

## STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

**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:** 9-30-17

**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.

**Education**

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 the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility provide the foundation for our programs. All courses and experiences are designed to achieve this mission.

Upon successful completion of any Master of Education licensure program, students will be able to

- demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential;
- demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners in accessing information and applying knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content;
- plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaged ways;
- demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior, and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.

**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
1. apply knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential.		YES	2019

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
2. demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners in accessing information and applying knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content.		YES	2019
3. design and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.	2016		2018
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.	2016		2018

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
<b>Education Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- apply <i>knowledge</i> of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet <i>high standards</i> and reach their full potential.</li> <li>- design and implement a variety of effective <i>instructional strategies and assessments</i> in coordinated and engaging ways.</li> </ul>	demonstrate <i>leadership</i> and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the <i>highest levels</i> of learner achievement.	demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to <i>support learners</i> in accessing information and <i>applying knowledge in real world settings</i> to assure mastery of content.	demonstrate leadership and collaboration by <i>modeling ethical behavior</i> and <i>professional responsibility</i> resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.

**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:**

- The hallmarks of a Marymount education are *scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics*. 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.
- 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.
- Teacher Education on the graduate 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 PK-6 elementary, K-12 General Curriculum in Special Education, or secondary grades 6-12 (in content areas of English, mathematics, biology, chemistry, earth science, physics, or history/social studies). 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. The Title II Report ensures that we collect, certify, and track Teacher Education students' enrollment and pass rates on the licensure exams. Our CAEP site visit will take place in the fall 2020 semester so our data collection has already begun for this accreditation report. 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 E-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. Education 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.
- ◆ **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 education faculty using a standardized rubric.
- ◆ **The University Supervisor Evaluation:** University Supervisors (US) 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 Teachers (CT) complete evaluations of their student teachers at the mid-point and at the final week of the student teaching placement. They use the same instrument as the University Supervisors. 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).
- ◆ **RVE: Reading for Virginia Educators:** This licensure examination is required of all elementary and special education students.

#### Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement:

- All education faculty members participate in the data analysis process and setting the planned improvements. In a day-long department meeting held in May, faculty view all gathered data from the past year. Although this report only looks at two of the Student Learner Outcomes at a time, because of accreditation, data is gathered from all sources on each Learner Outcome each semester. Viewing the whole data set allows the department to monitor and look for trends across all certification 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:

- ◆ CAEP, the current national accreditation body for education provider programs (EPP), created a rubric to establish a level of sufficiency for assessing our instruments that are used for data collection. During 2016-17, we received feedback on our rubrics from CAEP: we needed to revise our rubrics. Over the summer 2017, we revised the rubrics for our E-Portfolio, Summative Evaluation for Student Teachers, and Dispositions. During the 2017-18 academic year, we will be piloting the revised rubrics and making any additional revisions for the spring 2018 semester. While our accreditation visit does not occur until fall 2020, it is vital that our instruments meet CAEP's level of sufficiency so that we can collect meaningful data for our report. We will be revising our Teacher Work Sample rubric during the fall 2017 semester.

**Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:**

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>As effective practitioners, graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: ESL program being discontinued. Last class will complete their program in spring 2017.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>Graduate Special Education: Students will videotape strategies used during their case study in ED523 and participate in a critique activity to discuss their effectiveness.</li> <li>ALL: Measurement tools will be assessed and redesigned where necessary to better align with state, national, CAEP, InTASC, and discipline-specific standards.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>ESL</u>: The last class successfully completed the ESL program in spring 2017.</li> <li><u>Graduate PK-6/PDS</u>: In ED 555 the students taped and analyzed strategy lessons. This is a worthwhile activity that will be continued. Revisions will be made based upon this initial implementation. The focus will be on strategies for word study rather than comprehension and more structure for the analysis of the videos will be provided.</li> <li><u>Graduate Secondary</u>: ED 537 students videotaped an instructional strategy and provided self-assessment. Since many students were in both ED 537 and ED 538, this assignment was conducted this past year in one class. ED 538 will be adding a video component this year but ensuring that it is different than the one they do in ED 537 to avoid overlap in project objectives.</li> <li><u>Graduate SPED</u>: ED 523 students videotaped strategies they used during their case study. There was positive feedback on this activity and will be continued each time the class runs.</li> <li><u>ALL</u>: Our measurement tools underwent major revision for the 2016-17 academic year. We revised the following instruments:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Summative Evaluation by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors of Student Teachers/Interns</li> <li>Formative Evaluation by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors of Student Teachers/Interns</li> <li>E-Portfolio Rubrics</li> <li>Dispositional Rubric</li> <li>Critical Assignment Rubrics</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
<p>As Caring Professionals, graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ESL: ESL program will be discontinued in May 2017.</li> <li>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 Standard #6: Professionalism.</li> <li>Graduate Secondary: In ED503, instructions and opportunities on how to do "service learning" component added. This one piece of evidence will be</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>ESL</u>: The last class successfully completed the ESL program in spring 2017.</li> </ul> <p><u>ALL</u>: We made this planned improvement throughout the 2016-17 academic year. ED 503 runs in the fall and spring semesters and starting in the fall 2016, the faculty members teaching ED 503 made adjustments to the service learning component.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students in ED 503 were shown the rubric for how they would be graded on this E-Portfolio Link #1 piece of evidence for Standard #6: Professionalism.</li> </ul>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
educational setting.	able to be added to the ED570 portfolio in a student's first semester under Standard #6: Professionalism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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 Standard #6: Professionalism.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More opportunities were provided to the ED 503 students to choose from for their Service Learning hours.</li> </ul>

**Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:** There were no recommendations for this year's report.

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY GRADUATE LEARNING OUTCOMES 2016-17			
LEARNING OUTCOMES: Teacher candidates will:	DATE TO BE ASSESSED	CRITICAL ASSIGNMENT / PORFOLIO EVIDENCE TO BE ASSESSED	EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT TO BE ASSESSED
1. apply knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential. <b>Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker</b> <b>InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3: Learner and Learning</b> <b>1. Learning Development; 2. Learning Differences; 3. Learning Environments</b>	2017	<b>Standard 5: Learning Environment</b> <b>"Behavior Plan with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy and application"</b> ED549, ED552 <b>Teacher Work Sample: Task #1: Contextual Factors</b>	US/CT Final Evaluation <b>Standard 5: Learning Environment</b>
2. demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners in accessing information and applying knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content. <b>Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker</b> <b>InTASC Standards 4, 5: Content</b> <b>4. Content Knowledge; 5. Application of Knowledge</b>	2017	<b>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</b> <b>"Evidence of Content Knowledge"</b> ED539, ED559, ED568/569	US/CT Final Evaluation <b>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</b>
3. design and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways. <b>Conceptual Framework: Effective Practitioner</b> <b>InTASC Standards 6, 7, 8: Instruction</b> <b>6. Assessment; 7. Planning for Instruction; 8. Instructional Strategies</b>	2018	<b>Standard 2: Instructional Planning</b> <b>"Unit Plan"</b> ED529, ED538, ED557 <b>Standard 3: Instructional Delivery</b> <b>"Variety of Instructional Strategies"</b> ED555, ED556, ED509, ED537	US/CT Final Evaluation <b>Standard 2: Instructional Planning</b> <b>Standard 3: Instructional Delivery</b> <b>Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</b>

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY GRADUATE LEARNING OUTCOMES 2016-17			
LEARNING OUTCOMES: Teacher candidates will:	DATE TO BE ASSESSED	CRITICAL ASSIGNMENT / PORFOLIO EVIDENCE TO BE ASSESSED	EVALUATIVE INSTRUMENT TO BE ASSESSED
		<b>Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning: "Variety of assessments"</b> ED538, ED558 <b>Teacher Work Sample: Task #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6</b>	
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement. <b>Conceptual Framework: <i>Caring Professional</i></b> <b>InTASC Standards: 9, 10: Professional Responsibility</b> <b>9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice;</b> <b>10: Leadership and Collaboration</b>	2018	<b>Standard 6: Professionalism</b> <b>"Community Outreach/Service Learning"</b> ED503	<b>US/CT Final Evaluation</b> <b>Standard 6: Professionalism</b>

**Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017**

**Learning Outcome 1:** Teacher candidates will demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential.

**Assessment Activity**

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<b>1. E-Portfolio Standard:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Standard #5: Learning Environment</b> <i>The teacher candidate uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful,</i></li> </ul>	DEFINED – <b>Standard #5:</b> <b>Evidence 1: Critical Assignment</b> Behavior management plan - with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy with description of application to your future classroom (ED 552; ED 549).	<b>Collection:</b> Faculty members score students' E-Portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, by licensure program, and then by percentage for each level of the rubric. Student scores are submitted into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to disaggregate the data by program. Before grading each semester's E-Portfolios, our department meets to review the rubric, scores sample student work individually, and then shares out their scoring to help provide inter-reliability among graders.  <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; width: fit-content; margin: 0 auto;"> <b>Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #5: Learning Environment</b> </div>	<b>1) Analysis Process:</b> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we craft our action plan for the next year.



<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>		<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																											
<p><i>positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is direct measure</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence 2: Student Teaching</b> Video depicting teacher-student rapport and classroom environment (no more than 3-5 minutes.).</p> <p><u>Acceptable Level:</u> Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment and on their E-Portfolio evidence from Student Teaching using a three column rubric; in which level 3 “Evidence Meets Expectations” is the acceptable level of student performance. However, students must receive an overall grade of 2.5 on all seven standards of the E-Portfolio so students may receive ratings below a 3.0 on a particular standard. Our department goal is that all students submit evidence that get assessed with: “Evidence Meets Expectations.”</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Standard #5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>2.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Programs	Standard #5	PK-6 N = 20	2.9	SEC N = 8	3.0	SPED N = 1	3.0	ESL N = 8	3.0	<p>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>	<p><b>2) Findings:</b></p> <p>A. The aggregate means for Secondary, SPED, and ESL met the Level 3: <i>Evidence Meets Expectations</i>. Only the PK-6 group aggregate mean fell below Level 3 with a 2.9.</p> <p>B. Individually, all Secondary, SPED, and ESL students earned a Level 3 rating. Two (2) PK-6 students (10%) received Level 2 <i>Evidence Approaches Expectations</i>, which resulted in 90% of the group’s evidence meeting expectations.</p>																	
Programs	Standard #5																														
PK-6 N = 20	2.9																														
SEC N = 8	3.0																														
SPED N = 1	3.0																														
ESL N = 8	3.0																														
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4"><b>Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3"><b>Rubric Score</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>3.0</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>1.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>		<b>Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment</b>					<b>Rubric Score</b>			Program	3.0	2.0	1.0	PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	10% (2)	0% (0)	SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)	SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	ESL N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)
<b>Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment</b>																															
	<b>Rubric Score</b>																														
Program	3.0	2.0	1.0																												
PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	10% (2)	0% (0)																												
SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)																												
SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																												
ESL N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)																												



<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>												
<p><b>2. Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</b></p> <p>Standard #1: Contextual Factors <i>The teacher uses information about the learning-teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals and plan instruction and assessment.</i></p> <p>This is a Direct Measure</p>	<p>DEFINED – Standard #1: Contextual Factors assesses students in four indicators within this standard:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors</li> <li>2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students</li> <li>3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, &amp; Prior Learning</li> <li>4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</li> </ol> <p>They are assessed in all four areas on a three column rubric, in which Level 3 "Indicator Met" is the acceptable level of performance.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="745 407 1377 794"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #1 : Contextual Factors</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>Average Score for Standard #1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>2.94</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>2.89</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 6</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Collection: Faculty members score Teacher Work Samples after students submit the assignment. Due dates fall approximately in the middle of their student teaching semester. The data for the Teacher Work Sample is collected by the student teacher at the site of their placement. Faculty enter student teacher scores into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to disaggregate the data by program.</p> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:</p>	Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #1 : Contextual Factors		Program	Average Score for Standard #1	PK-6 N = 20	2.94	SEC N = 8	2.89	SPED N = 1	3.0	ESL N = 6	3.0	<p><b>1) Analysis Process:</b> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we craft our action plan for the next year.</p> <p><b>2) Findings:</b> A. The aggregate mean for PK-6 (2.94) and Secondary (2.89) fell below Level 3: <i>Indicator Met</i>. The aggregate mean for SPED and ESL met Level 3: <i>Indicator Met</i></p> <p>B. <b>PK-6:</b> Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students met Indicator #1 and #4. One (1) PK-6 student did not meet Indicator 2, which resulted in 95% of the group meeting that indicator. Four (4) PK-6 students did not meet Indicator #3, which resulted in</p>
Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #1 : Contextual Factors															
Program	Average Score for Standard #1														
PK-6 N = 20	2.94														
SEC N = 8	2.89														
SPED N = 1	3.0														
ESL N = 6	3.0														

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																																																												
		<p>1 Indicator Not Met 2 Indicator Partially Met 3 Indicator Met</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="747 581 1644 1414"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5"><b>Teacher Work Sample: Rubric Percentage Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th><b>PK-6 N = 20</b></th> <th><b>SEC N = 8</b></th> <th><b>SPED N = 1</b></th> <th><b>ESL N = 6</b></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>1.1 Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>100% (20)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>100% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students</b></td> <td><b>2.95</b></td> <td><b>2.88</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>95% (19)</td> <td>88% (7)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>100% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>12% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, &amp; Prior Learning</b></td> <td><b>2.8</b></td> <td><b>2.75</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>80% (16)</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>100% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>20% (4)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>2.88</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>100% (20)</td> <td>88% (7)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>100% (6)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Teacher Work Sample: Rubric Percentage Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors</b>					Indicator	<b>PK-6 N = 20</b>	<b>SEC N = 8</b>	<b>SPED N = 1</b>	<b>ESL N = 6</b>	<b>1.1 Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	3.0 Rating	100% (20)	100% (8)	100% (1)	100% (6)	<b>2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	3.0 Rating	95% (19)	88% (7)	100% (1)	100% (6)	2.0 Rating	5% (1)	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, &amp; Prior Learning</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	3.0 Rating	80% (16)	75% (6)	100% (1)	100% (6)	2.0 Rating	20% (4)	25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	3.0 Rating	100% (20)	88% (7)	100% (1)	100% (6)	<p>80% of the group meeting that indicator.</p> <p><u>SECONDARY</u>: Individually, 100% of the SEC students met Indicator #1. One (1) SEC student did not meet Indicator 2, which resulted in 88% of the group meeting that indicator. Two (2) SEC students did not meet Indicator #3, which resulted in 75% of the group meeting that indicator. One (1) SEC student did not meet Indicator 4, which resulted in 88% of the group meeting that indicator.</p> <p><u>SPED</u>: Individually, the one (1) SPED student met all four Indicators.</p> <p><u>ESL</u>: Individually, all six (6) ESL students met all four Indicators.</p>
<b>Teacher Work Sample: Rubric Percentage Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors</b>																																																															
Indicator	<b>PK-6 N = 20</b>	<b>SEC N = 8</b>	<b>SPED N = 1</b>	<b>ESL N = 6</b>																																																											
<b>1.1 Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>																																																											
3.0 Rating	100% (20)	100% (8)	100% (1)	100% (6)																																																											
<b>2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>																																																											
3.0 Rating	95% (19)	88% (7)	100% (1)	100% (6)																																																											
2.0 Rating	5% (1)	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																																											
<b>3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, &amp; Prior Learning</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>																																																											
3.0 Rating	80% (16)	75% (6)	100% (1)	100% (6)																																																											
2.0 Rating	20% (4)	25% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																																											
<b>4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>																																																											
3.0 Rating	100% (20)	88% (7)	100% (1)	100% (6)																																																											

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>					<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																								
		<table border="1" data-bbox="745 391 1646 464"> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>12% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Mean Overall</b></td> <td><b>2.94</b></td> <td><b>2.89</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> <td><b>3.0</b></td> </tr> </table> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:            1 Indicator Not Met            2 Indicator Partially Met            3 Indicator Met</p>					2.0 Rating	0% (0)	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<b>Mean Overall</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>															
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																											
<b>Mean Overall</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.0</b>																											
<p><b>3.Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations Performance Standard #5: Learning Environment</b>  <i>The teacher candidate uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</i></p> <p>This is a direct measure.</p>	<p>DEFINED – Standard #5: Assesses students in four areas within this standard which are aligned with specific VDOE Performance Standard Indicators:            5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.            5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.            5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2016 and spring 2017. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2016-17 academic year.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="745 824 1331 1226"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Standard 5: Learning Environment</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CT</th> <th>US</th> <th>Self</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>3.68</td> <td>3.59</td> <td>3.64</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>3.72</td> <td>3.81</td> <td>3.75</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N= 1</td> <td>3.25</td> <td>3.25</td> <td>3.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>3.41</td> <td>3.69</td> <td>3.47</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i>            4 = Exemplary    2 = Developing            3 = Proficient    1 = Unacceptable</p>					Standard 5: Learning Environment				Program	CT	US	Self	PK-6 N = 20	3.68	3.59	3.64	SEC N = 8	3.72	3.81	3.75	SPED N= 1	3.25	3.25	3.25	ESL N = 8	3.41	3.69	3.47	<p>1) <u>Analysis Process:</u>            During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we craft our action plan for the next year.</p> <p>2) <u>Findings:</u>            A. Aggregated means for the four licensure programs by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessment were above the <i>Proficient</i> level of performance (3.0).</p>
Standard 5: Learning Environment																															
Program	CT	US	Self																												
PK-6 N = 20	3.68	3.59	3.64																												
SEC N = 8	3.72	3.81	3.75																												
SPED N= 1	3.25	3.25	3.25																												
ESL N = 8	3.41	3.69	3.47																												

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																																																				
	<p>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</p> <p>They are assessed using a four column rubric, in which level 3 <i>Proficient</i> is the acceptable level of performance.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="743 516 1638 553"><b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for PK-6</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="743 553 1159 623">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1159 553 1339 623">CT N=20</th> <th data-bbox="1339 553 1482 623">US N=20</th> <th data-bbox="1482 553 1638 623">Self N=16</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 623 1159 786"><b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b></td> <td data-bbox="1159 623 1339 786" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4</b></td> <td data-bbox="1339 623 1482 786" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.5</b></td> <td data-bbox="1482 623 1638 786" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.4</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 786 1159 823">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 786 1339 823" style="text-align: center;">55% (11)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 786 1482 823" style="text-align: center;">45% (9)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 786 1638 823" style="text-align: center;">50% (8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 823 1159 860">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 823 1339 860" style="text-align: center;">30% (6)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 823 1482 860" style="text-align: center;">55% (11)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 823 1638 860" style="text-align: center;">38% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 860 1159 898">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 860 1339 898" style="text-align: center;">15% (3)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 860 1482 898" style="text-align: center;">0% (0)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 860 1638 898" style="text-align: center;">12% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 898 1159 1027"><b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b></td> <td data-bbox="1159 898 1339 1027" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.8</b></td> <td data-bbox="1339 898 1482 1027" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.7</b></td> <td data-bbox="1482 898 1638 1027" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.7</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1027 1159 1065">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 1027 1339 1065" style="text-align: center;">80% (16)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1027 1482 1065" style="text-align: center;">70% (14)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 1027 1638 1065" style="text-align: center;">69% (11)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1065 1159 1102">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 1065 1339 1102" style="text-align: center;">20% (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1065 1482 1102" style="text-align: center;">30% (6)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 1065 1638 1102" style="text-align: center;">31% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1102 1159 1265"><b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b></td> <td data-bbox="1159 1102 1339 1265" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.8</b></td> <td data-bbox="1339 1102 1482 1265" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.6</b></td> <td data-bbox="1482 1102 1638 1265" style="text-align: center;"><b>3.8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1265 1159 1302">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 1265 1339 1302" style="text-align: center;">80% (16)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1265 1482 1302" style="text-align: center;">65% (13)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 1265 1638 1302" style="text-align: center;">75% (12)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1302 1159 1339">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 1302 1339 1339" style="text-align: center;">20% (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1302 1482 1339" style="text-align: center;">25% (5)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 1302 1638 1339" style="text-align: center;">25% (4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 1339 1159 1377">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1159 1339 1339 1377" style="text-align: center;">0% (0)</td> <td data-bbox="1339 1339 1482 1377" style="text-align: center;">10% (2)</td> <td data-bbox="1482 1339 1638 1377" style="text-align: center;">0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for PK-6</b>				Indicator	CT N=20	US N=20	Self N=16	<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>	4.0 Rating	55% (11)	45% (9)	50% (8)	3.0 Rating	30% (6)	55% (11)	38% (6)	2.0 Rating	15% (3)	0% (0)	12% (2)	<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	4.0 Rating	80% (16)	70% (14)	69% (11)	3.0 Rating	20% (4)	30% (6)	31% (5)	<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	4.0 Rating	80% (16)	65% (13)	75% (12)	3.0 Rating	20% (4)	25% (5)	25% (4)	2.0 Rating	0% (0)	10% (2)	0% (0)	<p>B. Three (3) PK-6 students were assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing</i> Level of Performance on two indicators. Two (PK-6) self-assessed themselves as <i>Developing</i> on Indicator 5.2/5.3.</p> <p>C. Indicator #5.2/5.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters.</p>
<b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for PK-6</b>																																																							
Indicator	CT N=20	US N=20	Self N=16																																																				
<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.4</b>																																																				
4.0 Rating	55% (11)	45% (9)	50% (8)																																																				
3.0 Rating	30% (6)	55% (11)	38% (6)																																																				
2.0 Rating	15% (3)	0% (0)	12% (2)																																																				
<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>																																																				
4.0 Rating	80% (16)	70% (14)	69% (11)																																																				
3.0 Rating	20% (4)	30% (6)	31% (5)																																																				
<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>																																																				
4.0 Rating	80% (16)	65% (13)	75% (12)																																																				
3.0 Rating	20% (4)	25% (5)	25% (4)																																																				
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	10% (2)	0% (0)																																																				

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>				<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																															
	<p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i>            4 = Exemplary            3 = Proficient            2 = Developing            1 = Unacceptable</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b></td> <td><b>3.7</b></td> <td><b>3.7</b></td> <td><b>3.8</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.0 Rating</td> <td>80% (16)</td> <td>70% (14)</td> <td>75% (12)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>25% (5)</td> <td>25% (4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Mean Score</b></td> <td><b>3.68</b></td> <td><b>3.59</b></td> <td><b>3.64</b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>	4.0 Rating	80% (16)	70% (14)	75% (12)	3.0 Rating	10% (2)	25% (5)	25% (4)	2.0 Rating	10% (2)	5% (1)	0% (0)	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>3.64</b>				<p>B. No Secondary student was assessed or self-assessed at the <i>Developing</i> level.</p> <p>C. The University Supervisor and the Self-Assessment scores appear to be in better alignment than with the Cooperating Teacher scores.</p> <p>D. Indicator #5.2/5.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters.</p>											
<b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.8</b>																																		
4.0 Rating	80% (16)	70% (14)	75% (12)																																		
3.0 Rating	10% (2)	25% (5)	25% (4)																																		
2.0 Rating	10% (2)	5% (1)	0% (0)																																		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>3.59</b>	<b>3.64</b>																																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4"><b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SEC Students (N = 8)</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>CT</th> <th>US</th> <th>Self N=7</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b></td> <td><b>3.5</b></td> <td><b>3.6</b></td> <td><b>3.6</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rating 4.0</td> <td>50% (4)</td> <td>63% (5)</td> <td>57% (4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rating 3.0</td> <td>50% (4)</td> <td>37% (3)</td> <td>43% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b></td> <td><b>3.9</b></td> <td><b>4.0</b></td> <td><b>3.9</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rating 4.0</td> <td>88% (7)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>86% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rating 3.0</td> <td>12% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>14% (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				<b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SEC Students (N = 8)</b>				Indicator	CT	US	Self N=7	<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	Rating 4.0	50% (4)	63% (5)	57% (4)	Rating 3.0	50% (4)	37% (3)	43% (3)	<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>	Rating 4.0	88% (7)	100% (8)	86% (6)	Rating 3.0	12% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)
<b>STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SEC Students (N = 8)</b>																																					
Indicator	CT	US	Self N=7																																		
<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>																																		
Rating 4.0	50% (4)	63% (5)	57% (4)																																		
Rating 3.0	50% (4)	37% (3)	43% (3)																																		
<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.9</b>																																		
Rating 4.0	88% (7)	100% (8)	86% (6)																																		
Rating 3.0	12% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)																																		

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>				<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>															
		<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.7</b>	B. This student was assessed and self-assessed at the <i>Proficient</i> and <i>Exemplary</i> levels, with no score being at <i>Developing</i> .															
Rating 4.0	63% (5)	75% (6)	71% (5)																		
Rating 3.0	37% (3)	25% (2)	29% (2)																		
<b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.9</b>																		
Rating 4.0	88% (7)	88% (7)	86% (6)																		
Rating 3.0	12% (1)	12% (1)	14% (1)																		
<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>3.75</b>																		
<i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary    2 = Developing 3 = Proficient    1 = Unacceptable																					
<table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" style="text-align: center;">STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SPED Students (N = 1)</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Indicator</th> <th style="text-align: center;">CT</th> <th style="text-align: center;">US</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Self</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="730 1084 1220 1354"> <b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b> </td> <td data-bbox="1220 1084 1352 1354" style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1352 1084 1484 1354" style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1484 1084 1638 1354" style="text-align: center;">3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="730 1354 1220 1391">3.0</td> <td data-bbox="1220 1354 1352 1391" style="text-align: center;">100%</td> <td data-bbox="1352 1354 1484 1391" style="text-align: center;">100%</td> <td data-bbox="1484 1354 1638 1391" style="text-align: center;">100%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SPED Students (N = 1)				Indicator	CT	US	Self	<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	100%	100%	100%		
STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SPED Students (N = 1)																					
Indicator	CT	US	Self																		
<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0																		
3.0	100%	100%	100%																		

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>			<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>											
		<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	3.0	4.0	3.0	<p>B. The only individual scores at the <i>Developing</i> level were on the student self-assessment on Indicator 5.2/5.3.</p> <p>C. Indicator #5.2/5.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters. Indicator #5.5/5.6 had the highest scores</p>										
4.0	0	100%	0													
3.0	100%	0	100%													
<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	3.0	3.0	3.0													
3.0	100%	100%	100%													
<b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b>	4.0	3.0	4.0													
4.0	100%	0	100%													
3.0	0	100%	0													
<b>Mean Score</b>	3.25	3.25	3.25													
<p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i>            4 = Exemplary    2 = Developing            3 = Proficient    1 = Unacceptable</p>		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for ESL Students (N = 8)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>CT</th> <th>US</th> <th>Self</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> <td> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for ESL Students (N = 8)				Indicator	CT	US	Self				
STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for ESL Students (N = 8)																
Indicator	CT	US	Self													



<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>			<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>			
		<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.0</b>	across all three groups of raters.		
4.0 Rating	88% (1)	63% (5)	25% (2)	3.0 Rating	12% (7)		37% (3)	50% (4)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	25% (2)	<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>3.5</b>		<b>3.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>
4.0 Rating	50% (4)	63% (5)	63% (5)	3.0 Rating	50% (4)		37% (3)	37% (3)
<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>	4.0 Rating	50% (4)		75% (6)	63% (5)
4.0 Rating	50% (4)	25% (2)	37% (3)	<b>5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.</b>	<b>3.5</b>		<b>3.8</b>	<b>3.6</b>
3.0 Rating	50% (4)	75% (6)	63% (5)	4.0 Rating	50% (4)		25% (2)	37% (3)
3.0 Rating	50% (4)	25% (2)	37% (3)	<b>Mean Score</b>	<b>3.41</b>		<b>3.69</b>	<b>3.47</b>
<i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary    2 = Developing 3 = Proficient    1 = Unacceptable								

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																																																							
<p><b>4. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the "Candidate Dispositions Rubric:</b> The teacher candidate values diversity"</p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p>DEFINED: The Target disposition for "The teacher candidate values diversity" is stated as: <i>Actively seeks opportunities to work with those of different abilities, race, gender, or ethnicity. Actively seeks interaction and feedback from variety of other people. Has compassion for others. Listens actively and values the opinions of others. Is of the belief that all students can learn.</i></p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2016 and spring 2017. Students completed a self-assessment on the same instrument. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2016-17 academic year.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="745 581 1612 1031"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Name</th> <th colspan="3">CT</th> <th colspan="2">US</th> <th colspan="2">Self</th> </tr> <tr> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>U</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>95% (19)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td colspan="2">0% (0)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100 (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td colspan="2">0% (0)</td> <td>100 (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100 (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td colspan="2">0% (0)</td> <td>88% (7)</td> <td>12% (1)</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p>	By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity								Name	CT			US		Self		T	E	U	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	5% (1)	5% (1)	90% (18)	10% (2)	95% (19)	5% (1)	SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100 (8)	0% (0)	SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)		100 (1)	0% (0)	100 (1)	0% (0)	ESL N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		88% (7)	12% (1)	75% (6)	25% (2)	<p>1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we crafted our action plan for the next year.</p> <p>2) <u>Findings:</u> A. The Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor, and Self-Assessment scores for both Secondary and SPED were completely aligned in ratings.</p> <p>B. Individually, one (1) PK-6 student was assessed by the CT as <i>Unsatisfactory</i>.</p>
By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity																																																										
Name	CT			US		Self																																																				
	T	E	U	T	E	T	E																																																			
PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	5% (1)	5% (1)	90% (18)	10% (2)	95% (19)	5% (1)																																																			
SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100 (8)	0% (0)																																																			
SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)		100 (1)	0% (0)	100 (1)	0% (0)																																																			
ESL N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		88% (7)	12% (1)	75% (6)	25% (2)																																																			

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	<b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																				
<p><b>5. 2016-17 Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Development Alumni survey</b></p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p>DEFINED: Students responded to the statements on a 5 point scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="743 418 1648 493"><b>Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree</b></th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="743 493 1230 634"><b>Statement</b></th> <th data-bbox="1230 493 1362 634">PK-6 N = 10</th> <th data-bbox="1362 493 1530 634">SEC N = 3</th> <th data-bbox="1530 493 1648 634">ESL N = 7</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 634 1230 743">I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 634 1362 743">100</td> <td data-bbox="1362 634 1530 743">100</td> <td data-bbox="1530 634 1648 743">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 743 1230 862">I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 743 1362 862">100</td> <td data-bbox="1362 743 1530 862">100</td> <td data-bbox="1530 743 1648 862">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="743 862 1230 937">I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.</td> <td data-bbox="1230 862 1362 937">100</td> <td data-bbox="1362 862 1530 937">100</td> <td data-bbox="1530 862 1648 937">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<b>Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree</b>				<b>Statement</b>	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 3	ESL N = 7	I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.	100	100	100	I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.	100	100	100	I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.	100	100	100	<p>1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> While the data was received after our May 2017 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2017 meeting.</p> <p>2. <u>Findings:</u> Of all who completed the survey, 100% rated those three statements at the <i>highest</i> levels of the scale (4 and 5) for evaluating their development during the program.</p>
<b>Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree</b>																							
<b>Statement</b>	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 3	ESL N = 7																				
I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.	100	100	100																				
I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.	100	100	100																				
I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.	100	100	100																				

**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: "Teacher candidates will demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential." was analyzed based upon direct and indirect measures.

- This was the first year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and we were interested in taking a deeper look into the results we received. One PK-6 student had a challenging student teacher experience but through cooperation and collaboration with the Cooperating Teacher, this student finished the placement with the support needed. We will be looking to compare this year's results with next year's since we are revising the rubric. We will continue our discussions on how we can continually improve the alignment of coursework and student teaching evidence to the standards being assessed in the E-Portfolio.

- This was the first year of our new Summative Evaluation used during Student Teaching. We were pleased with our overall assessment of our student teachers by the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. Both the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers provided positive feedback on the major changes made to this instrument.
- This was the first year of our new Dispositions Rubric so we feel confident about getting scores to analyze. We will continue to monitor and work with any student at the *Unsatisfactory* level, as well as those are at the *Emerging* level. With our new revisions to the rubric taking effect this year, we look forward to how this might affect the ratings.
- The GSS results provided us with positive data that we are providing our students with the skills needed to be prepared to enter the profession.
- 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:**

- One major strength is the substantial revisions we made to our instruments used to collect data on our students. We feel that the data we collected provided us with more specific and targeted feedback on how are students are progressing and meeting our Learning Outcomes. We began in the summer 2017 to revise these instruments again to meet CAEP requirements and in doing so, we feel confident that we again made positive and significant changes to increase the quality of our data, which will consequently help us better assess the quality of our program.
- On the Summative Evaluation of the student teachers, it was not surprising that Indicator 5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time had to lowest scores. This indicator deals with classroom management, which is often one of the more challenging aspects of student teaching. We will continue to seek feedback from the students on how they feel we could better prepare them while at Marymount.

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

1. Based upon the changes with the E-Portfolio assignment for the student teaching piece of evidence (Link 2), our department will revise if necessary in order to meet the revised rubric.
2. The faculty teaching the ED 552 and ED 549 courses (Classroom Management for Student Teachers) will meet to discuss the E-Portfolio assignment for Link 1 to make any revisions or updates based upon the revised rubric for that standard.
3. Rubrics will be revised for both the E-Portfolio and Teacher Work Sample. We will be moving from a three-column rubric to a four-column rubric and we will be revising the language used for each of the distinctive levels to comply with CAEP levels of sufficiency

---

**Learning Outcome 2:** Teacher candidates will demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners in accessing information and applying knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content.

**Assessment Activity**

<p><b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p><b>Analysis</b> <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>												
<p><b>1. E-Portfolio Standard:</b> <u>Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</u> <i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is direct measure</li> </ul>	<p>DEFINED – <u>Standard #1:</u> <u>Evidence 1: Critical Assignment</u> Evidence of content knowledge (ED 559/ED 539/ED568/569) <u>Evidence 2: Student Teaching</u> Series of lesson plans</p> <p><u>Acceptable Level:</u> Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment and on their E-Portfolio evidence using a three column rubric; in which level 3 “Evidence Meets Expectations” is the acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Faculty members score students’ E-Portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, by licensure program, and then by percentage for each level of the rubric. Student scores are submitted into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to disaggregate the data by program. Before grading each semester’s E-Portfolios, our department meets to review the rubric, scores sample student work individually, and then shares out their scoring to help provide inter-reliability among graders.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="695 699 1472 954"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Standard #1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>2.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>2.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>2.75</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>	Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1: Professional Knowledge		Programs	Standard #1	PK-6 N = 20	2.8	SEC N = 8	3.0	SPED N = 1	2.0	ESL N = 8	2.75	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we crafted our action plan for the next year.</p> <p><u>2). Findings:</u> A. Only 100% the Secondary students had evidence assessed as meeting expectations.</p> <p>B. Individually, the SPED student’s evidence was assessed at <i>Evidence Approaches Expectations</i>. Four (4) PK-6 students’ evidence was assessed at <i>Evidence Approaches Expectations</i>, which resulted in 80% of the overall group’s evidence meeting expectations. Two (2) ESL students’ evidence was assessed at <i>Evidence Approaches Expectations</i>, which resulted in 75% of the overall group’s evidence meeting expectations.</p>
Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1: Professional Knowledge															
Programs	Standard #1														
PK-6 N = 20	2.8														
SEC N = 8	3.0														
SPED N = 1	2.0														
ESL N = 8	2.75														

		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="3">Rubric Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>1.0</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>3.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>20% (4)</td> <td>80% (16)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td>75% (6)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>	Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge					Rubric Score			Program	1.0	2.0	3.0	PK-6 N = 20	0% (0)	20% (4)	80% (16)	SEC N = 8	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (8)	SPED N = 1	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	ESL N = 8	0% (0)	25% (2)	75% (6)	E-Portfolio	
Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge																																
	Rubric Score																															
Program	1.0	2.0	3.0																													
PK-6 N = 20	0% (0)	20% (4)	80% (16)																													
SEC N = 8	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (8)																													
SPED N = 1	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)																													
ESL N = 8	0% (0)	25% (2)	75% (6)																													
<p><b>2. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on Performance Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</b> <i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</i></p>	<p>DEFINED – Standard #1: Assesses students in three areas within this standard which are aligned with specific VDOE Performance Standard Indicators: 1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications. 1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2016 and spring 2017. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2016-17 academic year.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CT</th> <th>US</th> <th>Self</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.44</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>3.67</td> <td>3.79</td> <td>3.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>3.33</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.33</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>3.17</td> <td>3.54</td> <td>3.21</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing</p>	Standard 1: Professional Knowledge				Program	CT	US	Self	PK-6 N = 20	3.50	3.50	3.44	SEC N = 8	3.67	3.79	3.57	SPED N = 1	3.33	3.0	3.33	ESL N = 8	3.17	3.54	3.21	<p>1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we crafted our action plan for the next year.</p> <p>2) <u>Findings:</u> A. Aggregated means for all licensure programs by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessment were above the <i>Proficient</i> level of performance (3.0). The aggregate mean for the Secondary students were the highest by all raters.</p>					
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge																																
Program	CT	US	Self																													
PK-6 N = 20	3.50	3.50	3.44																													
SEC N = 8	3.67	3.79	3.57																													
SPED N = 1	3.33	3.0	3.33																													
ESL N = 8	3.17	3.54	3.21																													

<p>This is a direct measure.</p> <p>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</p> <p>They are assessed using a four column rubric, in which level 3 <i>Proficient</i> is the acceptable level of performance.</p> <p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable</p>	<p>3 = Proficient    1 = Unacceptable</p>	<p>B. Three (3) PK-6 students were assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing</i> Level of Performance on two indicators. Two (PK-6) self-assessed themselves as <i>Developing</i> on Indicator 1.3 and 1.4.</p> <p>C. The means for the CT and US on all three indicators were identical; however, the percentages receiving a 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0 varied.</p>			
	<p><b>STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for PK-6 Students N = 20</b></p>				
	Indicator		CT	US	Self N=16
	<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</b>		<b>Mean 3.6</b>	<b>Mean 3.6</b>	<b>Mean 3.4</b>
	4.0 Rating		60% (12)	55% (11)	50% (8)
	3.0 Rating		40% (8)	45% (9)	38% (6)
	2.0 Rating		0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (2)
	<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>		<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.3</b>
	4.0 Rating		60% (12)	55% (11)	44% (7)
	3.0 Rating		25% (5)	40% (8)	44% (7)
	2.0 Rating		15% (3)	5% (1)	12% (2)
	<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>		<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.6</b>
	4.0 Rating		55% (11)	45% (9)	63% (10)
	3.0 Rating		35% (7)	55% (11)	37% (6)



		2.0 Rating	10% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<p>B. No Secondary student was assessed or self-assessed at the <i>Developing</i> level.</p> <p>C. Indicator #1.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters, then Indicator 1.7.</p> <p>B. This student received every score all at or above the <i>Proficient</i> level.</p> <p>B. One (1) ESL student was assessed by the CT at the <i>Developing</i> Level of Performance on Indicator 1.3 and 1.4.</p>
		<p><b>STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for SEC Students N = 8</b></p>				
	<p><i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable</p>	Indicator	CT	US	Self N=7	
		<p><b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.6</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.6</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.4</p>	
		4.0 Rating	63% (5)	63% (5)	43% (3)	
		3.0 Rating	37% (3)	37% (3)	57% (4)	
		<p><b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.8</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 4.0</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.6</p>	
		4.0 Rating	75% (6)	100% (8)	57% (4)	
		3.0 Rating	25% (2)	0% (0)	43% (3)	
		<p><b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b></p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.6</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.8</p>	<p><b>Mean</b> 3.6</p>	
		4.0 Rating	63% (5)	75% (6)	57% (4)	
		3.0 Rating	37% (3)	25% (2)	43% (3)	

<p><i>Rubric Performance</i> <i>Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable</p>	<p><b>STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for SPED</b> <b>Students N = 1</b></p>			
	Indicator	CT	US	Self
	<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>
	3.0 Rating	100% (1)	100% (1)	100% (1)
	<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 4.0</b>
	4.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)
	3.0 Rating	100% (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)
	<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>	<b>Mean 4.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>
	4.0 Rating	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
	3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (1)	100% (1)

		<b>STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for ESL Students N = 8</b>				
		Indicator	CT	US	Self	
<i>Rubric Performance</i> <i>Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable		<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</b>	<b>Mean 3.1</b>	<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.2</b>	
		4.0 Rating	25% (2)	50% (4)	12% (1)	
		3.0 Rating	63% (5)	50% (4)	88% (7)	
		2.0 Rating	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
		<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>	<b>Mean 3.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.5</b>	<b>Mean 3.3</b>	
		4.0 Rating	12% (1)	50% (4)	25% (2)	
		3.0 Rating	75% (6)	50% (4)	75% (6)	
		2.0 Rating	12% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
		<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>	<b>Mean 3.4</b>	<b>Mean 3.6</b>	<b>Mean 3.3</b>	
		4.0 Rating	37% (3)	63% (5)	25% (2)	
		3.0 Rating	63% (5)	37% (3)	75% (6)	
	<b>3. Cooperating Teacher (CT),</b>	DEFINED: The target disposition for "The	<u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching			1) <u>Analysis Process:</u>

<p><b>University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the Candidate Dispositions Rubric:</b> The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: Class Preparation; and In-Class Performance</p>	<p>teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING” is stated in two dispositions statements: <u>Class Preparation</u> <i>Work is of exceptional quality. Shows a desire to pursue the intended learning at a deep level. Work shows evidence of personal reflection and revision. Always attends class well prepared. Uses an array of quality resources to add to the breadth and depth of a project.</i> <u>In-Class Performance</u> <i>Shows initiative in class activities. Applies knowledge to other situations and makes connections with previous learning. Asks questions showing intellectual interest. Seeks to extend understanding through higher-level thinking.</i></p>	<p>internship in fall 2016 and spring 2017. Students completed a self-assessment on the same instrument. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2016-17 academic year.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="693 406 1512 909"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: Class Preparation</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Name</th> <th colspan="3">CT</th> <th colspan="2">US</th> <th colspan="2">Self</th> </tr> <tr> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>U</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>80% (16)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>75% (15)</td> <td>25% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td></td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td></td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td></td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td>50% (4)</td> <td>50% (4)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="693 1071 1512 1412"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: In-Class Performance</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Name</th> <th colspan="3">CT</th> <th colspan="2">US</th> <th colspan="2">Self</th> </tr> <tr> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>U</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 20</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> <td>90% (18)</td> <td>10% (2)</td> <td>95% (19)</td> <td>5% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SEC N = 8</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td></td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (8)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: Class Preparation								Name	CT			US		Self		T	E	U	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 20	80% (16)	10% (2)	10% (2)	90% (18)	10% (2)	75% (15)	25% (5)	SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)	SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)		100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	ESL N = 8	75% (6)	25% (2)		75% (6)	25% (2)	50% (4)	50% (4)	By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: In-Class Performance								Name	CT			US		Self		T	E	U	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	5% (1)	5% (1)	90% (18)	10% (2)	95% (19)	5% (1)	SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)	<p>During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review the data as a whole and then by licensure area to help identify trends and areas in need of attention. Based upon this data, we crafted our action plan for the next year.</p> <p><u>2) Findings on Class Preparation:</u> A. The Secondary and SPED students aligned across the three rating groups. B. Individually, two (2) PK-6 students and two (2) ESL students were assessed at the <i>Emerging</i> level by the CTs. Two (2) PK-6 students and two (2) ESL students were assessed at the <i>Emerging</i> level by the USs. Five (5) PK-6 and four (4) ESL students self-assessed themselves at the <i>Emerging</i> level. Two (2) PK-6 students were assessed at the <i>Unsatisfactory</i> level.</p> <p><u>2) Findings on In-Class Performance:</u> A. The Cooperating Teacher and Self-Assessment scores for both PK-6 and SPED were completely aligned in ratings. B. All percentages were identical across the CT, US, and Self-Assessment within each of the Secondary, SPED, and ESL programs. C. One (1) PK-6 student was assessed at the <i>Unsatisfactory</i> level, one at the <i>Emerging</i>, resulting in 90% (18) of the students meeting the <i>Target</i> level.</p>
By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: Class Preparation																																																																																																	
Name	CT			US		Self																																																																																											
	T	E	U	T	E	T	E																																																																																										
PK-6 N = 20	80% (16)	10% (2)	10% (2)	90% (18)	10% (2)	75% (15)	25% (5)																																																																																										
SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)																																																																																										
SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)		100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)																																																																																										
ESL N = 8	75% (6)	25% (2)		75% (6)	25% (2)	50% (4)	50% (4)																																																																																										
By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: In-Class Performance																																																																																																	
Name	CT			US		Self																																																																																											
	T	E	U	T	E	T	E																																																																																										
PK-6 N = 20	90% (18)	5% (1)	5% (1)	90% (18)	10% (2)	95% (19)	5% (1)																																																																																										
SEC N = 8	100% (8)	0% (0)		100% (8)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)																																																																																										

		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>SPED N = 1</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ESL N = 8</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> <td>75% (6)</td> <td>25% (2)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p>	SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	ESL N = 8	75% (6)	25% (2)	75% (6)	25% (2)	75% (6)	25% (2)			
SPED N = 1	100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)													
ESL N = 8	75% (6)	25% (2)	75% (6)	25% (2)	75% (6)	25% (2)													
<p><b>4. 2016-17 Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Preparation Alumni survey</b></p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p>DEFINED: Students responded to the <i>Evaluation of Preparation</i> statements on a scale 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent).</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Evaluation of Preparation Statement</th> <th>PK-6 N = 10</th> <th>SEC N = 3</th> <th>ESL N = 6</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.</td> <td>100</td> <td>100</td> <td>85</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Find appropriate sources of information.</td> <td>90</td> <td>100</td> <td>71</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation				Evaluation of Preparation Statement	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 3	ESL N = 6	Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.	100	100	85	Find appropriate sources of information.	90	100	71	<p>1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> While the data was received after our May 2017 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2017 meeting.</p> <p>2) <u>Findings:</u> A. The Secondary students rated their preparation at the highest level. The ESL students rated their preparation at lower levels compared to the other groups.</p> <p>B. All groups, except for PK-6 in on the <i>Apply Critical Thinking Skills</i>, responded that their student teaching allowed them to 100% develop those skills identified in the three statements.</p>
Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation																			
Evaluation of Preparation Statement	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 3	ESL N = 6																
Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.	100	100	85																
Find appropriate sources of information.	90	100	71																

		Percentage of Students Who Responded "YES" to: <i>The internship, clinical, or student teaching experience(s) allowed you to:</i>		
		PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 3	ESL N = 6
Students responded to the student teaching experience statements with Yes or No	Apply critical thinking skills	90%	100%	100%
	Develop a portfolio of work samples	100%	100%	100%
	Improve your competitiveness in the job market	100%	100%	100%

**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: "Teacher candidates will demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners in accessing information and applying knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content" was analyzed based upon direct and indirect measures.

- This was the first year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and we were interested in taking a deeper look into the results we received. One PK-6 student had a challenging student teacher experience but through cooperation and collaboration with the Cooperating Teacher, this student finished the placement with the support needed. We will be looking to compare this year's results with next year's since we are revising the rubric. We will continue our discussions on how we can continually improve the alignment of coursework and student teaching evidence to the standards being assessed in the E-Portfolio.
- This was the first year of our new Summative Evaluation used during Student Teaching. We were pleased with our overall assessment of our student teachers by the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers. Both the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers provided positive feedback on the major changes made to this instrument.
- This was the first year of our new Dispositions Rubric so we looked forward to getting scores to analyze on this instrument. We will continue to monitor and work with any student at the *Unsatisfactory* level, as well as those are at the *Emerging* level. With our new revisions to the rubric taking effect this year, we look forward to how this might affect the ratings.
- The GSS results provided us with positive data that we are providing our students with the skills needed to be prepared to enter the profession.
- 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:**

- One major strength is the substantial revisions we made to our instruments used to collect data on our students. We feel that the data we collected provided us with more specific and targeted feedback on how are students are progressing and meeting our Learning Outcomes. We began in the summer 2017 to revise these

instruments again to meet CAEP requirements and in doing so, we feel confident that we again made positive and significant changes to increase the quality of our data, which will consequently help us better assess the quality of our program.

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

Rubrics will be revised for both the E-Portfolio and Teacher Work Sample. We will be moving from a three-column rubric to a four-column rubric and we will be revising the language used for each of the distinctive levels to comply with CAEP levels of sufficiency.

**Curriculum Map**

*These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.*

**GRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP**

**Degree 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.)

**Year:** 2016-17

**Program Outcomes:**

Program Outcome	Critical Reading <sup>1</sup>	Written Communication	Oral Communication /Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use Resource Materials
Make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data;	X	X	X	X	X

<sup>1</sup> Graduate program competencies derived from GSC Committee Requirements for New Graduate Programs: “Achieving this criteria may be demonstrated by, but is not limited to:

1. Course content that is increasingly more complex and rigorous than UG courses (course objectives, learning activities, outcome expectations, etc.)
2. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in reading critically.
3. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in writing clearly.
4. Coursework that produces graduates with advanced skills in arguing persuasively.
5. Coursework that produces graduates competent in identifying, investigating, and applying theory and principles of the discipline to new ideas, problems, and materials.
6. Competence in the scholarly presentation of the results of independent study and in the use of bibliographic and other resource materials with emphasis on primary sources for data.
7. A capstone or final integrative activity that demonstrates achievement of graduate-level knowledge and application of the theory and principles of the discipline”



Program Outcome	Critical Reading <sup>1</sup>	Written Communication	Oral Communication /Persuasive Argument	Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline	Scholarly Presentation and the Use Resource Materials
Use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of students;	X	X	X	X	X
Demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy;	X	X	X	X	X
Effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods;	X	X	X	X	X
Exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting .			X	X	X

**Curriculum Map:**

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: F-foundational, A-advanced, M-mastery

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Endorsement Area	Critical Reading <sup>1</sup>		Written Communication		Oral Communication/Persuasive Argument		Identification, Investigation, and Application of Theory and Principles of the Discipline		Scholarly Presentation and Use of Resource Materials	
		Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
ED 502	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY	F	P	F	P	F	O	F	P	F	P
ED 503	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY	F	PR, P	F	PR, P	F	PR, O	F	PR, P	F	P
ED 509	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY, SPED	F	P	F	P, PR	F	O	F	I	F	PR
ED 511	SPED	A	P	A	P	A	O, E	A	PR	A	PR
ED 516	SECONDARY	A	PR, P, O	A	P	A	P, E	A	P, E	A	P
ED 519	SPED	A	P, E	A	P	A	O, PR	A	O, P	A	PR

ED 523	SPED	A	P	A	P, PR	A	O, PR	A	PR	A	O, P, PR
ED 526	ESL, SECONDARY	F	OT	F	OT	F	O	A	OR, OT	A	OT
ED 529	SPED	A	PR	A	PR, E	A	O, OT	A	PR	A	PR, P
ED 537	SECONDARY	A	PR, P	A	PR, P	A	PR, O	A	PR, P, O	A	PR, P, O
ED 538	SECONDARY			F	OT			A	OT		
ED 539	SPED	A	P	A	PR	A	O, PR	A	PR, P	A	O, PR
ED 543	ESL	F	P	M	PR	F	O	F	PR		
ED 545	SPED	A	P	A	PR	A	O, PR	A	O, P	A	O, P
ED 549	SPED	M	P, PR	M	PR	M	I, O	M	I, O, P	M	PR, O, I
ED 550	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY	A	P	A	P	A	PR	A	PR, OT	A	P
ED 552	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY	A	PR, P	A	PR, P	A	PR, O	A	PR, P, O, I	A	PR, P
ED 553	ESL	F	P	F	P	A	O	F	OT	F	OT
ED 554	ESL, PK-6, SECONDARY							M	OT		
ED 555	PK-6, SPED	A	P	M	PR	M	O	M	PR, O	A	PR
ED 556	PK-6	A	P	M	PR, O	M	P, O	M	PR, OT	A	PR
ED 557	PK-6	A	P	A	PR, P	A	O	A	PR		
ED 558	PK-6, SPED	A	PR	A	PR	A	O	A	PR, O, P	A	PR, O, P
ED 559	PK-6	A	PR	A	PR	A	O	A	PR, O, P	A	PR, O, P
ED 561	ESL	A	P	A	PR	A	O	M	PR	M	PR
ED 563	ESL	F	OTH	F	OT	M	O	F	PR	F	PR

<b>ED 570 (all sections)</b>	<b>ESL, Pk6, Secondary, SPED</b>					<b>M</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>I, PR</b>	<b>M</b>	<b>I, PR</b>
------------------------------	----------------------------------	--	--	--	--	----------	----------	----------	--------------	----------	--------------