

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT (2015-2016)

PROGRAM: Multidisciplinary Studies (B.A.)

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 460, ED 460E, and ED 460S) 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, the Assessment Coordinator of the Department, 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 teaching licensure are dedicated to the mission "Preparing Education 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.

Through a variety of programs, Marymount undergraduate students may earn Virginia licensure at elementary, secondary, special education and K-12 levels. Undergraduates major in an appropriate liberal arts or science discipline and complete their teacher licensure program requirements as outlined. All programs are designed to prepare graduates to enter the job market as beginning professionals in their respective fields.

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:

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.

University Mission Hallmarks	Scholarship		Leadership	Service	Ethics
Education 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. Our undergraduate program supports this mission by offering a rigorous four-year licensure program, which makes us one of the few universities in Virginia that offer this type of expedited career path. 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.

With the creation of an education minor, we are pleased to offer interested students an insight into the knowledge, skills, and dispositions of effective educators which ultimately can benefit any professional who has to deal with learning, training, collaboration, and motivation.

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 undergraduate 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 undergraduate level at Marymount University is an initial licensure program for persons majoring in a specific content area. The student learning outcomes are the same for all teacher education students whether they are seeking to become teachers in the elementary (PK-6), secondary (6-12 in content areas of English, mathematics, biology, or history/social studies), special education (General Curriculum K-12) or Art Education (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. Its 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. Full-time faculty share in the responsibility of evaluating the portfolio both in the fall and spring. Twenty percent of all portfolios are double scored to look at inter-rater reliability and to determine needed training for raters. It was determined by the education faculty that using the *Virginia Uniform Performance Standards* 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.
- ◆ **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.

- ◆ The 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 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 that are chosen for the reporting year per endorsement area. Faculty who are most clearly tied to the endorsement area work to 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 visit 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 implemented 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 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>
Undergraduate Teacher Education graduates make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data	<p><u>PK-6:</u> Introduction of SMART goals should be added in ED310 and a data analysis assignment added to ED357 to support the use of assessment data in setting academic achievement goals</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> A case study should be added to ED337 to support the use of assessment data in setting academic achievement goals</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> A case study should be added to ED323 to support the use of assessment data in setting academic achievement goals</p>	<p><u>PK-6:</u> SMART goals were added to ED310 and the data analysis assignment was added to ED357 in fall of 2014</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Case study was implemented in the Spring 15 in ED337.</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> A case study was implemented for ED323 students.</p>
Undergraduate Teacher Education graduates use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students	<p><u>PK-6:</u> Addition of a video and reflective response to a role-play activity in the Behavior Management assignment for ED452. ED358 students will be teaching and learning at Ft. Belvoir Elementary school and applying problem-solving strategies to meet the needs of the K-6 children. ED357 will add problem-solving exercise to their data analysis assignment.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Addition of a video and reflective response to a role play activity in the Behavior Management assignment for ED452</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 ED452. ED358 students taught and were mentored at Ft. Belvoir Elementary school and applied problem- solving strategies to meet the needs of the K-6 children.</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 ED452</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> A video and reflection were</p>

	<p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> A video and reflective response to classroom scenarios will be added to ED 349</p>	<p>implemented in ED349, Spring 15.</p>
<p>Undergraduate Teacher Education graduates demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy</p>	<p><u>PK-6:</u> Stronger emphasis on completing Praxis II – Elementary Content Knowledge while taking ED 357 and monitoring of test performance by advisors</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Stronger emphasis on completing Praxis II – Specialized Content Knowledge at the end of the junior year and monitoring of test performance by advisors. Addition of Praxis II scores as direct measures for the Learning Outcomes Assessment in academic year 2014-15</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Collaboration with the Arts & Sciences departments will support the content emphasis for MDSSPED students to determine “best” courses to provide background for teaching in a secondary special education setting.</p>	<p><u>PK-6:</u> Based upon test performance, free tutoring sessions in Language Arts and Math were held during 2015-16 by education dept. faculty.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY:</u> Praxis II scores added as direct measure for Learning Outcomes Assessment.</p> <p><u>SPECIAL EDUCATION:</u> Two meetings were held (one in October; another in April) with A & S representatives to discuss and monitor the sequencing of courses to best support our students.</p>

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

	Recommendations for next year's assessment process	Status
1	Begin to develop trend data for each Learning Outcome and measure.	Trend data is reported to APBP in the Program Review for all Learner Outcomes and accreditation requires constant review of all of the data for teacher education.
2	Review the Learning Outcomes to ensure that they express the emphasis of the program between content knowledge and skill building in the program's goals.	Faculty regularly reviews the Learning Outcomes in the fall of the year prior to revision in the University catalog copy.
3	Move data collection and analysis to the whole academic year. All 5 Learning Outcomes do not have to be analyzed each academic year.	Data is collected both in the fall and the spring for student teachers.
4	Consider analyzing data at more than the capstone experience.	One half of the documents students submit in the Professional Portfolio are taken from Critical Assignments in 5 key courses in each student's program.
5	More clearly define the role of the entire faculty in analyzing data and selecting opportunities for improvement.	See description of analyzing of the assessment process in the section below.

Outcomes Assessment 2015-2016

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

Assessment Activity

<u>Outcome Measures</u> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<u>Performance Standard</u> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<u>Data Collection</u> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<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>1. Portfolio Standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard #2: Instructional Planning: Standard #3: Instructional Delivery Standard #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning 	<p>DEFINED – <u>Standard #2:</u> Candidates plan using appropriate curriculum standards, effective strategies, resources, and data to meet the needs of all students.</p> <p><u>Standard #3:</u> Candidates effectively engage students in</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Full-time faculty members score full portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, then by licensure program, and the total group.</p> <table border="1" 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</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Standard #3</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Standard #4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>PK-6</i> <i>n = 10</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.60</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.45</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.05</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>SEC</i> <i>n = 7</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.57</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.29</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><i>SPED</i> <i>n = 1</i></td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.00</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.00</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.00</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4 for all programs				Programs	Standard #2	Standard #3	Standard #4	<i>PK-6</i> <i>n = 10</i>	3.60	3.45	3.05	<i>SEC</i> <i>n = 7</i>	3.57	3.29	3.50	<i>SPED</i> <i>n = 1</i>	3.00	3.00	4.00	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified 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>
Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4 for all programs																							
Programs	Standard #2	Standard #3	Standard #4																				
<i>PK-6</i> <i>n = 10</i>	3.60	3.45	3.05																				
<i>SEC</i> <i>n = 7</i>	3.57	3.29	3.50																				
<i>SPED</i> <i>n = 1</i>	3.00	3.00	4.00																				

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All are Direct Measures 	<p>learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.</p> <p><u>Standard #4:</u> 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 Portfolio rubric.</p>	<p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="716 492 1526 735"> <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>PK-6</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>20% (2)</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>60% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>14% (1)</td> <td>57% (4)</td> <td>29% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="716 971 1526 1214"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery</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>PK-6</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>20% (2)</td> <td>50% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>57% (4)</td> <td>29% (2)</td> <td>14% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</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	PK-6	10% (1)	20% (2)	10% (1)	60% (6)	SEC	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	29% (2)	SPED	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery							Rubric Score					Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	PK-6	10% (1)	10% (1)	10% (1)	20% (2)	50% (5)	SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	57% (4)	29% (2)	14% (1)	SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<p>2) Findings:</p> <p>A. The aggregate means in all of the Standards met the accepted level (3.0) for all three endorsement areas.</p> <p>B. Individually, one PK-6 student was below the acceptable level (3.0) for <i>Standard 2</i>, two PK-6 students were rated below acceptable (3.0) in <i>Standard 3</i> and three PK-6 students scored below acceptable (3.0) on <i>Standard 4</i>.</p> <p>C. For Portfolio <i>Standard #2</i>: 80% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students scored at or above the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric. Additionally, 60% of the PK-6 and 29% of the Secondary students scored at the highest level possible on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).</p> <p>D. For Portfolio <i>Standard #3</i>: 80% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education</p>
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #2: Instructional Planning																																																																					
	Rubric Score																																																																				
Program	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0																																																																	
PK-6	10% (1)	20% (2)	10% (1)	60% (6)																																																																	
SEC	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	29% (2)																																																																	
SPED	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																																																	
Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery																																																																					
	Rubric Score																																																																				
Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0																																																																
PK-6	10% (1)	10% (1)	10% (1)	20% (2)	50% (5)																																																																
SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	57% (4)	29% (2)	14% (1)																																																																
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																																																

		<table border="1" data-bbox="716 280 1526 524"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="5">Rubric Scores</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>PK-6</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>20% (2)</td> <td>40% (4)</td> <td>10% (1)</td> <td>20% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>43% (3)</td> <td>14% (1)</td> <td>43% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="716 560 1192 657"> Rubric Scale: 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable 2 = Developing 4 = Target </p>	Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning							Rubric Scores					Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0	PK-6	10% (1)	20% (2)	40% (4)	10% (1)	20% (2)	SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	43% (3)	14% (1)	43% (3)	SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	<p data-bbox="1549 217 1923 505"> students scored at or above the acceptable level (3.0) on the rubric. Additionally, 50% of the PK-6 and 14% of the Secondary students scored at the highest level possible on the rubric scale: Target (4.0). </p> <p data-bbox="1549 545 1923 1016"> E. For Portfolio <i>Standard #4</i>: 70% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students scored at or above the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric. Additionally, 20% of the PK-6, 43% of the Secondary, and 100% 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 #4: Assessment of and for Student Learning																																							
	Rubric Scores																																						
Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0																																		
PK-6	10% (1)	20% (2)	40% (4)	10% (1)	20% (2)																																		
SEC	0% (0)	0% (0)	43% (3)	14% (1)	43% (3)																																		
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)																																		

2. Teacher Work Sample

Criteria Statement #3: Assessment Plan and #4: Instructional Design

This is a Direct Measure

DEFINED – Criteria Statement #3: Assessment Plan – “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.”

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 data has directed planning.”

Collection: Full-time faculty members score Teacher Work Samples at the middle of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student and then by licensure program.

Teacher Work Sample Average Scores by Program for Task #3 and Task #4		
Program	Criteria Area #3: Assessment Plan	Criteria Area #4: Instructional Design
PK-6 n = 12	3.63	3.58
SEC n = 7	3.57	3.00
SPED n = 1	4	4

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

Teacher Work Sample: Percentages of Students Meeting or Exceeding Task #3: Assessment Plan					
	Rating Scores				
Program	2.0	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
PK-6	0% (0)	8% (1)	25% (3)	0% (0)	67% (8)
SEC	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	0% (0)	72% (5)
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)

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

1) Analysis Process: included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Criteria Statements for the Learning Outcome. Teacher candidates per licensure program were averaged as groups for the 2015-2016 academic year (which includes students’ TWS scores from both the fall and spring semesters).

2) Findings:

A. The aggregate means for all three endorsement areas met the acceptable level (3.0) for both Criteria Statements.

B. Individually, one PK-6 and one Secondary student received a below acceptable (3.0) rating in the area of *Assessment Plan*. Two Secondary students did not receive an acceptable (3.0) rating in the area of *Instructional Design*.

C. For *Task #3: Assessment*,

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				
	Rating Scores			
Program	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
PK-6	0% (0)	42% (5)	0% (0)	58% (7)
SEC	29% (2)	57% (4)	0% (0)	14% (1)
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:

1 = Not acceptable

3 = Acceptable

2 = Developing

4 = Target

92% of the PK-6, 86% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students scored at or above the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric.

D. For *Task #3: Assessment*, 67% of PK-6, 72% 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 PK-6, 71% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students scored at or above the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric.

F. For *Task #4: Instructional Design*, 58% of PK-6, 14% of Secondary, and 100% of Special Education students scored at the highest level of 4.0, Target, on the rubric.

<p>3. Cooperating Teacher (CT) and University Supervisor (US) Evaluations</p> <p>Criteria statement: As an Effective Practitioner, the Student Teacher uses communication, technology, management, and pedagogical skills to implement instruction and assessment.</p> <p>This is a direct 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="718 396 1499 854"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: Instruction and Assessment 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>PK-6 n = 13</td> <td>3.54</td> <td>3.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 7</td> <td>3.57</td> <td>3.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 1</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>3.00</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: Instruction and Assessment from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument			Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	PK-6 n = 13	3.54	3.64	SEC n = 7	3.57	3.90	SPED n = 1	4.00	3.00	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Criteria Statements for the Learning Outcome. Ratings from the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisors’ evaluation instruments for this criteria statement were 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 were at or above the acceptable (3.0) level. B. No individual student from any of the three groups was rated below the acceptable (3.0) level. C. Evaluated by the Cooperating/Mentor</p>
Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: Instruction and Assessment from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument																		
Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor																
PK-6 n = 13	3.54	3.64																
SEC n = 7	3.57	3.90																
SPED n = 1	4.00	3.00																

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

Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument	
	3	4
PK-6	46% (6)	54% (7)
SEC	43% (3)	57% (4)
SPED	0% (0)	100% (1)

Rubric Rating Scale:

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

University Supervisor Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – Instruction and Assessment from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument

Group	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument	
	3	4
PK-6	31% (4)	69% (9)
SEC	14% (1)	86% (6)
SPED	100% (1)	0% (0)

Rubric Rating Scale:

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

Teachers, 100% of all three groups were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: *“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”*

D. Evaluated by the **Cooperating/Mentor Teachers**, 54% of PK-6, 57% of Secondary, and 100% of Special Education students were rated at the highest level on the rubric: *4.0 “Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.”*

E. Evaluated by the **University Supervisors**, 100% of all three groups were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: *“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”*

F. Evaluated by the **University Supervisors**, 69% of PK-6, and 86% of Secondary students were rated at the highest level on the rubric: *4.0 “Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.”*

Interpretation of Results

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” was effectively met at the acceptable level (3.0) by all of our three groups across the academic 2015-16 school year: 1. PK-6 Elementary; 2. Secondary; and 3. 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 through student teaching evaluations, 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. We are overall pleased with our results but will continue to monitor and discuss any needed and appropriate changes to help improve the individual student and overall group scores for each measurement outcome.

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, undergraduate teacher education graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods
UNDERGRADUATE PK-6	Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes.
UNDERGRADUATE SECONDARY	Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes. Move the XX385 capstone pedagogical courses from A&S into the Education Department
UNDERGRADUATE SPECIAL EDUCATION	Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes.
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. Professional Portfolio – Standard #6: Professionalism 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.” <u>Acceptable Level:</u> A rating of 3 out of 4 is considered</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Full-time faculty members score full 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="751 933 1262 1214"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Standard #6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 n = 10</td> <td>3.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC n = 7</td> <td>3.43</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED n = 1</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	Standard #6	PK-6 n = 10	3.30	SEC n = 7	3.43	SPED n = 1	3.50	<p>1) <u>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). 2) <u>Findings:</u> A. All licensure areas met</p>
Average Scores for Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism													
Programs	Standard #6												
PK-6 n = 10	3.30												
SEC n = 7	3.43												
SPED n = 1	3.50												

“Acceptable” on the rubric.

Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism				
	Rubric Score			
Program	2.5	3.0	3.5	4.0
PK-6	20% (2)	30% (3)	20% (2)	30% (3)
SEC	0% (0)	57% (4)	0% (0)	43% (3)
SPED	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)

Rubric Scale:
 1 = Ineffective 3 = Acceptable
 2 = Developing 4 = Target

or exceeded the acceptable (3.0) level for Standard #6 – Professionalism.

B. Individually, two PK-6 students were below the acceptable (3.0) level for Standard #6 – Professionalism.

C. For Portfolio Standard #6: 80% of the PK-6, 100% of the Secondary, and 100% of the Special Education students scored at or above the acceptable (3.0) level on the rubric.

D. For Portfolio Standard #6: 30% of the PK-6 and 43% of the Secondary students scored at the highest level possible on the rubric scale: Target (4.0).

2. Cooperating Teacher (CT) and University Supervisor (US) Evaluations
Criteria statement - Professionalism

This is an indirect measure.

DEFINED – “Student 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.

Collection: 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.

Average Scores for All Programs on a Scale (1-4) for Criteria Statement: Professionalism from the Student Teaching Summative Evaluative Instrument		
Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor
PK-6 n = 13	3.92	3.82
SEC n = 7	4.00	4.00
SPED n = 1	4.00	3.00

Rubric Rating:
1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors
2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors
3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors
4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors

1) Analysis Process:
included the department examining the data in Excel spreadsheets and summary charts for the specified Criteria Statements for the Learning Outcome. Ratings from the Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisors’ evaluation instruments for this criteria statement were 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 the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors 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**

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

	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument	
Group	3	4
PK-6	8% (1)	92% (12)
SEC	0% (0)	100% (7)
SPED	0% (0)	100% (1)

Rubric Rating:
1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors
2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors
3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors
4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors

University Supervisor Ratings: Percentage of Students Meeting or Exceeding Criteria Statement – Professionalism from the Summative Evaluative Instrument

	Rubric Rating From the Evaluation Instrument	
Group	3	4
PK-6	15% (2)	85% (11)
SEC	0% (0)	100% (7)
SPED	100% (1)	0% (0)

Rubric Rating:
1 = Seldom or Never Exhibits Behaviors
2 = Occasionally Exhibits Behaviors
3 = Usually Exhibits Behaviors
4 = Consistently Exhibits Behaviors

Teachers, 100% of the all three groups were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: *“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”*

D. Evaluated by the **Cooperating/Mentor Teachers**, 92% of PK-6, 100% of Secondary, and 100% of Special Education students were rated at the highest level on the rubric: *4.0 “Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.”*

E. Evaluated by the **University Supervisors**, 100% of the all three groups were rated at or above the acceptable (3.0) level: *“Usually Exhibits Behaviors.”*

F. Evaluated by the **University Supervisors**, 85% of PK-6 and 100% of Secondary students were rated at the highest level on the rubric: *4.0 “Consistently Exhibits Behaviors.”*

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, undergraduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting,” all of our three groups (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, 85% 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 our students with a better understanding 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, undergraduate teacher education graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting.
UNDERGRADUATE PK6	In ED250, instructions and opportunities on how to do complete their service learning component will be added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED460 summative portfolio.
UNDERGRADUATE SECONDARY	In ED250, 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 ED460 summative portfolio.
UNDERGRADUATE SPECIAL EDUCATION	In ED250, 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 ED460 summative portfolio.