

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report (Due October 1, 2023)

Program Name (no acronyms): Masters of Arts in Teaching      Department: Education

Degree or Certificate Level: Masters      College/School: School of Education

Date (Month/Year): September 2023      Assessment Contact: [Karissa Sywulka](#) /Angela Moret

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2022-2023

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? September 2021

Is this program accredited by an external program/disciplinary/specialized accrediting organization or subject to state/licensure requirements? Yes

If yes, please share how this affects the program's assessment process (e.g., number of learning outcomes assessed, mandated exams or other assessment methods, schedule or timing of assessment, etc.): The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education requires certification teachers be scored using the MEES standards. There are 9 MEES standards that are aligned with the SLU Graduate SLOs.

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please provide the complete list of the program's learning outcome statements and **bold** the SLOs assessed in this cycle.)

MEES (Missouri Educator Evaluation System) is the mandatory assessment system for universities that have approved programs to prepare teachers, both those pursuing MoDESE (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education) certification via either the traditional route or the alternative route. There are nine MEES standards regarding which candidates for Missouri teacher certification must demonstrate proficiency to a prescribed level used state-wide protocols, rubrics, and reporting systems.

In the Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) evaluation cycle, this year's report is to focus on MEES Standard 2. The complete list can be found [here](#).

#### **MEES Standard 2**

**Student learning, growth, and development.**

**The teacher understands how students learn, develop and differ in their approaches to learning. The teacher provides learning opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners and support the intellectual, social, and personal development of all students**

### 2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe the artifacts in detail, identify the course(s) in which they were collected, and if they are from program majors/graduates and/or other students. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

All MAT students are full-time teachers in either public or non-public schools. The MEES is designed to assess students' competence in nine key areas of teaching based on data collected by means of observations of the teacher certification candidate in the classroom teaching students, reviews of artifacts of teaching and learning, and conferring with other school personnel with whom the teacher interacts.

The student is evaluated using the MEES by both a university supervisor and a school mentor/cooperating teacher multiple times during each of the student's two years in the MAT program. Data are gathered regarding the student's

demonstrated level of performance. These data are used formatively to affirm students' teaching skills and attributes and to support students in continuous improvement during the two years.

These artifacts are gathered during the Practicum course that students take each of the two fall terms and each of the two spring terms. The observations take place at the school at which the student is a full-time teacher. Conferences typically are held at the school following the observation when feasible or in real-time via Zoom at a mutually agreeable time for the student who is the teacher of record at his/her school and the university supervisor and school mentor/cooperating teacher.

EDF 5700 Advanced Growth & Development (I)  
EDI-6230 Instructional Design (D)  
EDSP 5310 Adv Psych/Ed of Exceptional (D)  
EDI-6250 Practicum (D, R, A)

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (please do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The MEES scores are determined by university supervisors and school mentors/cooperating teachers by using a DESE required rubric. The rubric uses prescribed methods of combining the scores on the given strands (aspects of the standard) articulated in the MEES rubric to arrive at a score for the standard.

The MAT program director reviews each rubric as it is submitted. As each cohort finishes their program, the summative scores are compiled and reported to DESE. The program director then confers with the program faculty and instructors to share the results and discuss patterns, if any, that would suggest the need for more emphasis in coursework to support students' understanding of and ability to use the concept or skill in practice.

The MEES Rubric is [linked here](#). A section from the MEES Manual is also [linked here](#) that prescribes the method for combining ratings on the various strands of the rubric into a score for the standard.

A score of 3 is the expected level of teaching performance as of the summative assessment at the end of the MAT degree program.

### 4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Results:

A total of 16 MAT students graduated with their degrees in May 2023. Graduates have two scores for each standard – one from a university supervisor and one from a cooperating teacher/school mentor.

Summative Scores for MEES Standard 2:

Score of 4	16
Score of 3	15
Score of 2	01
Score of 1	00

There are no variations in teaching modality. Students are observed "live" in the act of teaching, and conferences are held either in person or synchronously via Zoom. The students are observed at their school site in their own classrooms.

## 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you? Address both a) learning gaps and possible curricular or pedagogical remedies, and b) strengths of curriculum and pedagogy.

MAT teachers did very well in developing their teaching skills and practice regarding student learning and growth and development. DESE regulations set the passing score for the MEES such that a certification candidate can earn certification with the majority of scores in the 3 or 4 category, while still having a few scores of 2. Under trying circumstances less than 1% of our students' scores earned 2s.

Strengths of the overall curriculum and pedagogy are seen through a comparison of the 2021-2022 MEES scores and the 2022-2023 MEES scores. The scores for MEES Standard 2 are higher in 2022-2023. This is the second year that these courses have been taught by the same professor, which may relate to the higher scores. Students are able to acknowledge deeper cultural communication strategies and not only acknowledge surface level cultural differences. Our program is producing educators that are developing culturally responsive assessment and special events in our schools.

Learning gaps of the overall curriculum and pedagogy, as related to the MEES Standard 2, are that MAT teachers know they should be using their students' data and assessment to inform the selection and modification of strategies for diverse learners, however, there is a gap with putting it into practice during their 2 years of teaching while in the MAT program.

Possible curricular or pedagogical remedies include increasing the degree to which we have them reflect on using assessment data to change instruction for diverse learners. We will create a shared drive of resources related to using data to adapt instruction. We will ask the University Supervisors to ask MAT teachers to bring their students' data to a meeting to review and make decisions regarding their instruction to meet the needs of the diverse learners in their classrooms.

## 6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss the results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The MAT Pathway Directors met in September to discuss the data related to MEES Standard 2. The team discussed the quantitative and qualitative data collected; they identified strengths, learning gaps, and possible curriculum and pedagogical remedies for improving the MAT program.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Artifacts of student learning
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

Possible curricular or pedagogical remedies include increasing the degree to which we have them reflect on using assessment data to change instruction for diverse learners. We will create a shared drive of resources related to using data to adapt instruction. We will ask the University Supervisors to ask MAT teachers to bring their students' data to a meeting to review and make decisions regarding their instruction to meet the needs of the diverse learners in their classrooms. The MAT Faculty plans to increase the frequency of collecting the MEES artifacts and other related data to student learning outcomes of the program.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

**7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes**

**A.** What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years **as a result of previous assessment data**?

We have increased the communication between professors and the program directors regarding academic and practicum progress. Individual attention to MAT teacher growth has increased, specifically looking at how MAT teachers are performing in the program.

**B.** How has the change/have these changes identified in 7A been assessed?

MAT teachers have been required to individually conference with the pathway directors to discuss how their students' individual needs are being met and what needs remain unaddressed. The pathway directors meet to discuss strengths and challenges identified from data that is collected.

**C.** What were the findings of the assessment?

MAT pathway directors found that MAT teachers are appreciative of course content while also struggling to balance the demands of teaching full-time while being a grad student. A shared drive of resources is being created to offer MAT teachers assistance that they can access on their own time.

**D.** How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

MAT pathway directors will continue to collect data and artifacts, meet with faculty, review the assessment plan, and make recommendations for curricular and programmatic revisions moving forward.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., artifact prompts, rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted/appended into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document. Thank you.**