

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: UNDERGRADUATE Teacher Education Program (MDS PK-6; Special Education K-12; Secondary Education)

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 460, ED 460E, and ED 460S) for the Student Learning Assessment Report. All reporting of evaluation ratings are completed electronically through a Google Survey to eliminate error, keep evaluations confidential, and speed the process of analysis of data. This data is compiled in the Education Database on the "S" drive of the School of Education and Human Services in the Education folder under Assessment. The database is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education and is password controlled. Only the Chair of the Department, the Assessment Coordinator of the Department, and the Clinical Experiences Coordinator have access.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Multidisciplinary Studies

This major is designed specifically for students seeking teaching licensure in either elementary education (grades PK-6) or special education: general curriculum (grades K-12). Upon successful completion of the multidisciplinary studies program, students will be able to

- make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data;
- use a variety of problem-solving strategies to meet the needs of their students;
- demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy;
- effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods; and
- exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting.

Multidisciplinary Studies with Elementary Education (PK-6) Teaching Licensure (B.A. in Multidisciplinary Studies)

This program allows students to complete a baccalaureate degree in multidisciplinary studies and also be licensed to teach grades PK-6. Students pursuing licensure in this manner complete all requirements necessary for Virginia licensure, including field experiences and student teaching, at the end of four years.

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. demonstrate 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. plan for 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

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE 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. demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential. Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3: Learner and Learning 1. Learning Development; 2. Learning Differences; 3. Learning Environments	2017	Standard 5: Learning Environment "Behavior Plan with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy and application" ED452, ED349 Teacher Work Sample: Task #1: Contextual Factors	US/CT Final Evaluation Standard 5: Learning Environment
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. Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker InTASC Standards 4, 5: Content 4. Content Knowledge; 5. Application of Knowledge	2017	Standard 1: Professional Knowledge "Evidence of Content Knowledge" ED339, ED358, XX385	US/CT Final Evaluation Standard 1: Professional Knowledge
3. plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways. Conceptual Framework: Effective Practitioner InTASC Standards 6, 7, 8: Instruction 6. Assessment; 7. Planning for Instruction; 8. Instructional Strategies	2018 <i>Evaluated 2016</i>	Standard 2: Instructional Planning "Unit Plan" ED329, ED327, ED357 Standard 3: Instructional Delivery "Variety of Instructional Strategies" ED311, PSY341	US/CT Final Evaluation Standard 2: Instructional Planning Standard 3: Instructional Delivery

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE 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
		Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning "Variety of assessments" ED327, ED358, PSY310 Teacher Work Sample: Task #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6	Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement. Conceptual Framework: Caring Professional InTASC Standards: 9, 10: Professional Responsibility 9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; 10: Leadership and Collaboration	2018 <i>Evaluated</i> 2016	Standard 6: Professionalism "Community Outreach/Service Learning" ED250	US/CT Final Evaluation Standard 6: Professionalism

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

Marymount University Mission: Marymount University is an independent Catholic university that emphasizes academic excellence at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Committed to the liberal arts tradition, the university combines a foundation in the arts and sciences with career preparation and opportunities for personal and professional development. Marymount is a student-centered learning community that values diversity and focuses on the education of the whole person, promoting the intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth of each individual. Scholarship, leadership, service, and ethics are hallmarks of a Marymount education.

University Mission Hallmarks	Scholarship	Leadership	Service	Ethics
				
Education Student Learning Outcomes	- demonstrate <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. - plan for and implement a variety of effective <i>instructional</i>	demonstrate <i>leadership</i> and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.	demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners 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.

	<i>strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.</i>			
--	---	--	--	--

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 undergraduate level at Marymount University is an initial licensure program for persons majoring in a specific content area. The student learning outcomes are the same for all teacher education students whether they are seeking to become teachers in PK-6 elementary (Multidisciplinary Studies), K-12 General Curriculum in Special Education (Multidisciplinary Studies), secondary grades 6-12 (in content areas of English, mathematics, biology, or history/social studies), or K-12 Art education. 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 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>
As effective practitioners, graduates will effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergraduate PK-6: Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes. Undergraduate Secondary: Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes. Move the XX385 capstone pedagogical courses from A&S into the Education Department Undergraduate Special Education: Development of a specific course on assessment with a reflective component on outcomes. ALL: Measurement tools will be assessed and redesigned where necessary to better align with state, national, CAEP, InTASC, and discipline-specific standards. 	<p>1. <u>Undergraduate PK-6, Secondary, and Special Education</u>: In the beginning of the 2016-17 school year, the Education department created a new course, ED 251 “Assessment,” which would begin in fall 2017. As we took a deeper look into the rigor and sequencing of the course during this past year to prepare for its brand new implementation, we revised the number to a three-hundred level course, ED 351, which was approved during Faculty Council during the 2016-17 academic year to take place in fall 2017.</p> <p>2. <u>Secondary</u>: This program is assessed by the Arts and Sciences department; however, we transitioned the Arts and Sciences XX 385 courses into the education department by creating ED 366, ED 367, ED 368, and Ed 369. These four courses were approved by the Faculty Council during the 2016-17 academic year to take place in fall 2018.</p> <p><u>ALL</u>: Our measurement tools underwent major revision for the 2016-17 academic year. We revised the following instruments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Summative Evaluation by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors of Student Teachers/Interns Formative Evaluation by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors of Student Teachers/Interns E-Portfolio Rubrics Dispositional Rubric Critical Assignment Rubrics
As Caring Professionals, graduates will exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergraduate PK-6: In ED250, instructions and opportunities on how to do complete their service learning component will be added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED460 summative portfolio. Undergraduate Secondary: In ED250, instructions and opportunities on how to complete their service learning component will be added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED460 summative portfolio. 	<p><u>ALL</u>: We made this planned improvement throughout the 2016-17 academic year. ED 250 runs in both the fall and spring semesters and starting in the fall 2016, the faculty member teaching ED 250 made adjustments to the service learning component.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Service Learning project conducted at the comparable graduate level was shared with the undergraduate professor to help ensure greater consistency among candidates’ submission of their E-Portfolio evidence across both levels for Standard #6.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undergraduate Special Education: In ED250, instructions and opportunities on how to complete their service learning component will be added. This one piece of evidence will be able to be added to the ED460 summative portfolio. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students in ED 250 were shown the rubric for how they would be graded on this E-Portfolio Link #1 piece of evidence. More opportunities were provided to the ED 250 students to choose from for their Service Learning hours.

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.

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

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<p>1. E-Portfolio Standard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Standard #5: Learning Environment</u> <i>The teacher candidate uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe,</i> 	<p>DEFINED – <u>Standard #5: Evidence 1: Critical Assignment</u> Behavior management plan - with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy with description of application to your future classroom (ED 552/452; ED 349/549). <u>Evidence 2: Student Teaching</u></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>	<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 craft our</p>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis 1) <i>Describe the analysis process.</i> 2) <i>Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																											
<p><i>student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is direct measure 	<p>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; therefore, students may receive ratings below a 3.0 on a particular standard. Our department goal is that all students submit evidence that gets assessed with: “<i>Evidence Meets Expectations.</i>”</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="789 418 1352 662"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #5</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Standard #5</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>2.78</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>2.5</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="789 857 1394 1123"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Program</th> <th colspan="3">Rubric Score</th> </tr> <tr> <th>3.0</th> <th>2.0</th> <th>1.0</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>78% (7)</td> <td>22% (2)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>75% (3)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>25% (1)</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 #5		Programs	Standard #5	PK-6 N = 9	2.78	SPED N = 4	2.5	Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment				Program	Rubric Score			3.0	2.0	1.0	PK-6 N = 9	78% (7)	22% (2)	0% (0)	SPED N = 4	75% (3)	0% (0)	25% (1)	<p>action plan for the next year.</p> <p><u>2) Findings:</u> A. The aggregate means for both groups fell below Level 3: <i>Evidence Meets Expectations.</i></p> <p>B. Individually, one (1) out of the four (4) SPED students’ evidence did not meet “<i>Evidence Meets Expectations</i>” which resulted in 75% of the overall group’s evidence meeting expectations. It was two (2) PK-6 students’ evidence that did not meet Rating 3, which resulted in 78% of the overall group’s evidence meeting expectations.</p>
Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #5																														
Programs	Standard #5																													
PK-6 N = 9	2.78																													
SPED N = 4	2.5																													
Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #5: Learning Environment																														
Program	Rubric Score																													
	3.0	2.0	1.0																											
PK-6 N = 9	78% (7)	22% (2)	0% (0)																											
SPED N = 4	75% (3)	0% (0)	25% (1)																											
<p>2. Teacher Work Sample (TWS)</p>	<p>DEFINED – Standard #1: Contextual Factors assesses students in four indicators within this standard:</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> 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</p>	<p><u>1) Analysis Process:</u> During our May 2017 department meeting, we dedicated time to review</p>																											

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>								
<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>1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors 2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students 3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, & Prior Learning 4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</p> <p>They are assessed in all four indicators on a three column rubric, in which Level 3 "<i>Indicator Met</i>" is the acceptable level of performance.</p>	<p>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> <table border="1" data-bbox="789 716 1505 927"> <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 = 8</td> <td>2.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>3.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale: 1 Indicator Not Met 2 Indicator Partially Met 3 Indicator Met</p>	Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #1 : Contextual Factors		Program	Average Score for Standard #1	PK-6 N = 8	2.90	SPED N = 4	3.0	<p>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) Findings: A. The aggregate mean for PK-6 fell below Level 3: Indicator Met. The aggregate mean for SPED met Level 3: <i>Indicator Met</i></p> <p>B. <u>PK-6</u>: Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students met Indicator #1 and #2. One (1) PK-6 student did not meet Indicator 3, which resulted in 88% of the group meeting that indicator. Two (2) PK-6 students did not meet Indicator #4, which resulted in 75% of the group meeting that indicator.</p>
Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #1 : Contextual Factors											
Program	Average Score for Standard #1										
PK-6 N = 8	2.90										
SPED N = 4	3.0										

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.																								
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="789 420 1539 483"> Teacher Work Sample: Mean Score by Indicator and Percentage of Student Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors </th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="789 483 1035 516"></th> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="1035 483 1539 516"> Program </th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="789 516 1035 548">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1035 516 1323 548">PK-6 N = 8</th> <th data-bbox="1323 516 1539 548">SPED N = 4</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="789 548 1035 678"> 1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors </td> <td data-bbox="1035 548 1323 678"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%) </td> <td data-bbox="1323 548 1539 678"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%) </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="789 678 1035 776"> 2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students </td> <td data-bbox="1035 678 1323 776"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%) </td> <td data-bbox="1323 678 1539 776"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%) </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="789 776 1035 938"> 3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, & Prior Learning </td> <td data-bbox="1035 776 1323 938"> Mean = 2.88 Rating 3 = 7 (88%) Rating 2 = 1 (12%) </td> <td data-bbox="1323 776 1539 938"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%) </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="789 938 1035 1076"> 4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment </td> <td data-bbox="1035 938 1323 1076"> Mean = 2.75 Rating 3 = 6 (75%) Rating 2 = 2 (25%) </td> <td data-bbox="1323 938 1539 1076"> Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%) </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="789 1076 1035 1109"> Mean Overall </td> <td data-bbox="1035 1076 1323 1109"> 2.90 </td> <td data-bbox="1323 1076 1539 1109"> 3.0 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="789 1109 1539 1239"> TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale: 1 Indicator Not Met 2 Indicator Partially Met 3 Indicator Met </p>	Teacher Work Sample: Mean Score by Indicator and Percentage of Student Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors				Program		Indicator	PK-6 N = 8	SPED N = 4	1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%)	2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%)	3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, & Prior Learning	Mean = 2.88 Rating 3 = 7 (88%) Rating 2 = 1 (12%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%)	4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	Mean = 2.75 Rating 3 = 6 (75%) Rating 2 = 2 (25%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%)	Mean Overall	2.90	3.0	<p data-bbox="1554 448 1858 545"> SPED: Individually, 100% of the SPED students met all four Indicators. </p>
Teacher Work Sample: Mean Score by Indicator and Percentage of Student Scores for Standard #1: Contextual Factors																											
	Program																										
Indicator	PK-6 N = 8	SPED N = 4																									
1. Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%)																									
2. Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 8 (100%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%)																									
3. Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, & Prior Learning	Mean = 2.88 Rating 3 = 7 (88%) Rating 2 = 1 (12%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 4 = 8 (100%)																									
4. Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment	Mean = 2.75 Rating 3 = 6 (75%) Rating 2 = 2 (25%)	Mean = 3.0 Rating 3 = 4 (100%)																									
Mean Overall	2.90	3.0																									

<p>3. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations Performance Standard #5: Learning Environment <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>See Appendix for revised Summative Evaluation instrument.</p>	<p>DEFINED – Standard #5: Assesses students in four areas within this standard which are aligned with specific VDOE Performance Standard Indicators:</p> <p>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.</p> <p>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</p> <p>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students’ diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</p> <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 Proficient is the acceptable and expected level of performance. In our training, we explained that Level 3 is our expected level of performance for all student teachers. Level 4 is for those who are consistently performing beyond the level expected for a novice teacher.</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="793 440 1497 686"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Standard 5: Learning Environment</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>Cooperating Teacher</th> <th>University Supervisor</th> <th>Self-Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>3.47</td> <td>3.67</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N= 4</td> <td>3.56</td> <td>3.56</td> <td>3.83 (N = 3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Rubric Performance Rubric:</u> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable</p>	Standard 5: Learning Environment				Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	Self-Assessment	PK-6 N = 9	3.47	3.67	3.67	SPED N= 4	3.56	3.56	3.83 (N = 3)	<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 both licensure programs by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessment were above the <i>Proficient</i> level of performance (3.0).</p> <p>B. Only one individual student was assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing</i> Level of Performance on just one indicator: Indicator #5.4.</p>
Standard 5: Learning Environment																			
Program	Cooperating Teacher	University Supervisor	Self-Assessment																
PK-6 N = 9	3.47	3.67	3.67																
SPED N= 4	3.56	3.56	3.83 (N = 3)																

STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for MDS PK-6 Students (N = 9)			
Indicator	CT	US	Self
5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.	3.22	3.44	3.44
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	44% (4)	44% (4)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	56% (5)	56% (5)
5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.	3.44	3.56	3.67
4.0 Rating	44% (4)	67% (6)	67% (6)
3.0 Rating	56% (5)	22% (2)	33% (3)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)
5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.	3.67	3.89	3.78
4.0 Rating	67% (6)	89% (8)	78% (7)
3.0 Rating	33% (3)	11% (1)	22% (2)
5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.	3.56	3.78	3.78
4.0 Rating	56% (5)	78% (7)	78% (7)
3.0 Rating	44% (4)	22% (2)	22% (2)
Mean Score	3.47	3.67	3.67
<i>Rubric Performance Rubric:</i> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable			

C. The University Supervisor and the Self-Assessment scores appear to be in better alignment than with the Cooperating Teacher scores.

D. Indicator #5.2/5.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters. Indicator #5.5/5.6 had the highest scores across all three groups of raters.

B. Only one individual student was assessed at Level 2: *Developing* on just one indicator: Indicator #5.7.

C. While the overall mean of the CT and US were the same, they had different rating percentages for three of the four indicators.

STANDARD 5: LEARNING ENVIRONMENT for SPED				D. Indicator #5.2/5.3 had the lowest scores across all three groups of raters.
<i>Indicator</i>	<i>CT</i> (N = 4)	<i>US</i> (N = 4)	<i>Self</i> (N = 4)	
5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations, routines, and procedures and enforces them consistently and fairly to maximize instructional time.	3.25	3.25	3.67	
4.0 Rating	25% (1)	25% (1)	67% (3)	
3.0 Rating	75% (3)	75% (3)	33% (1)	
5.4 Establishes a climate of trust and teamwork by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.	3.50	4.0	4.0	
4.0	50% (2)	100% (4)	100% (4)	
3.0	50% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.	4.0	3.50	3.67	
4.0	100%(4)	50% (2)	67% (3)	
3.0	0% (0)	50% (2)	33%(1)	
5.7 Actively listens and pays attention to students' needs and responses.	3.50	3.50	4.0	
4.0	75% (3)	50% (2)	100% (4)	
3.0	0% (0)	50% (2)	0% (0)	
2.0	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
Overall Standard #5 Mean	3.56	3.56	3.83	

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>																																				
<p>4. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the "Candidate Dispositions Rubric: The teacher candidate values diversity"</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>Collection: 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="789 646 1524 938"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="8">Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th colspan="2">Cooperating Teacher</th> <th colspan="2">University Supervisor</th> <th colspan="2">Self N = 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>100% (9)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>78% (7)</td> <td>22% (2)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>100% (4)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>75% (3)</td> <td>25% (1)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p>	Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity								Program	Cooperating Teacher		University Supervisor		Self N = 3			T	E	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 9	100% (9)	0% (0)	78% (7)	22% (2)	100% (3)	0% (0)	SPED N = 4	100% (4)	0% (0)	75% (3)	25% (1)	100% (3)	0% (0)	<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 and Self-Assessment scores for both PK-6 and SPED were completely aligned in ratings.</p> <p>B. Individually, two (2) PK-6 students (22%) and one (1) SPED student (25%) had ratings of <i>Emerging</i> in this area.</p>
Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Diversity																																							
Program	Cooperating Teacher		University Supervisor		Self N = 3																																		
	T	E	T	E	T	E																																	
PK-6 N = 9	100% (9)	0% (0)	78% (7)	22% (2)	100% (3)	0% (0)																																	
SPED N = 4	100% (4)	0% (0)	75% (3)	25% (1)	100% (3)	0% (0)																																	

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis 1) <i>Describe the analysis process.</i> 2) <i>Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>										
<p>5. 2016-17 Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Development Alumni survey</p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p>DEFINED: Survey conducted by Academic Affairs aggregates statements into the percentage students responded to the statements on a 5 point scale: 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree)</p> <p>We have chosen three survey statements.</p>	<p><u>Collection/Population:</u> “Attached are the results for your department(s) from the 2016-2017 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), as well as the overall report. This survey was sent to students who graduated in December 2016 and May 2017, as well as students who will graduate in August 2017.”</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="779 607 1547 1019"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="779 607 1547 643">Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="779 643 1310 737">Statement</th> <th data-bbox="1310 643 1547 737">MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="779 737 1310 837">I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.</td> <td data-bbox="1310 737 1547 837">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="779 837 1310 954">I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.</td> <td data-bbox="1310 837 1547 954">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="779 954 1310 1019">I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.</td> <td data-bbox="1310 954 1547 1019">100</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree		Statement	MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13	I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.	100	I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.	100	I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.	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>
Percentage of Students Who Agree or Strongly Agree													
Statement	MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13												
I believe I have the knowledge and skills necessary to be effective at making positive changes in my community.	100												
I'm confident in my ability to work collaboratively with people of diverse backgrounds and experiences.	100												
I feel a sense of commitment to serve others throughout my lifetime.	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. While a small number received below a 3.0 rating, we still discussed why those scores came in as they did. 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. While no student received any *Unsatisfactory*, we will continue to monitor those students who 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 our 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 the 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 452 and ED 349 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.
4. The Dispositions Rubric will be revised so that it better aligns with the student teaching experiences, rather than heavily aligning with the experiences of a classroom student.

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>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>								
<p>1. E-Portfolio Standard: Standard #1: <u>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"> This is direct measure 	<p>DEFINED – Standard #1: <u>Evidence 1: Critical Assignment</u> Evidence of content knowledge (ED 358/ED 339) <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 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; therefore, students may receive ratings below a 3.0 on a particular standard. Our department goal is that all students submit evidence that gets assessed with: “<i>Evidence Meets Expectations.</i>”</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="772 764 1457 1015"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Programs</th> <th>Standard #1</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>2.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</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		Programs	Standard #1	PK-6 N = 9	2.67	SPED N = 4	2.75	<p>1) Analysis Process: 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). Findings: A. For both groups, the mean score fell below the <i>Evidence Meets Expectations</i> for this standard.</p> <p>B. Individually, one (1) out of the four (4) SPED students’ evidence did not meet “<i>Evidence Meets Expectations</i>” which resulted in 75% of the overall group’s evidence meeting expectations. It was three (3) PK-6</p>
Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1											
Programs	Standard #1										
PK-6 N = 9	2.67										
SPED N = 4	2.75										

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>																
		<p>Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="772 505 1522 708"> <thead> <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 = 9</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (3)</td> <td>67% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>25% (1)</td> <td>75% (3)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>		Rubric Score			Program	1.0	2.0	3.0	PK-6 N = 9	0% (0)	33% (3)	67% (6)	SPED N = 4	0% (0)	25% (1)	75% (3)	<p>students' evidence that did not meet Rating 3, which resulted in 67% of the overall group's evidence meeting expectations.</p>
	Rubric Score																		
Program	1.0	2.0	3.0																
PK-6 N = 9	0% (0)	33% (3)	67% (6)																
SPED N = 4	0% (0)	25% (1)	75% (3)																
<p>2.Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on Performance Standard #1: Professional Knowledge <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. 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="772 1065 1507 1308"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th>CT</th> <th>US</th> <th>Self N = 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>3.37</td> <td>3.22</td> <td>3.63</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N= 4</td> <td>3.42</td> <td>3.42</td> <td>3.78</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Rubric Performance Rubric:</u> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable</p>	Standard 1: Professional Knowledge				Program	CT	US	Self N = 3	PK-6 N = 9	3.37	3.22	3.63	SPED N= 4	3.42	3.42	3.78	<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> <u>PK-6/SPED:</u> A. Aggregated means for both licensure programs by the Cooperating Teachers, University</p>
Standard 1: Professional Knowledge																			
Program	CT	US	Self N = 3																
PK-6 N = 9	3.37	3.22	3.63																
SPED N= 4	3.42	3.42	3.78																

<p>Outcome Measures Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</p>	<p>Performance Standard Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p>Data Collection Discuss the data collected and student population</p>	<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>																																																				
<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>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="762 444 1520 505">STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS PK-6</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="4" data-bbox="762 505 1520 565">Students N = 9</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="762 565 1100 625">Indicator</th> <th data-bbox="1100 565 1234 625">CT</th> <th data-bbox="1234 565 1377 625">US</th> <th data-bbox="1377 565 1520 625">Self</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 625 1100 792"> 1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications. </td> <td data-bbox="1100 625 1234 792"> Mean 3.44 </td> <td data-bbox="1234 625 1377 792"> Mean 3.33 </td> <td data-bbox="1377 625 1520 792"> Mean 3.67 </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 792 1100 841">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 792 1234 841">44% (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 792 1377 841">33% (3)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 792 1520 841">67% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 841 1100 889">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 841 1234 889">56% (5)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 841 1377 889">67% (6)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 841 1520 889">33% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 889 1100 1003"> 1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught. </td> <td data-bbox="1100 889 1234 1003"> Mean 3.33 </td> <td data-bbox="1234 889 1377 1003"> Mean 3.22 </td> <td data-bbox="1377 889 1520 1003"> Mean 3.56 </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1003 1100 1052">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1003 1234 1052">33% (3)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1003 1377 1052">22% (2)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 1003 1520 1052">56% (5)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1052 1100 1101">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1052 1234 1101">67% (6)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1052 1377 1101">78% (7)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 1052 1520 1101">44% (4)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1101 1100 1279"> 1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group. </td> <td data-bbox="1100 1101 1234 1279"> Mean 3.33 </td> <td data-bbox="1234 1101 1377 1279"> Mean 3.11 </td> <td data-bbox="1377 1101 1520 1279"> Mean 3.67 </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1279 1100 1328">4.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1279 1234 1328">44% (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1279 1377 1328">11% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 1279 1520 1328">67% (6)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1328 1100 1377">3.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1328 1234 1377">44% (4)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1328 1377 1377">89% (8)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 1328 1520 1377">33% (3)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="762 1377 1100 1425">2.0 Rating</td> <td data-bbox="1100 1377 1234 1425">11% (1)</td> <td data-bbox="1234 1377 1377 1425">0% (0)</td> <td data-bbox="1377 1377 1520 1425">0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS PK-6				Students N = 9				Indicator	CT	US	Self	1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.	Mean 3.44	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.67	4.0 Rating	44% (4)	33% (3)	67% (6)	3.0 Rating	56% (5)	67% (6)	33% (3)	1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.22	Mean 3.56	4.0 Rating	33% (3)	22% (2)	56% (5)	3.0 Rating	67% (6)	78% (7)	44% (4)	1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.11	Mean 3.67	4.0 Rating	44% (4)	11% (1)	67% (6)	3.0 Rating	44% (4)	89% (8)	33% (3)	2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<p>Supervisors, and self-assessment were above the <i>Proficient</i> level of performance (3.0).</p> <p><u>PK-6</u> B. Only one individual student was assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing Level</i> of Performance on just one indicator: Indicator #1.7.</p> <p>C. There does not appear to be trends on which indicators were rated at the highest or lowest across all three groups.</p>
STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS PK-6																																																							
Students N = 9																																																							
Indicator	CT	US	Self																																																				
1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.	Mean 3.44	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.67																																																				
4.0 Rating	44% (4)	33% (3)	67% (6)																																																				
3.0 Rating	56% (5)	67% (6)	33% (3)																																																				
1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.22	Mean 3.56																																																				
4.0 Rating	33% (3)	22% (2)	56% (5)																																																				
3.0 Rating	67% (6)	78% (7)	44% (4)																																																				
1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.11	Mean 3.67																																																				
4.0 Rating	44% (4)	11% (1)	67% (6)																																																				
3.0 Rating	44% (4)	89% (8)	33% (3)																																																				
2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																																				

<p>Outcome Measures Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</p>	<p>Performance Standard Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p>Data Collection Discuss the data collected and student population</p>	<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>																																				
		<p><i>Rubric Performance Scale:</i> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="768 602 1520 1287"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="4">STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS SPED Students</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Indicator</th> <th>CT N = 4</th> <th>US N = 4</th> <th>Self N = 3</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.</td> <td>3.75</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.0 Rating</td> <td>75% (3)</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>25% (1)</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.25</td> <td>3.67</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.0 Rating</td> <td>25% (1)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>67% (2)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>67% (3)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>25% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS SPED Students				Indicator	CT N = 4	US N = 4	Self N = 3	1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.	3.75	3.50	3.67	4.0 Rating	75% (3)	50% (2)	67% (2)	3.0 Rating	25% (1)	50% (2)	33% (1)	1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.	3.0	3.25	3.67	4.0 Rating	25% (1)	33% (1)	67% (2)	3.0 Rating	50% (2)	67% (3)	33% (1)	2.0 Rating	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	<p><u>SPED</u> B. Only one (1) individual student was assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing Level</i> of Performance on Indicator #1.4 by one group (CT) and one (1) individual student was assessed at the Level 2 <i>Developing Level</i> of Performance on Indicator #1.7 by one group (US). C. Indicator 1.4 had the lowest mean for both the CT and US groups. D. The CT and US mean scores were identical for Indicator 1.7, while the percentages within the indicator varied.</p>
STANDARD 1: PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE: for MDS SPED Students																																							
Indicator	CT N = 4	US N = 4	Self N = 3																																				
1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real world experiences and applications.	3.75	3.50	3.67																																				
4.0 Rating	75% (3)	50% (2)	67% (2)																																				
3.0 Rating	25% (1)	50% (2)	33% (1)																																				
1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.	3.0	3.25	3.67																																				
4.0 Rating	25% (1)	33% (1)	67% (2)																																				
3.0 Rating	50% (2)	67% (3)	33% (1)																																				
2.0 Rating	25% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																				

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>				<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>																													
		<table border="1"> <tr> <td>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>3.50</td> <td>4.0</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>4.0 Rating</td> <td>50 % (2)</td> <td>67% (3)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.0 Rating</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.0 Rating</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>33% (1)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <p><i>Rubric Performance Scale:</i> 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable</p>				1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.	3.50	3.50	4.0		4.0 Rating	50 % (2)	67% (3)	100% (3)		3.0 Rating	50% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)		2.0 Rating	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)											
1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.	3.50	3.50	4.0																																
4.0 Rating	50 % (2)	67% (3)	100% (3)																																
3.0 Rating	50% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)																																
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	33% (1)	0% (0)																																
<p>3. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the Candidate Dispositions Rubric: The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: Class Preparation; and In-Class Performance</p>	<p>DEFINED: The target disposition for “The 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</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"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Class Preparation</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Program</th> <th colspan="2">CT</th> <th colspan="2">US</th> <th colspan="2">Self</th> </tr> <tr> <th></th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>44% (4)</td> <td>56% (5)</td> <td>78% (7)</td> <td>22% (2)</td> <td>89% (8)</td> <td>11% (1)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Class Preparation							Program	CT		US		Self			T	E	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 9	44% (4)	56% (5)	78% (7)	22% (2)	89% (8)	11% (1)	<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. 2) <u>Findings on Class Preparation:</u> A. There appears to be variation among all three groups on this disposition.</p>	
Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Class Preparation																																			
Program	CT		US		Self																														
	T	E	T	E	T	E																													
PK-6 N = 9	44% (4)	56% (5)	78% (7)	22% (2)	89% (8)	11% (1)																													

<p>Outcome Measures Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</p>	<p>Performance Standard Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</p>	<p>Data Collection Discuss the data collected and student population</p>							<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>																																																
	<p>the breadth and depth of a project. <u>In-Class Performance</u> 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.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="772 440 1522 573"> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>75%</td> <td>25%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>50%</td> <td>67%</td> <td>33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>N = 3 on Self</td> <td>(3)</td> <td>(1)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(2)</td> <td>(1)</td> </tr> </table> <p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="785 1089 1476 1448"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="7">Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: In-Class Performance</th> </tr> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Program</th> <th colspan="2">CT</th> <th colspan="2">US</th> <th colspan="2">Self</th> </tr> <tr> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> <th>T</th> <th>E</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PK-6 N = 9</td> <td>78% (7)</td> <td>22% (2)</td> <td>100% (9)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>100% (9)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SPED N = 4</td> <td>100% (4)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>50% (2)</td> <td>100% (3)</td> <td>0% (0)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>							SPED N = 4	75%	25%	50%	50%	67%	33%	N = 3 on Self	(3)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)	Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: In-Class Performance							Program	CT		US		Self		T	E	T	E	T	E	PK-6 N = 9	78% (7)	22% (2)	100% (9)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)	SPED N = 4	100% (4)	0% (0)	50% (2)	50% (2)	100% (3)	0% (0)	<p>B. Individually, five (5) PK-6 students and one (1) SPED student were assessed at the <i>Emerging</i> level by the CTs. Two (2) PK-6 students and two (2) SPED students were assessed at the <i>Emerging</i> level by the USs. One (1) PK-6 and SPED student self-assessed themselves at the <i>Emerging</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.</p> <p>B. Individually, two (2) PK-6 students (22%) were assessed by the CTs at <i>Emerging</i> and two (2) SPED students (50%) were assessed by the USs at <i>Emerging</i>.</p>
SPED N = 4	75%	25%	50%	50%	67%	33%																																																			
N = 3 on Self	(3)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(1)																																																			
Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: In-Class Performance																																																									
Program	CT		US		Self																																																				
	T	E	T	E	T	E																																																			
PK-6 N = 9	78% (7)	22% (2)	100% (9)	0% (0)	100% (9)	0% (0)																																																			
SPED N = 4	100% (4)	0% (0)	50% (2)	50% (2)	100% (3)	0% (0)																																																			

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>														
		<table border="1" data-bbox="787 440 1476 602"> <tr> <td>N = 3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>on Self</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	N = 3							on Self							<p>C. The US and Self scores were aligned in their ratings for PK-6. The CT and Self scores were aligned for SPED.</p>
N = 3																	
on Self																	
<p>4. 2016-17 Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Preparation Alumni survey</p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p>DEFINED: Survey conducted by Academic Affairs aggregates statements into the percentage students responded to the <i>Evaluation of Preparation</i> statements on a scale 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent).</p>	<p>Dispositions Rubric: Target (T) Emerging (E) Unsatisfactory (U)</p> <p><u>Collection/Population:</u> "Attached are the results for your department(s) from the 2016-2017 Graduating Student Survey (GSS), as well as the overall report. This survey was sent to students who graduated in December 2016 and May 2017, as well as students who will graduate in August 2017."</p>	<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. Two areas of preparations were rated at the highest levels. Two areas had lower ratings in terms of the evaluation of preparation.</p>														

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>												
	<p>Students responded to the student teaching/internship experience statements with a <i>Yes</i> or <i>No</i>.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="770 456 1499 971"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="770 456 1499 526"> <p>Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation</p> </th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="770 526 1262 646"> <p>Evaluation of Preparation Statement</p> </th> <th data-bbox="1262 526 1499 646"> <p>MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13</p> </th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="770 646 1262 719"> <p>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1262 646 1499 719"> <p>100</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="770 719 1262 803"> <p>Find appropriate sources of information.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1262 719 1499 803"> <p>100</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="770 803 1262 888"> <p>Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1262 803 1499 888"> <p>84.6</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="770 888 1262 971"> <p>Evaluate the quality of information (e.g. scholarly articles, newspapers)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1262 888 1499 971"> <p>92.3</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="770 1036 1348 1068">Responses on a 5-point scale: 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent)</p>	<p>Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation</p>		<p>Evaluation of Preparation Statement</p>	<p>MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13</p>	<p>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>Find appropriate sources of information.</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>84.6</p>	<p>Evaluate the quality of information (e.g. scholarly articles, newspapers)</p>	<p>92.3</p>	<p>B. All students responded that their student teaching allowed them to develop those skills identified in the four statements.</p>
<p>Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation</p>															
<p>Evaluation of Preparation Statement</p>	<p>MDS: PK-6 and SPED Combined N= 13</p>														
<p>Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.</p>	<p>100</p>														
<p>Find appropriate sources of information.</p>	<p>100</p>														
<p>Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.</p>	<p>84.6</p>														
<p>Evaluate the quality of information (e.g. scholarly articles, newspapers)</p>	<p>92.3</p>														

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</p>										
		<table border="1"> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="756 467 1486 570"> Percentage of Students (N = 13) Who Responded “YES” to: The internship, clinical, or student teaching experience(s) allowed you to: </th> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="756 570 1308 613">Apply critical thinking skills</td> <td data-bbox="1308 570 1486 613">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="756 613 1308 649">Develop a portfolio of work samples</td> <td data-bbox="1308 613 1486 649">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="756 649 1308 716">Improve understanding of responsibilities required in the profession.</td> <td data-bbox="1308 649 1486 716">100</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="756 716 1308 779">Improve your competitiveness in the job market</td> <td data-bbox="1308 716 1486 779">100</td> </tr> </table>	Percentage of Students (N = 13) Who Responded “YES” to: The internship, clinical, or student teaching experience(s) allowed you to:		Apply critical thinking skills	100	Develop a portfolio of work samples	100	Improve understanding of responsibilities required in the profession.	100	Improve your competitiveness in the job market	100	
Percentage of Students (N = 13) Who Responded “YES” to: The internship, clinical, or student teaching experience(s) allowed you to:													
Apply critical thinking skills	100												
Develop a portfolio of work samples	100												
Improve understanding of responsibilities required in the profession.	100												
Improve your competitiveness in the job market	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. While a small number received below a 3.0 rating, we still discussed why those scores came in as they did. 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. While no student received any *Unsatisfactory*, we will continue to monitor those students who 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:

1. 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.
2. We will be requesting through LAC and UCIC that two education courses receive an INQ designation and one education receive a W-I designation.

Appendices

Curriculum Map

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

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: Multidisciplinary Studies

Year: 2016-17

Program Outcomes:

Program Outcome	Critical Thinking	Inquiry	Information Literacy	Written Communication
Make instructional decisions based on student behavior, the context of the classroom, and assessment data.	XX	XX		XX
Use a variety of problem solving strategies to meet the needs of their students.	XX			
Demonstrate a thorough understanding of content, human development, and pedagogy.			XX	XX
Effectively implement instruction and assessment with appropriate pedagogical methods.	XX	XX		
Exhibit a love of teaching, appreciation of diversity, and respect for all persons in the educational setting.				XX

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: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level

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

Required Course	Program(s)	Critical Thinking		Inquiry		Information Literacy		Written Communication	
		Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
ED 219	SPED	R	P			I	P, O	I	O
ED 250	PK-6, SECONDARY, SPED	I	OT	I	OT	I	P, O	I	O, P, OT
ED 301	PK-6, SPED	I	OT	I	OT	I	O, OT	R	OT
ED 310	PK-6	R	O, OT	R	O, OT	R	O, OT	R	P, OT, O
ED 311	PK-6	R	O, OT	R	O, OT	R		R	
ED 323	SPED	R	OT	I	P;OT	R		R	
ED 327	SECONDARY	R	OT	R	OT	R		R	
ED 329	SPED	R	P, OT	R	OT			R	
ED 337	SECONDARY	R	OT	R	OT	R		R	
ED 339	SPED	R	P, OT	R	P, OT	R		R	
ED 341	SPED			R	P	R		R	
ED 349	SPED	R	OT, I	M	P, OT, I	M		R	
ED 357	PK-6			R	P	R		M	
ED 358	PK-6	R	OT	R	O; OT	R	O, OT	R	O, OT
ED ED 452	PK-6, SECONDARY	M	OT	M	O; OT	M	O, OT, I	R	
ED 460, 460E, 460S	PK-6, SECONDARY, SPED	M	I; OT	M	I; OT			M	I

MDS 480	PK-6, SECONDARY, SPED	M	P	M	P;O				
PSY 341	SPED	I	P,O	I	P	R		R	
PSY 310	SPED	R	OT	I	OT			R	
BIO 385	SEC/BIO	R	PE	R	PE	R	PO	R	P
EN 385	SEC/EN	R	AO	R	P	R	P	R	P
HI 385	SEC/HI	R	AO	R	PO	R	P	R	P
MA 385	SEC/MATH	R	AOP	R	P	R	PO	R	P
FA385	VISUAL ARTS (PK-12)	R	AOP	R	PA	R	PO	R	P