

**College of Saint Mary**  
**Rule 24 Section 2 – Artifacts 2 and 3**  
**Key Assessments and Findings**

**Endorsement Program: English as a Second Language**

Data from the Key Assessments table in Section 2 – Artifact 1 was collected and reported in each student's content area portfolio. The following ESL endorsement completers were reported in:

Content Area	Number of ESL completers – Undergraduate		Number of ESL completers – Graduate	
	2014-2015	2015-2016	2014-2015	2015-2016
Elementary Education	3	4	12	8
Special Education K-6	1	0	0	0
Foreign Language	0	1	2	1
Biology 7-12	0	0	1	0
English Language Arts 7-12	0	0	1	0
Language Arts 4-9, Science 4-9	0	0	0	1

Additionally, the following assessments are used for ESL endorsements:

Name of Assessment	Type or Form of Assessment	Brief Description of Assessment, including indicated information obtained from Assessment	When Assessment is Administered
SIOP Observation Checklist	Formative	Addresses eight specific areas: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery and Review and Assessment.	During EDU 473/573 ESL Practicum course
Long Form Practicum Evaluation	Summative	Addresses student development, learning differences, learning environments, content knowledge, planning for instruction, instructional strategies, professional learning and ethical practice and leadership and collaboration. Aligns with NDE clinical evaluation and INTASC standards.	At the completion of EDU 473/573 ESL Practicum course

**SIOP Observation Checklist –**

This assessment is derived from the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol developed by Echevarria and Vogt. The protocol addresses eight specific areas: Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery and Review and Assessment. The student is evaluated on a scale of one to four over twenty-five total indicators in the eight areas listed above. The teacher candidate submits a formal lesson plan following the SIOP Model and then is formally observed in a classroom setting teaching the lesson. The rubric is completed as the observation is in process. The observer discusses the indicators in a post-observation conference with the teacher candidate.

LINK: SIOP Rubric

**Long Form Practicum Evaluation --**

Addresses student development, learning differences, learning environments, content knowledge, planning for instruction, instructional strategies, professional learning and ethical practice and leadership and collaboration. Aligns with NDE clinical evaluation and INTASC standards.

LINK: Long Form Field Experience Evaluation

**Artifact 2:** Data tables with summarized data for each key assessment.

**Artifact 3:** Provide a narrative interpretation/summary of the assessment data from the institution's perspective.

### **Content Knowledge #1**

Graduation GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	3	2.724 – 3.836	3.305	16	3.755 – 4.00	3.955
2015-2016	5	3.016 – 3.782	3.522	10	3.451 – 3.984	3.834

### **Undergraduate**

The Graduation GPA for students seeking bachelor's degrees includes all program requirements including courses in General Education and the Education major including the Professional Core Courses and Supporting Courses. All courses on the Program of Study are included in the final Graduation GPA.

Review of the 2014-2015 data indicated that the undergraduate English as a Second Language Supplemental completers for the academic year 2014-2015 achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B- (2.66) to nearly an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. The data from 2015-2016 indicated that the completers in the undergraduate English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly a B (3.00) to an A- (3.66) on a 4.00 scale.

### **Graduate**

The graduation GPA of completers of the Master of Arts in Teaching Program is calculated on those credits earned at College of Saint Mary. Review of the data indicated that graduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement program achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly an A- (3.66) to an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. For 2015-2016, graduate completers achieved cumulative Graduate GPAs that ranged from nearly a B (3.0) to around an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Praxis II Test	
2014- 2015 2015-2016	There is no required Content Test for the English as a Second Language Endorsement.

### **Summary**

All completers passed Praxis II content relevant tests within their primary endorsement areas.

Analysis of the data indicates that all undergraduate and graduate completers demonstrated mastery of Content Knowledge that includes general academic content knowledge, theoretical knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge.

## **Content Knowledge #2**

Content GPA	Bachelors			Masters		
	N	Range	Mean	N	Range	Mean
2014- 2015	3	2.4 – 3.534	2.978	16	3.418 – 4.00	3.912
2015-2016	5	2.468 – 3.80	3.334	10	3.418 – 4.00	3.800

### **Undergraduate**

The Content GPA for the English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement undergraduate completers includes all endorsement requirements including courses in the supplemental endorsement. These courses identified on the Program of Study were included in the Content GPA.

Review of the data from 2014-2015 indicated that all of the undergraduate completers in the English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement program achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly above a C (2.0) to nearly a B+ (3.66) on a 4.00 scale. Undergraduate completers for the academic year 2015-2016 achieved Content GPAs that ranged from slightly above a B (3.00) to nearly a B+ (3.66) on a 4.00 scale.

### **Graduate**

The Content GPA for the English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement graduate completers includes all endorsement requirements for the supplemental endorsement as identified on the Program of Study.

Review of the data indicated that all of the graduate completers for the academic year 2014-2015 in the English as a Second Language Supplemental endorsement program achieved a Content GPA that ranged from between a B+ (3.33 ) and an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale. The data from 2015-2016 indicated that the graduate completers achieved Content GPAs ranging from between a B+ (3.33) and an A (4.00) on a 4.00 scale.

Practicum Evaluation (Standard 4.1)												
Standard 4.1: The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.												
	Bachelors Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed	Masters Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.70 (N=10)*	70%	30%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	2.86 (N=7)*	42.86%	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	0%	3.00 (N=10)	40%	20%	20%	10%	10%

\* Some students not reported – data not available because course was taken prior to Fall 2014

### Undergraduate

The majority of undergraduate ESL completers achieved a rating at the advancing and proficient levels for understanding the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches, and 43% of the ESL completers achieved rating of developing or beginning.

### Graduate

In 2014-2015, 100% of graduate ESL completers achieved a rating at the proficient or advancing levels for this indicator. In 2015-2016, 60% of ESL completers achieved a rating at the proficient or advancing levels for this indicator, 30% achieved ratings at the developing or beginning levels, and 10% were not observed for this indicator.

## Learner/Learner Environments

Practicum Evaluation (Standard 2.1 and 3.1)												
Standard 2.1: The teacher candidate understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities												
	Bachelors Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed	Masters Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.80 (N=10)*	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.33 (N=7)*	42.86%	28.57%	14.29%	0%	14.29%	3.56 (N=10)	50%	40%	0%	0%	10%
Standard 3.1: The teacher candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.80 (N=10)*	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.33 (N=7)*	57.14%	14.29%	0%	14.29%	14.29%	3.30 (N=10)	60%	20%	10%	10%	0%

\* Some students not reported – data not available because course was taken prior to Fall 2014

### **Undergraduate**

Review of the data indicates that 43% of undergraduate ESL completers from 2014-2016 scored proficient in understanding individual differences and diverse cultures and communities, 42% scored in the advancing and beginning levels and 14% were not observed. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of a field work.

### **Graduate**

Review of the data indicates that a large majority of 2014-2015 graduate ESL completers achieved a rating of proficient and 20% were rated as advancing on the indicator, understands individual differences and diverse cultures and communities. Fifty percent of graduate level completers in 2016-2016 were scored at the proficient level, 40 % at the advancing level and 10% were not observed for this indicator.

On the indicator, works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, 80% of graduate level ESL completers were rated at the proficient level and 20% were rated as advancing.

## Instructional Practices - Knowledge

Practicum Evaluation (Standard 4.1 and 7.1)												
Standard 4.1: The teacher candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches.												
	Bachelors Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed	Masters Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.70 (N=10)*	70%	30%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	2.86 (N=7)*	42.86%	14.29%	28.57%	14.29%	0%	3.00 (N=10)	40%	20%	20%	10%	10%
Standard 7.1: The teacher candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.80 (N=10)*	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.17 (N=7)*	42.86%	28.57%	0%	14.29%	14.29%	3.11 (N=10)	40%	30%	10%	10%	10%
2015-2016	3.42.86 (N=7)*	71.42%	14.29%	0%	14.29%	0%	3.60 (N=10)	80%	10%	0%	10%	0%

\* Some students not reported – data not available because course was taken prior to Fall 2014

### **Undergraduate**

Review of the data indicates that 43% of undergraduate ESL completers from 2014-2016 scored proficient in understanding the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of discipline(s), and 42% scored in the advancing and beginning levels. Forty-three percent of students were rated at the proficient level for planning instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals, a 42% were rated at advancing and developing levels, and 14% were rated at beginning levels on this standard.

### **Graduate**

Review of the data indicates that 70 percent of 2014-2015 graduate ESL completers achieved a rating of proficient and 30% were rated as advancing understanding the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of discipline(s), In 2015-2016 40% of graduate level completers scored at the proficient level, 40% at the advancing and beginning level sand 10% were not observed for this indicator.

On the indicator, works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, 80% of graduate level ESL completers were rated at the proficient level and 20% were rated as advancing.

SIOP Evaluation 100 points possible								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
<b>2014- 2015</b>	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015- 2016 completers				<b>93.98 (N=16)</b>	56.25%	43.75%	0%
<b>2015- 2016</b>	<b>91.56 (N=7)</b>	28.57%	71.43%	0%	<b>90.15 (N=10)</b>	10.0%	90.0 %	0%

### SIOP Observation Checklist

The SIOP Checklist has been identified as an Alternative Assessment for evaluating ESL completers knowledge of Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery and Assessment. The purpose of the SIOP evaluation is to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and skills in a genuine, meaningful practical learning experience.

Review of data indicates that the 100% of both the undergraduate and MAT ESL completers performed within the two top categories of Met or Partially Met on the SIOP checklist. Concern rests in the Partially Met category. Use of this data helped to drive decisions to separate graduate and undergraduate courses. The accelerated delivery of a summer program was difficult for undergraduates. Under the new offerings, undergraduates may take the practicum as early as sophomore or junior year due to rotations of offerings. Teacher candidates may not have taken all content methods courses prior to completion of this practicum. Graduate students also may complete this field placement prior to all content methods courses. For both undergraduate and graduate students, these results have been used as a formative measure.



## Instructional Practices – Effectiveness

Practicum Evaluation (Standard 7.1. 7.2 and 8.2)												
Standard 7.1: The teacher candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals.												
	Bachelors Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed	Masters Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.80 (N=10)*	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.17 (N=7)*	42.86%	28.57%	0%	14.29%	14.29%	3.11 (N=10)	40%	30%	10%	10%	10%
Standard 7.2: The teacher candidate draws upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.50 (N=10)*	20%	80%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.00 (N=7)*	42.86%	14%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	3.38 (N=10)	40%	30%	10%	0%	20%
Standard 8.2: The teacher candidate uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.80 (N=10)*	80%	20%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.00 (N=7)*	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	14.29%	3.33 (N=10)	50%	30%	0%	10%	10%

\* Some students not reported – data not available because course was taken prior to Fall 2014

### **Undergraduate**

Review of the data indicates that 43% of undergraduate ESL completers from 2014-2016 scored proficient in planning instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals, 28% scored in the advancing, 14% at the beginning levels and 14% were not observed. Forty-three percent of undergraduate ESL completers were rated as proficient for drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy, 28% were rated as advancing or developing, 14% as beginning, and 14% as not observed. For the third standard in this group, uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways, 43% of undergraduate ESL completers were rated as proficient for drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, technology, and pedagogy, 28% were rated as advancing or developing, 14% as beginning, and 14% as not observed. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of a field work.

## Graduate

Review of the data indicates that a large majority of 2014-2015 graduate ESL completers achieved a rating of proficient and 20% were rated as advancing on the standard, **plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals**. Forty percent of graduate level completers in 2016-2016 scored at the proficient level, 40 % at the advancing and developing levels, 10% at the beginning level, and 10% were not observed for this standard. On the standard, uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connection and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways, 80% of 2014-2015 graduate level ESL completers were rated at the proficient level and 20% were rated as advancing. In 2015-2016, 50% of graduate ESL completers were rated as proficient, 30% as advancing, 10% as beginning, and 105 were not observed.

SIOP Evaluation 100 points possible								
	Bachelors Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met	Masters Mean	Met	Partially Met	Not Met
2014- 2015	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015- 2016 completers				93.98 (N=16)	56.25%	43.75%	0%
2015- 2016	91.56 (N=7)	28.57%	71.43%	0%	90.15 (N=10)	10.0%	90.0 %	0%

## SIOP Observation Checklist

The SIOP Checklist has been identified as an Alternative Assessment for evaluating ESL completers knowledge of Lesson Preparation, Building Background, Comprehensible Input, Strategies, Interaction, Practice and Application, Lesson Delivery and Assessment. The purpose of the SIOP evaluation is to provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate knowledge and skills in a genuine, meaningful practical learning experience.

Review of data indicates that the 100% of both the undergraduate and MAT ESL completers performed within the two top categories of Met or Partially Met on the SIOP checklist. Concern rests in the Partially Met category. Use of this data helped to drive decisions to separate graduate and undergraduate courses. The accelerated delivery of a summer program was difficult for undergraduates. Under the new offerings, undergraduates may take the practicum as early as sophomore or junior year due to rotations of offerings. Teacher candidates may not have taken all content methods courses prior to completion of this practicum. Graduate students also may complete this field placement prior to all content methods courses. For both undergraduate and graduate students, these results have been used as a formative measure.

## Professional Responsibility

Practicum Evaluation (Standards 9.2, 9.3 and 10.2)												
Standard 9.2: The teacher candidate models ethical professional practice.												
	Bachelors Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed	Masters Mean	Proficient	Advancing	Developing	Beginning	Not Observed
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					4.00 (N=10)*	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%
2015-2016	3.42.86 (N=7)*	71.42%	14.29%	0%	14.29%	0%	3.60 (N=10)	80%	10%	0%	10%	0%
Standard 9.3: The teacher candidate uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each student.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.56 (N=10)*	50%	40%	0%	10%	0%
2015-2016	3.40 (N=7)*	42.86%	14.29%	14.29%	0%	28.57%	3.38 (N=10)	40%	30%	10%	0%	20%
Standard 10.2: The teacher candidate seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth.												
2014-2015	NA	Low number of completers, data reported with 2015-2016 completers					3.50 (N=10)*	30%	30%	0%	0%	40%
2015-2016	3.75 (N=7)*	42.86%	14.29%	0%	0%	42.86%	3.14 (N=10)	40%	0%	30%	0%	30%

\* Some students not reported – data not available because course was taken prior to Fall 2014

## **Undergraduate**

Review of the data indicates the majority of undergraduate ESL completers from 2014-2016 scored proficient, 14% were rated as advancing and 14% as beginning in modeling ethical professional practice. Forty-three percent of undergraduate ESL completers were rated as proficient for using evidence to continually evaluate practice, particularly the effects of choices and actions on others and adapting practice to meet the needs of each student, 28% were rated as advancing or developing, 29% as not observed. For the third standard in this group, 43% of undergraduate ESL completers were rated as proficient for seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth, 14% as advancing and 43% as not observed. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of a field work.

### **Graduate**

Review of the data indicates 100% of graduate ESL completers from 2014-2015 scored proficient modeling ethical professional practice. In 2015-2016, 80% of graduate ESL completers were rated as proficient, 10% as advancing, and 10% beginning for modeling professional practice. In 2014-2015, for using evidence to continually evaluate practice, particularly the effects of choices and actions on others and adapting practice to meet the needs of each student, 50% were rated as proficient, 40% were rated as advancing or developing, 10% as beginning. For the third standard in this group, 30% of 2014-2015 graduate ESL completers were rated as proficient for seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth, 30% as advancing and 40% as not observed. In 2015-2016, 40% of graduate ESL completers achieved a rating of advancing, 30% were rated at developing, and 30% were not observed for the standard, seeks opportunities, including appropriate technology, to collaborate with students, families, colleagues, and other school professionals, and community members to ensure student growth. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of a field work.

### **Overall Proficiency**

<b>2015 Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey English as a Second Language Endorsement</b>	
<b>2014- 2015 2015-2016</b>	The Nebraska First Year Teacher Survey did not identify ESL teachers specifically in 2015. The data for 2016 does list if the teachers are ESL endorsed, and it is unclear if those teachers are working in ESL positions, or in a position of another endorsement.

## **Overall Summary**

The English as a Second Language Practicum (field work) Evaluation for the 45 hour field work component of EDU 473/573 was selected as one of the Key Assessments for that program. The Long Form Field Work Evaluation is used as the evaluation of all field work greater than 20 hours. The expectation is that candidates score within the three highest levels (Proficient, Advancing, and Developing). Field work is a formative time in a teacher candidate's program.

### **Undergraduate**

Review of the data indicates that the majority of the undergraduate ESL completers scored within the first three levels on all indicators (ranging from 51.15%-85.72%) of completers. Beginning level indicators were scored in 7 of the indicators with the beginning level spread evenly across the 7 completers. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of a field work.

### **Graduate**

Review of the data indicates that the majority of the graduate ESL completers scored within the first three levels on all indicators of completers. Beginning level indicators were scored in 6 of the indicators with the beginning level spread evenly across the 6 different completers. The final category, Not Observed, is an expectation of field work and is less than the undergraduate data.

### **Summary**

Data demonstrates that the majority of ESL completers are developing the indicators present in the English as a Second Language Practicum Evaluation. Data from the undergraduate evaluations was used to drive the decision to separate the undergraduate courses in methods, evaluation, and field work. Undergraduates were struggling to maintain the pace of the hybrid MAT format for accelerated courses. The summer placement for English as a Second Language field work for MAT may give MAT graduates a more consistent opportunity across the day to experience all areas of curriculum and technology use. Undergraduate field work, though completed over 16 weeks, may be done at the same time of day for each visit, limiting undergraduate exposure to all areas of content and technology.

This review has revealed a need to revisit the alignment of the ESL Practicum Evaluation and the NDE Clinical Evaluation. Though assessment is addressed in the SIOP Checklist, there is no direct measure of assessment skills in the ESL Practicum Evaluation that compares directly to Standard 7 of the NDE Clinical Evaluation. The ESL instrument would be strengthened with a standard to address more obviously the NDE Clinical standard, 11.1 on the teacher's impact on the learning and development.