

Assessment

Programs included in this report

- English
- English as a Second Language*
- Mathematics
- Science (Biology, Chemistry, Earth Science, Physics)
- Social Studies

*The ESL program did not include EDIS 5820: Assessment of and for Learning until fall 2021. Therefore, ESL candidates included in this analysis did not take EDIS 5820.

Instrument 1: Internship Final Evaluation by Mentor

For this report, we are presenting data from the final evaluation completed by the **mentor teacher** at the end of Internship II. A copy of the internship evaluation is in each clinical experience handbook, such as the [Internship I handbook](#).

In 2019, the internship evaluation was redesigned in collaboration with P-12 partners. Purpose for revision:

- Review the instrument against the CAEP Evaluation Framework for EPP-Created Assessments
- Address concerns from mentors and coaches about the length of the instrument
- Clarify items: For many items, the difference in performance level related to frequency and not substantive behavioral changes. Some terminology was ambiguous.

The data below capture three administration windows:

- Spring 2021: Class of 2021
- Spring 2020: Class of 2020
- Spring 2019: Class of 2019 (pilot data; minor revisions were made after the pilot)

Item	Admin	Sec/ESL Mean	Sec/ESL SD	On-Grounds Mean*	On-Grounds SD
5. Planning with data: The candidate uses qualitative and quantitative data to document learning and plan for instruction.	Spring 2021	3.206	0.532	3.418	0.510
	Spring 2020	3.083	0.615	3.277	0.542
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.310	0.487	n/a (most elementary and special ed interns student taught fall 2018)	
9. Differentiation: The candidate differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	Spring 2021	3.333	0.454	3.447	0.500
	Spring 2020	3.024	0.661	3.295	0.603
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.375	0.612	n/a (most elementary and special ed interns student taught fall 2018)	
11. Assessment Strategies and Tools: The candidate uses appropriate, relevant, and valid assessments and assessment strategies to generate data that are appropriate to use for instructional planning and future assessment.	Spring 2021	3.389	0.439	3.478	0.485
	Spring 2020	3.250	0.567	3.356	0.572
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.391	0.521	n/a (most elementary and special ed interns student taught fall 2018)	

Item	Admin	Sec/ESL Mean	Sec/ESL SD	On-Grounds Mean*	On-Grounds SD
12. Checking for Understanding During Instruction: The candidate acknowledges background knowledge, checks in with students for content understanding, notices difficulties, and adjusts instructions as needed.	Spring 2021	3.444	0.416	3.559	0.474
	Spring 2020	3.174	0.698	3.382	0.610
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.521	0.541	n/a (most elementary and special ed interns student taught fall 2018)	
13. Quality of Feedback: The candidate provides high-quality feedback, including scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation of students' efforts.	Spring 2021	3.556	0.416	3.612	0.447
	Spring 2020	3.250	0.709	3.436	0.619
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.500	0.511	n/a (most elementary and special ed interns student taught fall 2018)	

*The on-grounds program includes all secondary areas, ESL, elementary, and special education.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Planning with Data: The candidate uses qualitative and quantitative data to document learning and plan for instruction.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not use data to plan for instruction.	The candidate uses data to document learning but does not consistently use data to plan for instruction.	The candidate uses data to document learning and plan for instruction that is differentiated for diverse learners.	The candidate systematically uses data to document learning and consistently plans instruction that is differentiated for diverse learners. The candidates involves students in planning for their own learning using data.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Differentiation: The candidate differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate does not differentiate instruction.	The candidate attempts to differentiate instruction, though efforts are based on a superficial understanding of students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and knowledge of students' lived experiences.	The candidate consistently differentiates instruction based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences.	The candidate employs systematic routines and procedures that facilitate differentiation based on students' prior knowledge, assessment data, and the candidates' knowledge of students' lived experiences. The candidate engages students in making decisions about their own learning within the classroom system.

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
Assessment Strategies and Tools: The candidate uses appropriate, relevant, and valid assessments and assessment strategies to generate data that are appropriate to use for instructional planning and future assessment.	There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.	The candidate uses few strategies and tools to assess students learning. Assessments may be inappropriate and invalid for the content and student population.	The candidate uses a limited range of strategies and tools to assessment student learning. Some assessments are appropriate and valid for the content and student population, while other assessments are not.	The candidate uses a range of assessment strategies and tools. Assessments are appropriate and valid for the content and student population and are used to adjust future instruction.	In the use of appropriate assessments valid decisions, the candidate creates opportunities for students to demonstrate progress toward stated learning targets in multiple ways. The candidate uses assessments results to adjust future assessments and instruction.

<p>Checking for Understanding During Instruction: The candidate acknowledges background knowledge, checks in with students for content understanding, notices difficulties, and adjusts instructions as needed.</p>	<p>There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.</p>	<p>The candidate is unable to check for student understanding during instruction.</p>	<p>The candidate attempts to check for understanding during instruction. The candidate may notice difficulties but is unable to adjust instruction as needed.</p>	<p>The candidate routinely checks for understanding during instruction. The candidate is able to adjust instruction in response to students' difficulties or misconceptions</p>	<p>The candidate routinely checks for understanding and adjusts instruction in response to students' difficulties. The candidate uses information gathered to plan for future instruction.</p>
--	---	---	---	---	--

	No Opportunity to Observe	Unacceptable: Rarely/Never	Developing: Inconsistently	Proficient: Consistently	Exemplary: Model for Colleagues
<p>Quality of Feedback: The candidate provides high-quality feedback, including scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation of students' efforts.</p>	<p>There was no opportunity to observe tasks related to this criterion.</p>	<p>The candidate provides limited feedback to students, leaving students to struggle through instructional activities.</p>	<p>The candidate attempts to use scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation, though these efforts are inconsistent. Feedback may be vague or perfunctory.</p>	<p>The candidate uses scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation to provide feedback to students. Feedback is specific and moves student learning forward as evidenced by student understanding of feedback.</p>	<p>The candidate uses scaffolding, timely assistance, and affirmation to provide feedback to students. Feedback is specific and enables students to reach a deeper understanding of material and concepts than they would be able to do independently. The candidate creates opportunities for peer feedback.</p>

Instrument 2: Employer Survey

UVA participates in the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative (VEAC) Employer Survey for Initial Licensure programs. VEAC utilizes a common, standardized survey of program completers and their employers using the language and concepts of the Commonwealth of Virginia's Uniform Performance Standards. There are 36 Educator Preparation Programs in the Commonwealth of Virginia surveying program completers and their employers each year seeking to improve their programs and meet requirements of the Virginia Department of Education and the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. By standardizing survey recruitment, timelines, and process, VEAC hopes to reduce the complexity of surveys that principals and administrators complete each year to support EPPs. By benchmarking with the other VEAC participants, EPPs can better understand their strengths and areas for improvement. Additionally, VEAC provides a common language and prompts discussion for program improvement.

Details about the survey are available in the [VEAC instrument guide](#).

- Scoring: The scaled levels match language found in the Virginia Uniform Performance Standards. The levels are “Exemplary” (4), “Proficient” (3), “Developing/Needs Improvement” (2), and “Unacceptable” (1).
- Employers are asked to respond to this prompt: “Please rate [completer]’s performance on each of the following...” The survey is institution-blind, so employers are not provided the university from which each completer graduated.

Additional information:

- VEAC consortium reports are available on the [VEAC website](#).
- UVA’s reports are available on [UVA EHD’s CAEP annual reporting website](#).

The data below capture three administration windows:

- Spring 2021: Classes of 2020, 2019, and 2018
 - 27 institutions participated in VEAC (over 1400 employer responses)
- Spring 2020: Classes of 2019, 2018, and 2017
 - 17 institutions participated in VEAC (over 480 employer responses)
- Spring 2019: Classes of 2018, 2017, and 2016
 - 3 institutions participated in pilot project; surveys were distributed by institution, so overall means are unavailable

Item	Admin	Sec/ESL Mean	Sec/ESL SD	UVA ONG Mean*	UVA ONG SD	VEAC Mean**	VEAC SD
D: The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the year.	Spring 2021	3.254	0.604	3.347	0.594	3.222^	0.649^
	Spring 2020	3.105	0.658	3.333	0.622	3.26	0.639
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.382	0.604	3.323	0.662	n/a (3-institution pilot without centralized administration)	
M: The teacher uses assessment results to inform and adjust practice.	Spring 2021	3.397	0.674	3.474	0.614	3.286^	0.635^
	Spring 2020	3.316	0.478	3.431	0.539	3.30	0.612
	Spring 2019 (pilot)	3.382	0.551	3.355	0.583	n/a (3-institution pilot without centralized administration)	

*The on-grounds program includes all secondary areas, ESL, elementary, and special education.

**VEAC data include data from all participating institutions.

^VEAC Employer Survey data for spring 2021 are preliminary. Final results will be published fall 2021.

Instrument 3: Completer Survey

UVA participates in the Virginia Education Assessment Collaborative (VEAC) Completer Survey for Initial Licensure programs. Refer to the employer survey above for more information.

Details about the survey are available in the [VEAC instrument guide](#).

- The items and rating scale are identical to those included in the employer survey.
- Completers are asked to respond to this prompt: “Based on your preparation at the University of Virginia, how would you rate your performance in each of these teaching areas...” Completers are explicitly asked to relate their preparation to their performance.

The data below capture two administration windows:

- Spring 2021: Classes of 2020, 2019, and 2018
 - 27 institutions participated in VEAC (over 1600 completer responses)
- Spring 2020: Classes of 2019, 2018, and 2017
 - 17 institutions participated in VEAC (over 800 completer responses)
 - In spring 2019, there was no VEAC pilot, and UVA administered a different completer survey. Those data are not included in this report.

Item	Admin	Sec/ESL Mean	Sec/ESL SD	UVA ONG Mean*	UVA SD	VEAC Mean**	VEAC SD
D: The teacher systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to both students and parents throughout the year.	Spring 2021	2.988	0.649	3.037	0.654	3.13	0.66
	Spring 2020	3.000	0.741	3.055	0.689	3.11	0.687

Item	Admin	Sec/ESL Mean	Sec/ESL SD	UVA ONG Mean*	UVA SD	VEAC Mean**	VEAC SD
M: The teacher uses assessment results to inform and adjust practice.	Spring 2021	3.155	0.591	3.183	0.599	3.27	0.62
	Spring 2020	3.135	0.658	3.236	0.605	3.32	0.624

*The on-grounds program includes all secondary areas, ESL, elementary, and special education.

**VEAC data include data from all participating institutions.