

**Rhode Island College**  
**Elementary Education Undergraduate Program Review**

**Section IV Evidence for Meeting Standards**

Assessment 5: Assessment of Candidate Effect on Student learning

Program Requirements

1. ELED 424: Teaching Developmental Reading II – Implemented lesson Plan
  2. **ELED 437: Teaching Elementary School Science – Assessment of Student Learning**
  3. ELED 438: Teaching Elementary School Mathematics – Assessment Analysis
- 

Program Requirement 2 – ELED 437: Teaching Elementary School Science – Assessment of Student Learning

**Brief Description of the Assessment**

ELED 437: Teaching Elementary School Science is one of the 6 content-based methods courses teacher candidates are required to take in their Elementary Education program. Teacher candidates use NSF-endorsed instructional materials and assessments during practicum with students in grades one through six. The science kit assessment system has been designed for unique science content, processes, skills and related attitudes.

The Assessment of Student Learning artifact is designed in stages and includes four distinct tasks. The tasks require teacher candidates to identify contextual factors and consider their implications on teaching and learning; use the contextual factor data to create an assessment plan and rationale; analyze student learning; and write a self-evaluation.

The Assessment of Student Learning is one measure teacher candidates use to demonstrate competence in the teaching of Science. Teacher candidates must earn an Acceptable or Exemplary rating on the artifact, and are allowed one opportunity for revision should there be issues with their unit. It is then presented as evidence in their Preparing To Teach Portfolio prior to student teaching as documentation of readiness in this area.

**Alignment with ACEI Standards**

The design of the Assessment of Student Learning artifact requires teacher candidates to first, come to know their students, the school and community then use this information (contextual factors) to make decisions about the strategies they'll use as they plan and teach science (ACEI 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). They use exemplary, NSES-based, science curricula as their source instructional materials and plan based on the current content being adopted by the partner district (ACEI 2.2). They learn that assessment is an ongoing process that requires them to continually rethink their plans and strategies as they learn more about each of their students (ACEI 4.0).

Teacher candidates must work with peers and classroom teachers in the planning and execution of the unit then write a thoughtful self-evaluation that includes specific ideas for enhancing student learning. The teacher candidate must also justify why they believe the revisions would improve student learning (ACEI 5.1).

**Analysis of the Data Findings**

In each of the three semesters of data collection, all teacher candidates earned a rating of Exemplary or Acceptable. In those three semesters a total of 16 teacher candidates, whose ratings are included in the Acceptable column, were required to revise some portion of their Assessment of Student Learning. The percentage of Exemplary artifacts is moderate to average in number with the spring 2010 semester showing 45% of the teacher candidates scored in the Exemplary rating category. In the fall 2009 semester 36% earned Exemplary while in the spring 2009 59% earned the Exemplary rating.

### Interpretation of How the Data Provides Evidence for Meeting Standards

The numbers show candidates to be, at the very least, proficient in their abilities identify student interests and needs and collaborate with the cooperating teacher and peers to formulate strategies and plans (ACEI 2.2, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3). They are also able to development assessments, analyze their assessment data then use that data to make decisions about ways to enhance and improve student learning (ACEI 4.0, 5.1).

### Assessment Documentation

Teacher candidates demonstrate proficiency of their understanding of the relevant factors that may affect the teaching-learning process and their abilities to design and explain the rationale for their chosen assessment systems. They are assessed on their ability to collect, record, represent and analyze their assessment data and report, through a self-evaluation, the results of their assessments. **Assessment tool follows this section.**

This artifact is one of the Department of Elementary Education's Preparing to Teach Portfolio requirements and as such must have a rating of Acceptable or Exemplary. Teacher candidates are allowed one opportunity for revision should there be any issues with this work. The Acceptable and Exemplary artifact scores represent the candidates' levels of readiness in this area.

The data is listed in the columns: Exemplary, Acceptable, Revised and NA (Not Applicable). In the instance of a teacher candidate who transfers to Rhode Island College with prior experience and coursework the Department of Elementary Education Chair makes a decision about course substitutions. NA denotes that a decision was made based on the Chair's decision to substitute one course for another. The Revision column lists the number of teacher candidates who earned an unacceptable rating upon first submission, revised the artifact and upon that revision earned an Acceptable rating. The Acceptable column includes the scores from teacher candidates who earned an Acceptable rating and also includes the scores of those who revised their artifacts and earned Acceptable.

### Program Requirement 2 – ELED 437: Teaching Elementary School Science – Assessment of Student Learning

	Assessment of Student Learning			
	Number scored at each rating level.			
	Exemplary	Acceptable	Revised	NA
Spring 2010 n = 57	26	31	4	-
Fall 2009 n = 81	29	52	7	-
Spring 2009 n = 49	29	20	5	-

Rhode Island College  
Feinstein School of Education and Human Development  
Department of Elementary Education  
Scoring Rubric for Assessment of Student Learning – ELED 437

**Purpose**

The purpose of the Assessment of Student Learning Artifact is to ensure that RIC teacher candidates demonstrate proficiency in the descriptive dimensions of the RIPTS Standard 9 and the FSEHD Conceptual Framework. Teacher candidates are expected to demonstrate their proficiency in RIPTS 9 as part of the course requirements for ELED 437.

**RIPT Standard 9**

*“Teachers use appropriate formal and informal assessment strategies with individuals and groups of students to determine the impact of instruction on learning, to provide feedback, and to plan future instruction.”*

*Teachers...*

- *Select and/or design individual and group classroom assessments based on the strengths, limitations, and data provided by the assessments.*
- *Identify and consider student and contextual variables that may influence performance so that a student’s performance can be validly interpreted.*
- *Systematically collect/synthesize, and interpret assessment results from multiple assessments to monitor, improve, and report individual and group achievement.*
- *Provide students with opportunities and guidance to evaluate their own work and behavior against defined criteria and use the results of self-assessment to establish individual goals for learning.*
- *Use assessment result to provide students timely, helpful, and accurate feedback on their progress toward achievement goals.*
- *Maintain records of student learning and communicate student progress to students, parents/guardians, and other colleagues.*
- *Use information from their assessment of students to reflect on their own teaching, to modify their instruction and to help establish professional development goals.*

**Association for Childhood Education International** (ACEI) Standard 4. Assessment for instruction—Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate, and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.

**Feinstein School of Education and Human Development** (FSEHD) Conceptual Framework.

This course artifact is based on the FSEHD Teacher Candidate Work Sample (TCWS).

**PLANNING**

- Contextual factors related to the community and students to be taught;
- Learning goals and unit objectives aligned with state or district content standards;
- An assessment plan designed to assess student learning before, during and after instruction, and;
- A design for instruction;

**ACTING**

- Instructional decision-making that facilitates student learning;

**REFLECTING**

- Analysis of student learning and evaluation of self as teacher of the unit.”

## **Instructional Context**

Teacher candidates in ELED 437 use NSF-endorsed instructional materials during practicum with Grades 1-6 students. The science kits include a system of assessments that RIC teacher candidates can use. The kit assessment system has been designed for unique science content, processes, skills, and related attitudes. In respecting the Department of Elementary Education diversity of field settings and placements across the multiple sections, as well as the diversity of its students, and given the expectation that all RIC teacher candidates have an opportunity to meet the RIPTS Standard 9, the following criteria is used by ELED 437 course instructors to guide RIC teacher candidates in the development and selection of this portfolio entry.

## **TASKS**

### **Part 1. Context - Description and Implications (ACEI 3.1, 3.2, 3.3)**

- Explain 3-5 relevant factors (e.g., social, political, economic, historical, philosophical, legal, professional, global, and cultural) and characteristics of your students, classroom, and school/community that may affect the teaching-learning process in your field placement.
- Explain how each of the factor/characteristic will influence your instructional decisions related to planning and teaching this science unit.

*Suggested page length for narrative: 1 – 2 pages*

### **Part 2. Design - Visual Organizer and Rationale (ACEI 2.2, 4.0)**

Design a plan for assessing student learning (e.g., visual organizer) that includes formative and summative measures to monitor student progress toward your unit outcomes. Conclude this task with a rationale that indicates why your assessments are appropriate for measuring learning, how they support the unit outcomes, and how you will evaluate student performance.

#### **A. Visual Organizer**

- Create a visual organizer that outlines an assessment plan for each unit outcome that includes assessments that will help you judge student performance, type of assessment, purpose, what will be assessed, how evidence will be collected, and relationship to learning outcomes and GSEs.

#### **B. Rationale (Narrative)**

- Choose TWO of your unit learning outcomes for this narrative rationale. Each outcome should represent different learning domains (science knowledge, science process skills, laboratory – procedural knowledge, and scientific attitudes) - for example: one science knowledge learning outcome and one science process skill learning outcome.
- For these two learning outcomes, explain the appropriateness and scheduling of the different types of assessments. Refer to the visual organizer.
- Explain your anticipated criteria. Explain how you will evaluate or score pre- and post-assessments. Include scoring criteria you will use to determine if the students' performances meet the two outcomes.

*Suggested page length for rationale narrative: 1 – 2 pages*

### **Part 3. Analysis of Subgroup of Students Learning (ACEI 4.0)**

For the TWO unit learning outcomes that you selected to assess, analyze assessment data for a subgroup of students.

- Select a group characteristic (e.g., gender, pre-test performance level, socio-economic status, language proficiency) to analyze in terms of your two chosen unit outcomes.
- Provide a rationale for your selection of this characteristic to form a subgroup. In other words, explain why it important to understand issues surrounding this subgroup.
- Create a visual representation (e.g., charts and graphs) that compares pre-, formative, and post-assessment results for the subgroup on your two chosen unit outcomes.
- Interpret what these data show about student learning for these selected outcomes.

*Suggested page length for narrative: 1 - 2 pages + charts/graphs and examples of student work.*

**Part 4. Self Evaluation (ACEI 5.1)**

- Analyze the two unit outcomes in Part 3 above and provide an honest and thoughtful self-evaluation in which you offer specific ideas for enhancing student learning.
- Explain why these revisions would improve student learning.

*Suggested page length for narrative: 2 – 3 pages*

**RUBRIC**

**PERFORMANCE STATEMENT**

The teacher candidate demonstrates proficiency of descriptive dimensions of the RIPTS Standard 9 by understanding the relevant factors that may affect the teaching-learning process; designing and explaining the rationale for an assessment system; collecting, recording, representing, and analyzing assessment data; and self-evaluating the results.

**SCORING**

Rating → Indicator ↓	1 Unacceptable	2 Acceptable	3 Exemplary	RIPTS	ACEI
<b>Part 1. Context – Description and Implications</b>	<p>Minimal, irrelevant, or biased knowledge of the contextual factors is evident.</p> <p>For one or more contexts, implications for instruction and assessment are missing OR provides inappropriate implications</p>	<p>A general description of the contextual factors - at least one context-related factor for students, classroom, school/community is evident.</p> <p>General implications for instruction and assessment based on student, classroom, and school/community factors are present.</p>	<p>A specific description of the context-factors - at least one context-related factor for students, classroom, school/community is evident.</p> <p>Inter-related aspects of context for instructional implications based on data are evident.</p> <p>Specific implications for instruction and assessment based on student, classroom, and school/community factors are present.</p>	9	3.1 3.2 3.3
<b>Part 2. Design - Visual Organizer and Rationale</b>	<p>Few or no outcomes are aligned with assessments</p> <p>Assessments are not valid for measuring unit outcomes.</p> <p>The rationale is mostly incomplete and/or inappropriate.</p> <p>The scoring procedures are vague or incomplete.</p>	<p>Some outcomes are aligned with assessments</p> <p>Assessments are mostly valid for measuring unit outcomes.</p> <p>The rationale is partially complete or appropriate.</p> <p>The scoring procedures are mostly clear and complete.</p>	<p>Most outcomes are aligned with assessments</p> <p>Assessments are clearly valid for measuring unit outcomes.</p> <p>The rationale is complete or appropriate.</p> <p>The scoring procedures are well defined &amp; complete.</p>	9	2.2 4.0

<b>Rating → Indicator ↓</b>	<b>1 Unacceptable</b>	<b>2 Acceptable</b>	<b>3 Exemplary</b>	<b>RIPTS</b>	<b>ACEI</b>
<b>Part 3. Analysis of Subgroup of Students' Learning</b>	<p>Analysis of subgroup of students' learning is not aligned with selected unit outcomes.</p> <p>Analysis does not provide a comprehensive profile of student learning relative to outcomes for subgroup.</p> <p>Presentation of graph(s) is not clear; does not accurately reflect the data.</p> <p>Interpretation is inaccurate; conclusions are missing or unsupported by data.</p>	<p>Analysis of subgroup of students' learning is partially aligned with selected unit outcomes.</p> <p>Analysis provides a somewhat comprehensive profile of student learning relative to outcomes for subgroup.</p> <p>Presentation of graph(s) is clear and logical; reflects the data somewhat accurately.</p> <p>Interpretation is somewhat accurate; some conclusions supported by data.</p>	<p>Analysis of subgroup of students' learning is fully aligned with selected unit outcomes.</p> <p>Analysis provides a comprehensive profile of student learning for a subgroup.</p> <p>Presentation of graph(s) is clear and logical; accurately reflects the data.</p> <p>Interpretation is meaningful and technically accurate supported by the data</p>	9	4.0
<b>Part 4. Self Evaluation</b>	<p>Self-evaluation provides few or no ideas or inappropriate ideas for redesigning unit outcomes, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Self-evaluation lacks rationale.</p>	<p>Self-evaluation provides some ideas for redesigning unit outcomes, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Self-evaluation offers a general rationale for why these changes would improve student learning.</p>	<p>Self-evaluation provides ideas for redesigning unit outcomes, instruction, and assessment.</p> <p>Self-evaluation offers a specific rationale as to why these modifications would improve student learning.</p>	9, 10	5.1
<b>Writing Conventions &amp; Voice</b>	<p>Essay is poorly expressed with little attention to language and sentence structure.</p> <p>Some conventions are addressed. Paper contains five or more errors in spelling, punctuation, and/or grammar.</p>	<p>Essay is focused and shows evidence of skill in writing. Voice may shift and audience may not be clear throughout.</p> <p>Most conventions are addressed. Paper contains no more than four spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors.</p>	<p>Well-focused essay with evidence of thought in composition, phrasing and structure. Audience is clear and is effectively addressed.</p> <p>All conventions are addressed. Paper contains fewer than three spelling, punctuation, or grammatical errors</p>	No RIPTS	No ACEI

**REPORTING**

**REPORT OF SCORES AND RATING TO TEACHER CANDIDATE**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

	<b>Part 1</b>	<b>Part 2</b>	<b>Part 3</b>	<b>Part 4</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>INDICATORS</b>	Context – Description and Implications	Design -Visual Organizer and Rationale	Alignment with Selected Unit Outcomes	Self Evaluation and Implications for Future Teaching	Writing Conventions & Voice
<b>ORIGINAL</b>					
<b>RE-SUBMISSION</b>					

NOTE: An overall Acceptable or Exemplary rating of the artifact is required for the Preparing to Teach portfolio. Students are required to earn a minimum score of 2.00 for each indicator to earn an Acceptable or Exemplary. If any indicator is less than 2.00, students can re-submit one time to improve the sub 2.00 indicator(s) to a 2.00 and earn an Acceptable rating.

**ORIGINAL SUBMISSION**

*The overall rating of this portfolio entry is:*

\_\_\_ **Exemplary (3)**    \_\_\_ **Acceptable (2)**    \_\_\_ **Unacceptable. (1)**

---

ELED Professor Signature (Name & Date), 1<sup>st</sup> Submission

---

**RE-SUBMISSION**

*The overall rating of this artifact is:*

\_\_\_ **Exemplary (3)**    \_\_\_ **Acceptable (2)**    \_\_\_ **Unacceptable. (1)**

---

ELED Professor Signature (Name & Date), 2nd Submission