate edTPA portfolio at the beginning of the internship. The edTPA portfolio is completed, submitted, and evaluated during the second semester of the internship.

As recommended by Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE), the SAIL’s were created to collect evidence from signature assessments as determined by program faculty. Currently, the Office of Assessment and Accreditation (OAA) manages SAIL’s for eighteen program areas. All SAIL’s contain a signature assessment addressing content knowledge and a signature assessment that demonstrates the candidate’s competency in the use of instructional technology. Most program areas have at least one signature assessment that requires the candidate to video record themselves while teaching. New signature assessments are currently in development.

The new portfolio structure (SAIL) allows candidates to develop a portfolio illustrating growth during their preparation, as well as a showcase portfolio demonstrating readiness to teach. This video provides a general overview of the portfolio system. It was used to introduce candidates and faculty to the new system in AY 2013-14.

**Introduction to the New Portfolio Structure**

The edTPA scores were used as the basis of the 2013 OAA Data Summit. As a result of the findings from the summit, faculty members from the professional core courses were invited to participate in edTPA committee meetings. During AY 2013-14, two professional core courses were revised to better align with requirements of the edTPA. SPED 4002 was revised to incorporate the language of the edTPA and to emphasize accommodations for students with special needs in both instruction and assessment. EDUC 4400 was revised to include additional information and instruction on analyzing assessment data.

**Advanced Licensure Programs**
During fall 2010, the advanced teacher education programs at ECU began the process of graduate program revision to align programs with the new NC Graduate Teaching Standards (NCGTS) and to infuse 21st Century skills throughout its programs. The Graduate Evidences Portfolio (GEP) was developed to meet the State Board of Education requirements for collecting and evaluating electronic evidences. A program-specific version of the GEP was developed for each MAEd program and the Master of Music program. The GEP consists of three to four electronic evidences.

Table 2: Graduate Evidence Portfolio Alignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2010 Approved Blueprints</th>
<th>NCPTS Alignment</th>
<th>NCATE Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Evidence 1 – Teacher Leadership Project</td>
<td>St. 1, St. 5</td>
<td>St. 1.b, 1.c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Evidence 2 – Cultural Diversity Proficiency Project</td>
<td>St. 2, St. 5</td>
<td>St. 1.c, 1.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Evidence 3 – Action Research Project</td>
<td>St. 3, St. 4</td>
<td>St. 1.a, 1.b, 1.c, 1.d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Evidence 4 – Special Education licensure areas ONLY</td>
<td>St. 3, St. 4</td>
<td>St. 1.a, 1.b, 1.c, 1.d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Evidence 1 – Teacher Leadership Growth Project**

The Leadership requirement of the MAEd and MM programs specifically addresses NCPTS Standard 1 – *Teacher Leadership* and is required of all advanced teaching candidates. In these courses, candidates are expected to demonstrate teacher leadership skills in appropriate educational settings by being able to design, develop, demonstrate, and use relevant projects that will ultimately enhance students’ growth in the classroom. Leadership courses in Art Education, Adult Education, and Elementary Education contain the Teacher Leadership Growth Project that students are required to complete. The Teacher Leadership Growth Project is based on each candidate’s individual self-assessment and requires examination of 21st Century Skills, NCGTS, and NCPTS. Candidates design and develop a project that promotes professional growth on specific leadership skills. The focus of this leadership project is centered on the leadership standard that candidates identify as an area in which they would like to grow professionally.

**Graduate Evidence 2 – Cultural Diversity Proficiency Project**

The Cultural Diversity Proficiency Project requires candidates to develop a two-tiered advocacy-based project that demonstrates their own personal and professional commitment to achieve greater cultural proficiency. The project is a model for individual transformation and organizational change that relies on evidence-based developmental approaches for addressing issues that emerge in diverse environments. The reflection paper requires candidates to explain how their project will help create more positive educational environments for students with special needs and how it will foster greater collaboration with the families and significant adults of their students. This project addresses NCGTS 2 – *Respectful Learning Environments*. 
**Graduate Evidence 3 – Action Research Project**
The action research project addresses NCGTS Standards 3 and 4. Candidates demonstrate depth of content knowledge, content pedagogy, and student learning related to their content area by completing a rigorous action research project. First, candidates reflect on their current school and/or classroom practices, policies, and/or learner outcomes. Second, candidates define a problem or phenomenon for study that they will investigate, and then synthesize current research literature related to the problem or phenomenon. Third, candidates propose research questions and develop rigorous methods and procedures to address their research questions. Finally, candidates specify study methods, carry out the study, collect data, and analyze data. The product or artifact associated with this project will be a research paper which includes a statement of research purpose and questions, literature review, study methods, results of analysis, discussion of results, discussions or conclusions, and a reference list.

**Graduate Evidence 4 – Case Study (Special Education only)**
The In-Depth Case Study in Special Education is an applied project that will require students to draw upon the literature, their knowledge, and their skills as teachers to pull deep comprehension of special education, assessment, curriculum, as well as the research and theories related to their students’ disability.