**# 5 (REQUIRED): Assessment of candidate effect on student learning**

**SED 498: Collaborative Capstone for Professional Inquiry, edTPA**

**Affiliated NCTE Content Standards:**

**II.3:** Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.

**III.4**: Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading proficiencies, and reading processes.
**III. 5**: Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.
**III.6**: Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.

**IV.3**: Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students’ writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.

**IV.4**: Candidates design instruction that incorporates students’ home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.
**V.3**: Candidates differentiate instruction based on students’ self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.

**VII.1**: Candidates model literate and ethical practices in English Language Arts teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to English Language Arts.

**Assessment Narrative:**

1. Assessment #5 is the state-mandated portfolio assessment that measures candidates’ effectiveness on student learning. In the two academic years in which edTPA data has been collected (2017-2018, 2018-2019), candidates’ scores on this assessment have not been consequential. Candidates have been required to submit a fully scored portfolio for licensure and to complete their academic program requirements; however, scores below what will become New Jersey’s required cut score (37) in the fall of 2019 have not (for this report) prohibited candidates from acquiring their secondary ELA certification.
2. Candidate impact on student learning is assessed during teacher candidates’ student teaching semester/Clinical 2 as a component of their content-specific student teaching capstone, SED 498: Collaborative Capstone for Professional Inquiry. Because many of the items on edTPA overlap with items on Assessment 4-4 English Teaching Performance Assessment which is used to evaluate candidates’ performance in EED 490: Student Teaching/English, edTPA was used to gather additional targeted impact data on specific aspects of candidate planning, implementation, and assessment that were evaluated earlier in the program, either in Clinical 1 **(III.4, III.5. III.6, VII.1)** (\*see Assessment 4-3 Unit and Lessons Plans Rubric) in EED 380: Teaching Writing **(II.3, IV.3, IV.4)** (\*see assessment 4-7 Teaching Writing Rubric), or that we wanted to examine in greater detail **(V.3)**. In particular, edTPA data was used to provide more comprehensive data on our candidates’ use of interdisciplinary, multimodal texts in their planning; candidates’ attention to language, interest, and community context in their writing instruction and assessment; and candidates use of formative and summative assessments to reflect on and adapt lessons to differentiated student learning needs.

A combination of Level 2 and 3 ratings will provide our candidates with enough total points to achieve the New Jersey minimum cut score of 37. However, our program goal after examining the first two years of pilot data is that all secondary English education candidates will achieve Level 3 ratings, earning them a cumulative score of 45, slightly higher than the recommended professional performance standard of 42 and aligned with the current national average.

1. In the two years of pilot edTPA data, our candidates are demonstrating target or near-target levels of proficiency more frequently in the planning categories. For example, they are able to plan lessons in which their students are making meaning of a range of texts and communicating their understanding via different modes of expression, including writing **(Rubric 1/II.2; Rubric 7/III.6)**. Candidates are also demonstrating target or near-target levels of proficiency incorporating content area language and language supports (vocabulary, language history and structure, dialect familiarity) in their planning and instruction **(Rubric 3/IV. 4; Rubric 4/III.5 & IV.3)**. However, our candidates are having more difficulty in the sections of edTPA in which they are being asked to analyze their assessments as well as justify their interpretations using student data **(Rubric 5/III.4, Rubric 10/VII.1; Rubric 14/III.5).**  Although our candidates receive proficient ratings for their use and development of assessments as well as their capacity for reflection on Assessment 4-4 (EED 490: Student Teaching/Clinical 2), their edTPA scores have not been as strong in these categories. This suggests that while our candidates are intentional and thoughtful in all aspects of their teaching (planning, instruction, assessment), their performance on edTPA is more successful in the descriptive sections of the portfolio than the analytic sections in which they interpret student data as evidence. Rubric 14, the rubric on which our candidates received the most Level 1 and 2 ratings, is a useful example. Rather than “explaining and providing evidence” (Level 3), candidates either “identified” (Level 1) or “described” (Level 2). Similarly, on Rubric 10, candidates’ discussion of future instructional changes were “superficially related to students’ learning needs” (Level 2) or superficially connected to research and theory (Level 3).

In the second year of the pilot implementation (2018-2019), candidate scores did improve. Whereas in 2017-2018, candidates were averaging a cumulative score of 42, in 2018-2019, the cumulative average increased to 45, our performance target. As a result, our candidates’ scores on the individual rubrics also (typically) improved. However, candidate ratings continued to be lower on the rubrics asking for analysis and interpretation of assessment data.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NCTE Standards** | **Assessment Categories** | **EdTPA Rubric** | **Cumulative Performance Ratings** | **Scoring Breakdown** |
| II.3 | Composition/Meaning-Making | Rubric 1 | 3.2 | 1(0), 2(2), 3(40), 4 (13) |
| III.4 | Reading Assessments | Rubric 5 | 2.8 | 1(0), 2 (9), 3 (44), 4 (2) |
| III.5 | Content Area Language | Rubrics 4; 14 | 2.9; 2.55 | Rubric 4: 1(0), 2(12), 3(36), 4 (7)Rubric 14: 1(3), 2(13), 3(25), 4(4) |
| III.6 | Interdisciplinary Planning and Teaching | Rubric 7 | 3 | 1(0), 2 (5), 3(45), 4(5) |
| IV.3 | Language Instruction | Rubric 4 | 2.9 | 1(0), 2(12), 3(36), 4 (7) |
| IV.4 | Language Integration | Rubric 3 | 3.1 | 1(0), 2(3), 3(40), 4(12) |
| V.3 | Assessments | Rubric 15 | 2.8 | 1(1), 2(14), 3(29), 4(11) |
| VII.1 | Ethical Practices/Reflection | Rubric 10 | 2.7 | 1(0), 2(16), 3(37), 4(2) |

**Assessment Documentation:**

1. Assessment Tools

The purpose of the edTPA portfolio is described in the “Introduction to edTPA Secondary English Language Arts” component of the *Secondary ELA Assessment Handbook*:

“The purpose of edTPA Secondary English Language Arts, a nationally available performance-based assessment, is it measures novice teachers’ readiness to teach secondary English Language Arts. The assessment is designed with a focus on student learning and principles from research and theory. It is based on findings that successful teachers

* Develop knowledge of subject matter content standards and subject-specific pedagogy
* Develop and apply knowledge of varied students’ needs
* Consider research and theory about how students learn
* Reflect on and Analyze evidence of the effect of instruction on student learning

As a performance-based assessment, edTPA is designed to engage candidates in demonstrating their understanding of teaching and student learning in authentic ways” (2019-2020 Handbook, p. 4).

Currently, the edTPA assessment consists of three different tasks: Planning for Instruction and Assessment, Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning, and Assessing Student Learning. Further description of these tasks can be found in the *Secondary ELA Assessment Handbook*, which is available to both faculty and students via edTPA and can be accessed online via the edTPA website: <https://www.edtpa.com/>

1. Rubrics

As with the assessment tools, edTPA provides scoring rubrics for each of the three required tasks. All of these rubrics are available in the *Secondary ELA Assessment Handbook*. The specific rubrics used for our assessment purposes are as follows (the descriptions below are culled from the Level 4 and 5 indicators for each rubric):

* Rubric 1: The candidate’s plans for instruction build on each other to support learning of meanings of complex text with clear and consistent connections between textual references and constructions of meaning from, interpretation of, or responses to a complex text.
* Rubric 3: The candidate justifies why learning tasks (or their adaptations) are appropriate using examples of students’ prior academic learning and personal, cultural or community assets. The candidate’s justification is supported by principles from research and/or theory.
* Rubric 4: The candidate’s use of language supports addresses the use of vocabulary, language function, and additional language demands (language supports are designed to meet the needs of students with different levels of language learning).
* Rubric 5: The assessments provide multiple forms of evidence, including a written product, to monitor students’ progress toward developing constructions of meaning from, interpretations of, or responses to text.
* Rubric 7: Students are engaged in learning tasks that deepen and extend their ability to construct meaning from, interpret, or respond to complex text. The candidate links prior academic learning and person, cultural, or community assets to new learning.
* Rubric 10: The candidate proposes changes that address individual and collective learning needs related to the central focus. The candidate justifies changes using principles from research and/or theory.
* Rubric 14: The candidate explains and provides evidence of language use and content learning for students with varied needs.
* Rubric 15: The candidate’s next steps provide targeted support to individuals and groups to improve their learning relative to constructing meaning from, interpreting, or responding to text. Next steps are justified with principles from research an or theory.
1. Data Charts

**Fall 2017-Spring 2018**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student | Total Score | Ave. Rubric | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 | R9 | R10 | R11 | R12 | R13 | R14 | R15 |
| 1 | 42 | 2.8 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 50 | 3.3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 41 | 2.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 4 | 46 | 3.1 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 37 | 2.5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 39 | 2.6 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 8 | 41 | 2.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 9 | 43 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 10 | 35 | 2.3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 11 | 40 | 2.7 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| 12 | 31 | 2.1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 13 | 35 | 2.3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 14 | 54 | 3.6 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 15 | 49 | 3.3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 16 | 36 | 2.4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 17 | 49 | 3.3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 18 | 36 | 2.4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 19 | 46 | 3.1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 20 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 21 | 43 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 22 | 43 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 23 | 40 | 2.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| **Average**  | **42** |  | **3.3** |  | **3** | **3** | **2.7** |  | **3** |  |  | **2.6** |  |  |  | **2.5** | **2.5** |

 **Fall 2018-Spring 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Student | Total Score | Ave. Rubric | R1 | R2 | R3 | R4 | R5 | R6 | R7 | R8 | R9 | R10 | R11 | R12 | R13 | R14 | R15 |
| 1 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 | 38 | 2.5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 51 | 3.4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 36 | 2.4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 9 | 40 | 2.7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 10 | 46 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 11 | 42 | 2.8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 12 | 47 | 3.1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 13 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 14 | 42 | 2.8 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 15 | 43 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 16 | 51 | 3.4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 17 | 54 | 3.6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 18 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 19 | 49 | 3.3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 20 | 52 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 21 | 45 | 3.0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 22 | 47 | 3.1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 23 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 |
| 24 | 33 | 2.2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 25 | 47 | 3.1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 26 | 46 | 3.1 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 27 | 44 | 2.9 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 28 | 34 | 2.3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| 29 | 40 | 2.7 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 30 | 48 | 3.2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 31 | 48 | 3.2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 32 | 47 | 3.1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| **Average** |  | **45** | **3.1** |  | **3.2** | **2.8** | **3** |  | **3** |  |  | **2.8** |  |  |  | **2.6** | **3.1** |