

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT (2015-2016)

PROGRAM: Graduate Teacher Education Programs Combined Report: Education: Elementary Education, PK-6 (M.Ed.); Education: English as a Second Language (M.Ed.); Education: Secondary Education, Grades 6-12 (M.Ed.); Education: Special Education – Grades K-12 (M.Ed.)

SUBMITTED BY: Lisa Turissini and Jessica Lewis

DATE: 9-30-16

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

Summative Data are collected each semester from the following Capstone Experience: Student Teaching Seminar (sections - ED 570A, ED 570B, ED 570D and ED 570SE) for the Student Learning Assessment Report. All reporting of evaluation ratings are completed electronically through a Google Survey to eliminate error, keep evaluations confidential, and speed the process of analysis of data. This data is compiled in the Education Database on the “S” drive of the School of Education and Human Services in the Education folder under Assessment. The database is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education and is password controlled. Only the Chair of the Department, Assistant Chair, and the Clinical Experiences Coordinator have access.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year’s catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

Marymount University’s professional programs leading to the Master of Education are dedicated to the mission "Preparing Educational Leaders for Diverse Learning Communities." The three tenets comprising the conceptual framework model that synergistically interact include critical thinker, effective practitioner, and caring professional. Knowledge of content, human growth and development, and pedagogy, along with current research and learning theory, provide the foundation for Marymount’s professional programs. All courses and experiences are designed to achieve this mission.

Graduate programs leading to a Master of Education and initial teaching licensure in Virginia are elementary education (grades PK-6); secondary education (grades 6-12 in art, biology, chemistry, earth science, English, history and social science,



mathematics, and physics); English as a Second Language (grades PK-12); and special education: general curriculum (grades K-12).

List all of the program’s learning outcomes: *(regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)*

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data 	2014		2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students 	2014		2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy 	2014		2017
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods 	2013	YES	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting 	2013	YES	

** Program Evaluation was completed in 2015 and thus, no annual report was completed.



Describe how the program's outcomes support Marymount's mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

<p>Marymount University Mission: Marymount University is an independent Catholic university that emphasizes academic excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Committed to the liberal arts tradition, the university combines a foundation in the arts and sciences with career preparation and opportunities for personal and professional development. Marymount is a student-centered learning community that values diversity and focuses on the education of the whole person, promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth of each individual. Scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics are hallmarks of a Marymount education.</p>					
University Mission Hallmarks	Scholarship		Leadership	Service	Ethics
Student Learning Outcomes	demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy	effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods	make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data	use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students	exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting

Describe how the program's outcomes support Marymount's mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

The hallmarks of a Marymount education are *scholarship, leadership, service, ethics, and a global perspective*. The University's mission emphasizes academic excellence, a liberal arts foundation, career preparation, and personal and professional development. The Education department directly supports this mission and Marymount's strategic plan with its own mission and theme: *"Preparing Educational Leaders for Diverse Learning Communities."* The three strands comprising our model include critical thinker, effective practitioner, and caring professional that synergistically interact with one another.

To develop our conceptual framework and learner outcomes, the Education department uses the guidelines set forth by the nationally recognized organization, the Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) and their model core teaching standards and learning progressions for teachers. Knowledge of the learner and learning, content, instructional



practice, and professional responsibility provide the foundation of our course work and field experiences. The extremely high employment rate of our students upon graduation is a testament to the rigor and preparation they receive while here.

Our classes are student-centered, personalized, and offer a variety of engaging and creative activities that help train each student in research-based best practices. Throughout the program, students are trained to personally and professionally develop and deepen the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to become an effective teacher. Our department's commitment to valuing diversity and a global perspective is demonstrated by placing students in a variety of settings both locally and abroad for their field experiences and student teaching placements which helps promote a deeper understanding, appreciation, and sensitivity to the diverse needs of their students, parents, and communities.

Our mission and program outcomes also support the SEHS mission to *enable students to serve as agents of positive change for individuals and in the global community*. Our students are required to participate in service learning opportunities and to engage with the larger community. Our program prepares teacher candidates to create learning environments that support individual and collaborative learning, model professional learning and ethical practice, and demonstrate leadership by taking responsibility for student learning. Additionally, many of our graduate students travel abroad to experience and apply their course work within a global context by serving as role models for instructional and assessment strategies and practices. Students who graduate our program become reflective practitioners who assess their professional and ethical responsibilities in bringing about positive change at the individual, school, community, and global level.

We designed our student learning outcomes to measure our students' abilities to be critical thinkers, effective practitioners, and caring professionals. We assess our students through a variety of critical assignments that span throughout their coursework and into their student teaching capstone experience. Our students are assessed by their professors, university supervisors, cooperating teachers, and field placement teachers. This variety of data allows our department to highlight our strengths and identify areas in need of improvement.



Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

Teacher Education on the graduate level at Marymount University is an initial licensure program for persons who wish to enter the teaching profession after they have completed an undergraduate degree. The student learning outcomes are the same for all graduate teacher education students whether they are seeking to become teachers in the elementary (PK-6), secondary (6-12 in content areas of English, mathematics, physics, earth science, biology, chemistry or history/social studies), special education (General Curriculum K-12) or ESL (K-12). When exiting (graduating) our programs, students are expected to effectively enter the classroom and assume all the duties of a full-time teacher.

Both a strength and a challenge of our assessment system for the Teacher Education Programs in the Education Department is that it plays an essential role, not only for internal accountability but also for the requirements of our accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE) and to satisfy the requirements of our programs to maintain approval by the Virginia Department of Education. We focus the gathering of summative assessment data on the products and evaluations of the capstone experience: Student Teaching Seminar. Since the ultimate outcome for teacher education students is their performance in the classroom, all data gathered for determining student learning outcomes is derived from the data collected during student teaching using the following:

- ◆ **Portfolio Evaluations:** The Professional Teaching Portfolio documents the student teacher's professional achievements and abilities as a teacher. Evidence for the Portfolio comes from course work and from documents from the student teaching experience. Student teachers upload evidence that supports each Portfolio standard. The Portfolio Rubric is based on the *Virginia Uniform Performance Standards for the Evaluation of Teachers*. For each of the seven (7) standards, students provide two (2) supportive pieces of evidence - one pre-determined by the department from course work and one of their choosing from their student teaching experience. It was determined by the education faculty that this would be beneficial to our graduating students to help them become familiar with the evaluation standards they will be held to as practicing teachers. This is new since our last report. All full-time faculty members participate in the Portfolio evaluation system. Twenty percent of all portfolios are double scored to look at inter-rater reliability and to determine needed training for the raters.
- ◆ **Teacher Work Sample:** The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) assignment requires candidates to pre-assess students, make data-based instructional decisions to design and teach an effective sequence of lessons, employ meaningful classroom post-assessments, analyze the data, and reflect on the experiences. The purpose of this assignment is to evaluate the degree of impact on student learning. The Teacher Work Sample is evaluated by the full-time faculty using a standardized rubric.

- ◆ **University Supervisor Evaluation:** Supervisors conduct five classroom observations, write up the post-observation conference evaluations on a standardized form, and evaluate reflective journal entries throughout their semester. They also complete two evaluations of the student teachers at the mid-point and final week of their placement. All of this data is used as one measure used by the Student Teaching Seminar professor to determine their final grade. Supervisors meet regularly for training and discussion to ensure consistency across evaluations.
- ◆ **Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Evaluation:** During student teaching, cooperating/mentor teachers complete evaluations of their student teachers at the mid-point and at the final week of the student teaching placement. This data is used as one measure by the Student Teaching Seminar professor to determine the final grade of each student teacher.
- ◆ **Praxis II content exam data:** This licensure examination is required of all elementary and secondary students, but not for those seeking licensure in English as a Second Language (ESL) or Special Education (SPED).

Data Analysis:

- ◆ All full-time faculty members participate in the evaluation system. In a day long department meeting held in May, full-time faculty view all gathered data. Although this report only looks at two or three of the Student Learner Outcomes, because of accreditation, data is gathered from all sources each semester. Viewing the whole data set allows the department to monitor and look for trends across all endorsement areas.
- ◆ Faculty then begin to specifically work together on the current Student Learning Assessment Report by reviewing planned improvements from the previous year and providing updates per endorsement area. Data is then analyzed at specific learner outcomes chosen for the reporting year per endorsement area. Faculty who are most clearly tied to the endorsement area work to discuss and plan program improvements for the following year.

Planned improvements:

- ◆ Since our last reporting, CAEP (the current accreditation body for Education programs) has released new requirements for assessment instruments that are used for data collection. The new requirements are more rigorous in the relationship to instrument validity and rater reliability. Although, our accreditation cycle does not occur until 2020, it is necessary to begin work on revision of all rubrics and assessment instruments. Therefore, during the 2016-2017 academic year the above assessments will be revised, sent to CAEP for feedback, and field-tested. The new rubrics will be fully used beginning in fall 2017.
- ◆ Additionally, as the department revises their instruments and rubrics, it has been decided that it is important to also revisit and revise our learning outcomes. Our department will have new learning outcomes for next year and will submit them for the 2017-18 catalog printing.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year (this was from 2014 because of the Program Evaluation completed in 2015):

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>Graduate Teacher Education students make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data.</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> Language proficiency assessment is applied to individualized instruction in ED543 and ED563</p> <p><u>PK-6:</u> Introduction of SMART goals in ED555 and ED557 to support the use of assessment data in setting academic achievement goals.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Case study in ED537 to include an evaluation of student assessment data, lesson plans, and post assessment focusing analysis of student learning gains.</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Introduction of SMART goals in ED523 as part of a case study to support the use of assessment data in setting academic achievement goals and analyzing data to make instructional decisions</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> In ED543, the improvement was seen in the oral reports, the written reports, and the Critical Assignments that the students presented.</p> <p><u>PK-6:</u> SMART goals in ED555 and ED557 to support the use of assessment data and focus on data driven instruction.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Case study was implemented in Fall 14 in ED537.</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> SMART goals were included in the ED523 case study documentation Spring 2015.</p>
<p>Graduate Teacher Education students use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students.</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> The critical assignments in ED543 and the field project in ED561 will be made more rigorous, reflecting a variety of levels and needs in language learning.</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> Great attention was given by the students in ED543 to the teaching of language deficient students and students with various learning disabilities.</p>

	<p><u>PK-6:</u> Addition of a video and reflective response to a role play activity in the Behavior Management assignment for ED552</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Addition of a video and reflective response to a role play activity in the Behavior Management assignment for ED552</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Addition of a video and reflective response in ED549</p>	<p><u>PK-6:</u> In Fall 2014, a video and reflective response to a role play activity was implemented in the Behavior Management assignment in ED552</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> In Fall 2014, a video and reflective response to a role play activity was implemented in the Behavior Management assignment in ED552</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> a video and reflection were implemented in ED549, Spring 15.</p>
<p>Graduate Teacher Education students demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy.</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> Greater emphasis is being required in content, human development and pedagogy in ED543, ED561, and ED563, measureable in terms of adaptations to the learners' individual characteristics</p> <p><u>PK-6:</u> Stronger emphasis on completing Praxis II: Elementary Content Knowledge during or immediately after taking ED503 and monitoring of test performance by advisors. Addition of Praxis II scores as a direct measure of the learning goal for academic year 2014-15</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Stronger emphasis on completing Praxis II – Elementary Content Knowledge during or immediately after taking ED 503 and monitoring of test performance by advisors.</p>	<p><u>ESL:</u> The students in ED543 proved to have a thorough knowledge of the content and ways to teach it with special attention to a variety of backgrounds, levels of language proficiency, and special needs as seen through classroom discussions.</p> <p><u>PK 6:</u> Personal assistance/tutoring of students to support Praxis II testing.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Students have been advised to take PRAXIS II content right after ED503. When these students have reached the student teaching portion of their program, Praxis II</p>

	<p>Addition of Praxis II scores as a direct measure of learning goal for academic year 2014-15</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Exploration of creating a content emphasis for all graduate special education students to support teaching in the secondary academic areas</p>	<p>scores will be recommended to be used for evidence for standard #1 in their Portfolio.</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Reviewed content emphasis with our department. Waiting on the Virginia Department of Education to approve regulations on whether this content emphasis will be a requirement or option for our SPED program.</p>
--	--	---

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

There were no recommendations.

Learning Outcome 1: As effective practitioners, graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods.

Assessment Activity

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Outcome Measures</u> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Performance Standard</u> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Data Collection</u> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Analysis</u> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>																								
<p>1. Portfolio Standards: Standard #2: Instructional Planning Standard #3: Instructional Delivery Standard #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</p>	<p>DEFINED – <u>Standard #2:</u> “Candidates plan using appropriate curriculum standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.” <u>Standard #3:</u> “Candidates effectively engage students</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Full-time faculty members score Portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, then by licensure program, and then by the total group.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="741 1003 1549 1416" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4 for all programs</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Programs</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Standard #2 Instructional Planning</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Standard #3 Instructional Delivery</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Standard #4 Assessment of and for Student Learning</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>ESL n= 3</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.67</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.00</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>PK-6 n= 27</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.46</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.67</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.46</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>SEC n= 12</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.92</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.58</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.58</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>SPED n= 3</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.67</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.33</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4 for all programs				Programs	Standard #2 Instructional Planning	Standard #3 Instructional Delivery	Standard #4 Assessment of and for Student Learning	<i>ESL n= 3</i>	3.67	4.00	3.50	<i>PK-6 n= 27</i>	3.46	3.67	3.46	<i>SEC n= 12</i>	3.92	3.58	3.58	<i>SPED n= 3</i>	3.67	3.33	3.67	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Portfolio Standard for the Learning Outcome. Teacher candidates per licensure program were averaged as licensure groups for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes students’ portfolio scores from fall and spring semesters).</p> <p><u>2) Findings:</u></p>
Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4 for all programs																											
Programs	Standard #2 Instructional Planning	Standard #3 Instructional Delivery	Standard #4 Assessment of and for Student Learning																								
<i>ESL n= 3</i>	3.67	4.00	3.50																								
<i>PK-6 n= 27</i>	3.46	3.67	3.46																								
<i>SEC n= 12</i>	3.92	3.58	3.58																								
<i>SPED n= 3</i>	3.67	3.33	3.67																								

<p>This is a Direct Measure.</p>	<p>in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.”</p> <p>Standard #4: “Candidates systematically gather, analyze, and use all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to students.”</p> <p><u>Acceptable Level:</u> A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.</p>	<p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="743 493 1551 771"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #2: Instructional Planning</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Rubric Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>2.5</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>3.5</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6</td> <td>11% (3)</td> <td>26% (7)</td> <td>22% (6)</td> <td>41% (11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>17% (2)</td> <td>83% (10)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="743 1008 1551 1286"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Rubric Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>3.5</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6</td> <td>30% (8)</td> <td>7% (2)</td> <td>63% (17)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>25% (3)</td> <td>33% (4)</td> <td>42% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p>	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #2: Instructional Planning						Rubric Score				Program	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	ESL	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)	PK-6	11% (3)	26% (7)	22% (6)	41% (11)	SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	83% (10)	SPED	% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery					Rubric Score			Program	3.0	3.5	4.0	ESL	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)	PK-6	30% (8)	7% (2)	63% (17)	SEC	25% (3)	33% (4)	42% (5)	SPED	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)	<p>A. The aggregate means in all three standards met or exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level for the four groups.</p> <p>B. Individually, three PK-6 students were below the acceptable (3.0) level for <i>Standard 2</i> and one PK-6 student scored below acceptable (3.0) on <i>Standard 4</i>. All other individual students in the other programs were at or above the acceptable (3.0) level.</p> <p>C. For Portfolio <i>Standard #2</i>: 100% of the ESL, 89% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students met or exceeded the acceptable level (3.0) on the rubric. Additionally, 67% of the ESL, 83% of the Secondary, and 67% of the Special Education students scored at the highest level possible on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).</p>
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #2: Instructional Planning																																																																		
	Rubric Score																																																																	
Program	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0																																																														
ESL	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)																																																														
PK-6	11% (3)	26% (7)	22% (6)	41% (11)																																																														
SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	17% (2)	83% (10)																																																														
SPED	% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)																																																														
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery																																																																		
	Rubric Score																																																																	
Program	3.0	3.5	4.0																																																															
ESL	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)																																																															
PK-6	30% (8)	7% (2)	63% (17)																																																															
SEC	25% (3)	33% (4)	42% (5)																																																															
SPED	33% (1)	67% (2)	0% (0)																																																															

Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning

Program	Rubric Scores			
	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
ESL	0% (0)	33% (1)	33% (1)	33% (1)
PK-6	3% (1)	41% (11)	15% (4)	41% (11)
SEC	8% (1)	16% (2)	25% (3)	50% (6)
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	67% (2)	33% (1)

Rubric Scale:

1 = Ineffective

2 = Developing

3 = Acceptable

4 = Target

D. For Portfolio *Standard #3*: 100% of all of the four groups met or exceeded the acceptable level (3.0). Additionally, 100% of the ESL, 63% of the PK-6, and 42% of the Secondary students scored at the 4.0 level.

E. For Portfolio *Standard #4*: 100% of the ESL, 97% of the PK-6, 92% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students met or exceeded the acceptable level (3.0). Additionally, 33% of the ESL, 41% of the PK-6, 50% of the Secondary, and 33% of the Special Education students scored at the 4.0 level.

<p>2. Teacher Work Sample</p> <p>Criteria Statement #3: Assessment Plan and #4: Instructional Design</p> <p>This is a Direct Measure.</p>	<p>DEFINED – Criteria Statement #3 Assessment Plan</p> <p>- “Pre and Post Assessment plans are specifically tied to individual unit learning outcomes and can provide data for individual students. SMART goals are available and formative assessment is planned.”</p> <p>Criteria Statement #4 - Instructional Design – “Lesson plans present relevant learning experiences using a variety of instructional strategies that engage students in the content of the unit. Adaptations and pre-assessment</p>	<p>Collection: Full-time faculty members score Teacher Work Samples at the middle of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, then by licensure program, and the total group.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="743 493 1507 883"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Teacher Work Sample Average Scores by Program for Task #3 and Task #4</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>Criteria Statement: #3 Assessment Plan</th> <th>Criteria Statement: #4 Instructional Design</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL n = 3</td> <td>3.33</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 25</td> <td>3.84</td> <td>3.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 12</td> <td>3.79</td> <td>3.29</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 3</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>4.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="743 922 1514 1224"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Teacher Work Sample: Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Task #3: Assessment Plan</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Rating Scores</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6</td> <td>4% (1)</td> <td>8% (2)</td> <td>88% (22)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>25% (3)</td> <td>75% (9)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale: 1 = Not acceptable 2 = Developing 3 = Acceptable 4 = Target</p>	Teacher Work Sample Average Scores by Program for Task #3 and Task #4			Program	Criteria Statement: #3 Assessment Plan	Criteria Statement: #4 Instructional Design	ESL n = 3	3.33	3.67	PK-6 n = 25	3.84	3.60	SEC n = 12	3.79	3.29	SPED n = 3	4.00	4.00	Teacher Work Sample: Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Task #3: Assessment Plan					Rating Scores			Program	2.0	3.0	4.0	ESL	0% (0)	67% (2)	33% (1)	PK-6	4% (1)	8% (2)	88% (22)	SEC	0% (0)	25% (3)	75% (9)	SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)	<p>1) Analysis Process: included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Teacher Work Sample Criteria Statements for the Learning Outcome. Teacher candidates per licensure program were averaged as licensure groups for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes students’ TWS scores from fall and spring semesters).</p> <p>2) Findings:</p> <p>A. All program groups met or exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level for both Criteria Statements.</p> <p>B. Individually, one PK-6 student received a below acceptable (3.0) rating on <i>Criteria Statement #3: Assessment Plan</i>. Two PK-6 students and one Secondary student did not receive an acceptable (3.0) rating on <i>Criteria Statement #4: Instructional Design</i>.</p>
Teacher Work Sample Average Scores by Program for Task #3 and Task #4																																																	
Program	Criteria Statement: #3 Assessment Plan	Criteria Statement: #4 Instructional Design																																															
ESL n = 3	3.33	3.67																																															
PK-6 n = 25	3.84	3.60																																															
SEC n = 12	3.79	3.29																																															
SPED n = 3	4.00	4.00																																															
Teacher Work Sample: Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Task #3: Assessment Plan																																																	
	Rating Scores																																																
Program	2.0	3.0	4.0																																														
ESL	0% (0)	67% (2)	33% (1)																																														
PK-6	4% (1)	8% (2)	88% (22)																																														
SEC	0% (0)	25% (3)	75% (9)																																														
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (3)																																														

data has directed planning.”

Acceptable Level:

A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.

Teacher Work Sample: Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Task #4: Instructional Design

Program	Rating Scores				
	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
ESL	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)	67% (2)
PK-6	0% (0)	8% (2)	20% (5)	16% (4)	56% (14)
SEC	8% (1)	0% (0)	50% (6)	8% (1)	33% (4)
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (4)

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:
 1 = Not acceptable 3 = Acceptable
 2 = Developing 4 = Target

C. For *Task #3: Assessment*, 100% of the ESL, 96% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students met or exceeded the acceptable level (3.0).

D. For *Task #3*: 33% of ESL, 88% of PK-6, 75% of Secondary, and 100% of Special Education students scored at the highest level of 4.0, Target, on the rubric.

E. For *Task #4: Instructional Design*, 100% of the ESL, 92% of the PK-6, 92% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students met or exceeded the acceptable level (3.0).

F. For *Task #4*: 67% of ESL, 56% of PK-6, 33% of Secondary, and 100% of Special Education students scored at the 4.0 Target level.

<p>3. Cooperating Teacher (CT) and University Supervisor (US) Evaluations</p> <p>Criteria Statement: Instruction and Assessment</p> <p>This is an indirect measure.</p>	<p>DEFINED – “Student teacher uses communication, technology, management, and pedagogical skills to implement instruction and assessment.”</p> <p><u>Acceptable Level:</u> A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors complete a rating on each student teacher at the midpoint and the end of his/her placement in either the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student and then by licensure program.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="743 472 1528 873"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: <i>Instruction and Assessment</i> from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>Cooperating Teacher</th> <th>University Supervisor</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL n = 3</td> <td>3.67</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 25</td> <td>3.46</td> <td>3.88</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 12</td> <td>3.31</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 3</td> <td>3.67</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Rubric Rating Scale:</u> 1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors 2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors 3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors 4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors</p>	Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: <i>Instruction and Assessment</i> from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument			Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	ESL n = 3	3.67	3.67	PK-6 n = 25	3.46	3.88	SEC n = 12	3.31	3.80	SPED n = 3	3.67	3.67	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Criteria Statement from the evaluative instrument used during student teaching for the Learning Outcome. Ratings from the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisors’ evaluation instruments for this criteria statement was analyzed by licensure program for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes rating scores from both the fall and spring semesters).</p> <p><u>2) Findings:</u> A. Aggregated means for all licensure programs by the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors met or exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level. B. Individually, one PK-6 and two Secondary students were rated below acceptable</p>
Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: <i>Instruction and Assessment</i> from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument																					
Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor																			
ESL n = 3	3.67	3.67																			
PK-6 n = 25	3.46	3.88																			
SEC n = 12	3.31	3.80																			
SPED n = 3	3.67	3.67																			

		<p>Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – Instruction and Assessment from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Group</th> <th colspan="3">Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument</th> </tr> <tr> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL n = 3</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 24</td> <td>4% (1)</td> <td>46% (11)</td> <td>50% (12)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 13</td> <td>15% (2)</td> <td>38% (5)</td> <td>46% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 3</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Rubric Rating Scale:</u> 1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors 2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors 3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors 4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors</p>	Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument			2	3	4	ESL n = 3	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)	PK-6 n = 24	4% (1)	46% (11)	50% (12)	SEC n = 13	15% (2)	38% (5)	46% (6)	SPED n = 3	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)	<p>(3.0) by their Cooperating Teachers on this standard.</p> <p>C. Evaluated by the Cooperating/Mentor teachers, 100% of the ESL, 96% of the PK-6, 85% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: <i>“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”</i></p> <p>D. Evaluated by the Cooperating/Mentor teachers, 67% of the ESL, 50% of the PK-6, 46% of the Secondary, and 67% of the Special Education students were rated at the highest level, 4.0: <i>“Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.”</i></p> <p>E. Evaluated by the University Supervisors, 100% of all four groups were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: <i>“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”</i></p>
Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument																									
	2	3	4																							
ESL n = 3	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)																							
PK-6 n = 24	4% (1)	46% (11)	50% (12)																							
SEC n = 13	15% (2)	38% (5)	46% (6)																							
SPED n = 3	0% (0)	33% (1)	67% (2)																							

		<p>University Supervisor Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – <i>Instruction and Assessment</i> from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Group</th> <th colspan="2">Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument</th> </tr> <tr> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL n = 3</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>37% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 24</td> <td>12% (3)</td> <td>88% (21)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 10</td> <td>20% (2)</td> <td>80% (8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 3</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Rubric Rating Scale:</u> 1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors 2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors 3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors 4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors</p>	Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument		3	4	ESL n = 3	33% (1)	37% (2)	PK-6 n = 24	12% (3)	88% (21)	SEC n = 10	20% (2)	80% (8)	SPED n = 3	33% (1)	67% (2)	<p>F. Evaluated by the University Supervisors, 37% of the ESL, 88% of the PK-6, 80% of the Secondary, and 67% of the Special Education students were rated at the highest level, 4.0: “<i>Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.</i>”</p>
Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument																			
	3	4																		
ESL n = 3	33% (1)	37% (2)																		
PK-6 n = 24	12% (3)	88% (21)																		
SEC n = 10	20% (2)	80% (8)																		
SPED n = 3	33% (1)	67% (2)																		



Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

The learning outcome being assessed here: “As effective practitioners, graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods” the averages for all four groups were effectively met at the acceptable level (3.0) for the academic 2015-16 school year: 1. PK-6 Elementary; 2. Secondary; 3. ESL; and 4. Special Education on all of the measures. We used three outcome measures: 1. Portfolio Standards: which is a culmination of their coursework and student teaching experiences; 2. Teacher Work Sample: which allows students to measure their effectiveness in the classroom; and 3. Evaluations conducted by their cooperating/mentor teachers and university supervisors.

Since we used measurement outcomes that included student work during their course work and throughout their student teaching experiences, the data showed that students are successfully meeting the varied assessments used to evaluate their instructional effectiveness and preparation to become a full-time teacher, as well as our own department effectiveness.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

This learning outcome demonstrated that students are being evaluated and rated at the acceptable (3.0) and above level on the three different instruments that we use to assess students. However, we are working to assess and redesign our measurement instruments due to the new standards set forth by our new accrediting agency, CAEP. While we will still measure these vital areas such as Instructional Delivery, Instructional Planning, and Assessment, we will be using new tools and rubrics to help provide us with more accurate, meaningful data. These new instruments will be better aligned with state, national, and professional standards that our future teachers will be held accountable.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Program	Planned Improvement that would impact Outcome #1: As effective practitioners, graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods.
ESL	ESL program being discontinued. Last class will complete their program in Spring 2017.
GRADUATE PK-6	In ED555, students will videotape an instructional strategy and view it in groups for individual feedback. A model will be established to be set expectations. In the PDS seminar, students will bring in one videotape of an instructional strategy for group feedback.
GRADUATE SECONDARY	In ED537 and ED538, students will videotape an instructional strategy and provide a self-assessment. Then they will conduct a peer review of the videos. The critical assignment matrix will need to be reviewed and revised once the new VDOE regulations are approved.
GRADUATE SPECIAL EDUCATION	Students will videotape strategies used during their case study in ED523 and participate in a critique activity to discuss their effectiveness.
ALL	Measurement tools will be assessed and redesigned where necessary to better align with state, national, CAEP, InTASC, and discipline-specific standards.

Learning Outcome #2 - As Caring Professionals, graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>												
<p>1. Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism</p> <p>This is a direct measure</p>	<p>DEFINED – “Candidates maintain a commitment to professional ethics, communicate effectively, and take responsibility for and participate in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.”</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Full-time faculty members score portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student and then by licensure program.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="758 834 1520 1284"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Portfolio Standard #6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL n =3</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 27</td> <td>3.31</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 12</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 3</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p>	Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism		Programs	Portfolio Standard #6	ESL n =3	3.50	PK-6 n = 27	3.31	SEC n = 12	3.50	SPED n = 3	3.50	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Portfolio Standard for the Learning Outcome. Teacher candidates per licensure program were averaged as licensure groups for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes students’ portfolio scores from fall and spring semesters).</p> <p><u>2) Findings:</u> A. The aggregate means in <i>Standard #6: Professionalism</i> met and exceeded the acceptable</p>
Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism															
Programs	Portfolio Standard #6														
ESL n =3	3.50														
PK-6 n = 27	3.31														
SEC n = 12	3.50														
SPED n = 3	3.50														

	<p><u>Acceptable Level:</u> A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="758 250 1591 625"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="5">Rubric Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>2.5</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>3.5</th> <th>4.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6</td> <td>4% (1)</td> <td>11% (3)</td> <td>41% (11)</td> <td>7% (2)</td> <td>37% (10)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>42% (5)</td> <td>17% (2)</td> <td>42% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p>	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism							Rubric Score					Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	ESL	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (1)	33% (1)	33% (1)	PK-6	4% (1)	11% (3)	41% (11)	7% (2)	37% (10)	SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	42% (5)	17% (2)	42% (5)	SPED	33% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	67% (2)	<p>(3.0) level for all four programs.</p> <p>B. Individually, four PK-6 students (15%) and one Special Education student (33%) received ratings below the acceptable (3.0) level for <i>Standard 6: Professionalism</i>. All other individual ratings were at or above the acceptable (3.0) level.</p> <p>C. For Portfolio <i>Standard #6</i>, 100% of the ESL, 85% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 67% of the Special Education students scored at the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric.</p> <p>D. For Portfolio <i>Standard #6</i>: 33% of the ESL, 37% of the PK-6, 42% of the Secondary, and 67% of the Special Education scored at the highest level possible on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).</p>
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism																																													
	Rubric Score																																												
Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0																																								
ESL	0% (0)	0% (0)	33% (1)	33% (1)	33% (1)																																								
PK-6	4% (1)	11% (3)	41% (11)	7% (2)	37% (10)																																								
SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	42% (5)	17% (2)	42% (5)																																								
SPED	33% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	67% (2)																																								
<p>2. Cooperating Teacher (CT)</p>	<p>DEFINED – “Student</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors complete a rating on each student teacher at the midpoint and the</p>	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department</p>																																										

and University Supervisor (US) Evaluation:
Criteria statement - Professionalism

This is a direct measure.

teacher exhibits high ethical standards, respectful attitudes, and a dedication to teaching.”

Acceptable Level:

A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered “Acceptable” on the rubric.

end of his/her placement in either the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, then by licensure program, and the total group.

Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: Professionalism from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument

	Cooperating Teacher Average Score	University Supervisor Average Score
ESL n = 3	4.00	4.00
PK-6 n = 24	3.92	4.00
SEC n = 12	3.92	3.90
SPED n = 3	4.00	4.00

Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – Professionalism from the Student Teacher Summative Evaluative Instrument

Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument	
	3	4
ESL	0% (0)	100% (3)
PK-6	8% (2)	92% (22)
SEC	8% (1)	92% (11)
SPED	0% (0)	100% (3)

Rubric Rating:

- 1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors
- 2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors
- 3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors
- 4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors

examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified student teaching criteria statement for the Learning Outcome. Ratings from the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisors’ evaluation instruments for this criteria statement was analyzed by licensure program for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes rating scores from both the fall and spring semesters).

2) Findings:

A. Aggregated means for all licensure programs by both the Cooperating Teachers and the University Supervisor were at or above the acceptable (3.0) level.

B. Individually, all students were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level.

C. Evaluated by the **Cooperating/Mentor teachers**, 100% of all four groups were rated at the

		<p>University Supervisor Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – Professionalism from the Summative Evaluative Instrument</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="758 285 1587 662"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Group</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ESL</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PK-6</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (24)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>8% (1)</td> <td>92% (11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Rating: 1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors 2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors 3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors 4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors</p>	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument			Group	3	4	ESL	0% (0)	100% (3)	PK-6	0% (0)	100% (24)	SEC	8% (1)	92% (11)	SPED	0% (0)	100% (3)	<p>acceptable (3.0) level: “<i>Usually Exhibits Behaviors.</i>”</p> <p>D. Evaluated by the Cooperating/Mentor teachers, 100% of the ESL, 92% of the PK-6, 92% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students were rated at the highest level, 4.0: “<i>Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.</i>”</p> <p>E. Evaluated by the University Supervisors, 100% of all four groups were rated at the acceptable (3.0) level: “<i>Usually Exhibits Behaviors.</i>”</p> <p>F. Evaluated by the University Supervisors, 100% of the ESL, 100% of the PK-6, 92% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students were rated at the highest level, 4.0: “<i>Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.</i>”</p>
Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument																					
Group	3	4																			
ESL	0% (0)	100% (3)																			
PK-6	0% (0)	100% (24)																			
SEC	8% (1)	92% (11)																			
SPED	0% (0)	100% (3)																			

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

For this learning outcome, “As caring professionals, graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting,” all of our four groups (ESL, PK-6, Secondary, and Special Education) scored at and above the acceptable level. We used two measurement tools: the Portfolio Standard for *Professionalism* and the *Professionalism* criteria statement on their Summative Evaluative Instrument for Cooperating/Mentor Teachers and University Supervisors. When rated by their cooperating/mentor teachers and university supervisors during the field experience, 92% and above of our students rated at the highest level of the instrument for this learning outcome.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

We discussed that students’ scores were lower for this learning outcome when assessed by the Portfolio standard as compared to the instrument used by cooperating/mentor teachers and university supervisors. We are pleased that our students are receiving extremely high ratings by their cooperating/mentor teachers and university supervisors since they are the ones who are witnessing our students interacting with students, faculty, and staff within a school setting on a daily basis. We will look for opportunities to improve our assessment of *Professionalism* during their coursework and provide a better understanding to our students of what kinds of experiences and evidence would best represent this standard in their Portfolios.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Program	Planned Improvement that would impact Outcome #2 - As Caring Professionals, graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting
ESL	ESL program will be discontinued in May 2017.
GRADUATE PK-6	In ED503, instructions and opportunities on how to complete their service learning component will be added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED570 portfolio in a student's first semester under <i>Standard #6: Professionalism</i> .
GRADUATE SECONDARY	In ED503, instructions and opportunities on how to do "service learning" component added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED570 portfolio in a student's first semester under <i>Standard #6: Professionalism</i> .
GRADUATE SPECIAL EDUCATION	In ED503, instructions and opportunities on how to do "service learning" component added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED570 portfolio in a student's first semester under <i>Standard #6: Professionalism</i> .