STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: Graduate Teacher Education Programs Combined Report: Education – Elementary Education, PK-6 (M.Ed.); Education; Education – Secondary Education, Grades 6-12 (M.Ed.); Education – Special Education, Grades K-12 (M.Ed.)
SUBMITTED BY: Lisa Turissini and Jessica Lewis
DATE: 9-30-18
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 570E, ED 570S 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 CANVAS in School of Sciences, Mathematics, and Education in the Education department 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. demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential.	2017	X	2019
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.	2017	X	2019
3. plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.	2016	YES	2020
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.	2016	YES	2020

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 *knowledge* of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet *high standards* and reach their full potential. - plan for and implement a variety of effective *instructional strategies and assessments* in coordinated and engaging ways.	demonstrate *leadership* 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 *applying knowledge in real world settings* to assure mastery of content.	demonstrate leadership and collaboration by *modeling ethical behavior* and *professional responsibility* 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

3

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 undergraduate and graduate 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 Candidates' 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 our Teacher Candidates is their performance in the classroom, the majority of the data gathered for determining Student Learning Outcomes is derived from the data collected during student teaching using the following:

♦ <u>E-Portfolio Evaluations:</u> The Professional Teaching E-Portfolio documents the Teacher Candidate'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.

♦ <u>Teacher Work Sample:</u> 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.

♦ <u>The University Supervisor Evaluation</u>: 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.

♦ <u>Cooperating/Mentor Teacher Evaluation</u>: 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.

♦ <u>Praxis II content exam data</u>: This licensure examination is required of all elementary and secondary students, but not for those seeking licensure in Special Education (SPED).

♦ <u>RVE:</u> Reading for Virginia Educators: This licensure examination is required of all elementary and special education students.

<u>Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement:</u>
▪ 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.

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

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update *(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)*
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.	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.	1. We revised the evidence needed for Link #2 for Standard #5. Feedback was positive, and scores indicated an increase in meeting proficiency. 2. The professors teaching these courses used the newly revised rubric for assessing their assignment for Link #1 on Standard #5. 3. Rubric for the E-Portfolio was revised during summer 2017 as planned. The TWS rubric was revised during the fall 2017 to be piloted for the spring 2018 semester. The language was modeled after CAEP *sufficient* criteria in that each level has a qualitative description of what is expected.
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.	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.	The rubric for the E-Portfolio was revised during summer 2017 as planned. The TWS rubric was revised during the fall 2017 to be piloted for the spring 2018 semester. The language was modeled after CAEP *sufficient* criteria in that each level has a qualitative description of what is expected.

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:
x Report Accepted as Submitted

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY GRADUATE LEARNING OUTCOMES 2017-18			
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*	**2019**	**Standard 5: Learning Environment** **"Behavior Plan with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy and application"** ED549, ED552 **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*	**2019**	**Standard 1: Professional Knowledge** **"Evidence of Content Knowledge"** ED539, ED559, ED568/569	**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**	**Standard 2: Instructional Planning** **"Unit Plan"** ED529, ED538, ED557 **Standard 3: Instructional Delivery** **"Variety of Instructional Strategies"** ED555, ED556, ED509, ED537 **Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning:** **"Variety of assessments"** ED538, ED558 **Teacher Work Sample: Task #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6**	**US/CT Final Evaluation** **Standard 2:** Instructional Planning **Standard 3:** Instructional Delivery **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**	**Standard 6: Professionalism** **"Community Outreach/Service Learning"** ED503	**US/CT Final Evaluation** **Standard 6:** Professionalism

Learning Outcome 1: Teacher candidates will plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.

<div align="center">

Assessment Activity

</div>

Outcome Measures *Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.*	Performance Standard *Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.*	Data Collection *Discuss the data collected and student population*	Analysis *1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.*
1. *E-Portfolio Standard*: ● Standard #2: Instructional Planning *The teacher candidate plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective strategies, resources, (and data) to meet the needs of all students.*	DEFINED – Standard #2: Evidence 1: Critical Assignment Unit Plan (ED 529; ED 538; ED 557). Evidence 2: Student Teaching Lesson Plan	Collection: 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. <table><tr><th colspan="4">Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4</th></tr><tr><th>Program</th><th>Standard #2</th><th>Standard #3</th><th>Standard #4</th></tr><tr><td>PK-6 N = 15</td><td>3.13</td><td>3.27</td><td>3.13</td></tr><tr><td>SEC N = 13</td><td>3.46</td><td>3.15</td><td>3.15</td></tr><tr><td>SPED N = 10</td><td>3.20</td><td>3.0</td><td>3.10</td></tr></table> E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations	1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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. 2) Findings: A. The aggregate means across all standards for all three groups were at or above the *Evidence Meets Expectations* level. Across all standards, both the SEC and SPED students earned the highest ratings on Standard #2.

Acceptable Level:
Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment and on their E-Portfolio evidence from Student Teaching using a four (4) column rubric; in which level 3 "*Evidence Meets Expectations*" is the acceptable level of student performance. However, students must receive an overall grade of 2.75 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.*"

Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #2: Instructional Planning	
Programs	**Standard # 2**
PK-6 N = 15	3.13
SEC N = 13	3.46
SPED N = 10	3.20

E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations
3 = Evidence Meets Expectations
2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #2: Instructional Planning

Program	Rubric Score			
	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 15	27% (4)	60% (9)	13% (2)	0% (0)
SEC N = 13	46% (6)	54% (7)	0% (0)	0% (0)
SPED N = 10	20% (2)	80% (8)	0% (0)	0% (0)

E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations
3 = Evidence Meets Expectations
2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

B. The aggregate means on Standard #2 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED students met or exceeded the Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations*. The SEC students scored the highest and the PK-6 the lowest.

C. For Standard # 2, Individually, the SPED and SEC students earned a Level 3 or Level 4 rating. Two (2) PK-6 students (13%) received Level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 87% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding expectations.

Standard 3: Instructional Delivery *The teacher candidate effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*	Standard #3: Evidence 1: Critical Assignment Variety of Instructional Strategies (ED 509) Evidence 2: Student Teaching Video demonstration of THREE (3) instructional strategies used with your students (1-3 minutes each).	(see tables below)	D. The aggregate means on Standard #3 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED students met or exceeded Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.* E. For Standard #3, individually, one (1) PK-6, two (2) SEC, and one (1) SPED student earned the level 2 rating.

Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #3: Instructional Delivery

Programs	Standard #3
PK-6 N = 15	3.27
SEC N = 13	3.15
SPED N = 10	3.0

Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #3: Instructional Delivery

	Rubric Score			
Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 15	33% (5)	60% (9)	7% (1)	0% (0)
SEC N = 13	31% (4)	54% (7)	15% (2)	0% (0)
SPED N = 10	10% (1)	80% (8)	10% (1)	0% (0)

E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations
3 = Evidence Meets Expectations
2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

• Standard 4: Assessment of and for Learning *The teacher candidate* (systematically gathers, analyzes, and) *uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods* (and provide timely feedback to students). • This is direct measure	Standard #4: Evidence 1: Critical Assignment Variety of Assessments (ED 538, ED 558) Evidence 2: Student Teaching Variety of Assessments	*(tables below)*	F. The aggregate means on Standard #4 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED students met level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.* G. For Standard # 4, individually, all SPED students (100%) earned a level 3 or 4. Two (2) PK-6 students earned level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 87% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding expectations. One (1) SEC student earned a Level 2 rating, which resulted in 92% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding expectations.

Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learning	
Programs	**Standard #4**
PK-6 N = 15	3.13
SEC N = 13	3.15
SPED N = 10	3.10

Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learning

	Rubric Score			
Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 15	27% (4)	60% (9)	13% (2)	0% (0)
SEC N = 13	23% (3)	69% (9)	8% (1)	0% (0)
SPED N = 10	10% (1)	90% (9)	0% (0)	0% (0)

E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations
3 = Evidence Meets Expectations
2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

| 2. *Teacher Work Sample (TWS)*

Standard #2: Learning Goals and Objectives
Standard #3: Assessment Plan
Standard #4: Instructional Decision-Making
Standard #5: Design for Instruction
Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning

This is a Direct Measure | DEFINED –
Standard #2: The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals/objectives.

Standard #3: The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches aligned with learning goals/objectives to assess student learning before, during and after instruction.

Standard #4: The teacher uses on-going analysis of student learning to make instructional decisions.

Standard #5: The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals/objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.

Standards #6: The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement. | 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. | 1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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.

2) Findings:
A. The aggregate means for all Standards for all groups were above the Proficient level with Standard #6 being the lowest assessed of the Standards.

B. The aggregate means on Standard #2 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED were above the Level 3: *Proficient*. |

TWS Standards #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6 by Program

Standard	PK-6 N = 5	SEC N = 8	SPED N = 7
2	3.42	3.88	3.52
3	3.21	3.62	3.34
4	3.36	3.46	3.14
5	3.31	3.56	3.17
6	3.04	3.12	3.0

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #2: Learning Goals and Objectives

Program	Average Score for Standard #2
PK-6 N = 15	3.42
SEC N = 8	3.88
SPED N = 7	3.52

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

They are assessed in all four areas on a four-column rubric, in which Level 3 "Proficient" is the acceptable level of performance.

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

TWS Standard #2: Learning Goals and Objectives			
Indicator	**PK-6** **N = 15**	**SEC** **N = 8**	**SPED** **N = 7**
2.1 Significance, Challenge and Variety	**Mean 3.27**	**Mean 3.63**	**Mean 3.43**
4.0 Rating	40% (6)	63% (5)	43% (3)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	37% (3)	57% (4)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.2 Appropriateness For Students	**Mean 3.33**	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.43**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	100% (8)	43% (3)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	0% (0)	57% (4)
2.0 Rating	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.3 Alignment with State and/or Local Standards	**Mean 3.67**	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.71**
4.0 Rating	67% (10)	100% (8)	71% (5)
3.0 Rating	33% (5)	0% (0)	29% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Mean Overall	**3.42**	**3.88**	**3.52**

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #3: Assessment Plan	
Program	**Average Score for Standard #3**
PK-6 N = 15	3.21
SEC N = 8	3.62
SPED N = 7	3.34

C. PK-6:
Two (2) PK-6 students earned a level 2: *Developing* on Indicator 2.1, which resulted in 87% of the group meeting *Proficient* for that Indicator. One (1) PK-6 student earned a level 2: *Developing* on Indicator 2.2, which resulted in 94% of the group meeting *Proficient* for that Indicator.

SEC and SPED:
Individually, 100% of the SEC and SPED students earned a 3 or higher on all three Indicators.

D. The aggregate means on Standard #3 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED were above the Level 3: *Proficient*.

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

TWS Standard #3: Assessment Plan			
Indicator	**PK-6** **N = 15**	**SEC** **N = 8**	**SPED** **N = 7**
3.1 Alignment of pre/post assessments with Learning Goals/Objectives	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.88**	**Mean 3.57**
4.0 Rating	60% (9)	88% (7)	57% (4)
3.0 Rating	33% (5)	12% (1)	43% (3)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0
3.2 Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Student Performance	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.88**	**Mean 3.43**
4.0 Rating	53% (8)	88% (7)	43% (3)
3.0 Rating	40% (6)	12% (1)	57% (4)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.3 Variety of Modes and Approaches to Assessment	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	20% (3)	37% (3)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	63% (5)	71% (5)
2.0 Rating	20% (3)	0% (0)	14% (1)
3.4 Formative Assessments	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.63**	**Mean 3.29**
4.0 Rating	20% (3)	63% (5)	29% (2)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	37% (3)	71% (5)
2.0 Rating	20% (3)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.5 Adaptations to your assessments based on students' needs	**Mean 3.07**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.43**
4.0 Rating	27% (4)	50% (4)	57% (4)
3.0 Rating	53% (8)	37% (3)	29% (2)
2.0 Rating	20% (3)	13% (1)	14% (1)
Mean Overall – Standard 3	**3.21**	**3.62**	**3.34**

E. PK-6: Individually for Standard #3, one (1) earned a level 2 rating on Indicator 3.1 and 3.2. Three (3) students earned a level 2 rating on Indicator 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.

SEC: Individually, only one (1) student earned a level 2 on all of the five Indicators, which was 3.5.

SPED: Individually, only one (1) student earned a level 2 on all of the five Indicators, which was 3.5.

TWS: Rubric Scoring
Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #4: Instructional Decision-Making	
Program	**Average Score for Standard #4**
PK-6 N = 15	3.36
SEC N = 8	3.46
SPED N = 7	3.14

TWS Standard #4: Instructional Decision-Making			
Indicator	**PK-6 N = 15**	**SEC N = 8**	**SPED N = 7**
4.1 Pre-Assessment Analysis	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	50% (4)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	37% (3)	71% (5)
2.0 Rating	6% (1)	13% (1)	14% (1)
4.2 Sound Professional Practice /Pedagogy	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.63**	**Mean 3.14**
4.0 Rating	53% (8)	63% (5)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	37% (3)	86% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4.3 Modifications/ Adjustments Based on Analysis of Student Learning	**Mean 3.13**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.29**
4.0 Rating	27% (4)	50% (4)	43% (3)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	37% (3)	43% (3)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	13% (1)	14% (1)
Mean Overall	**3.36**	**3.46**	**3.14**

F. The aggregate means on Standard #4 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED were above the Level 3: *Proficient*.

G. PK-6: Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on one Indicator (4.2). One student (1) earned a level 2 rating on Indicator 4.1, resulting in 94% of that group meeting or exceeding Indicator 4.1. Two (2) students earned a level 2 rating on Indicator 4.3, resulting in 87% of that group meeting or exceeding Indicator 4.3. SEC: One (1) student earned a level 2 for Indicator 4.1 and 4.3. SPED: One (1) student earned a level 2 for Indicator 4.1 and 4.3.

TWS: Rubric Scoring
Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #5: Design for Instruction	
Program	Average Score for Standard #5
PK-6 N = 15	3.31
SEC N = 8	3.56
SPED N = 7	3.17

H. The aggregate mean on Standard #5 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED were above the Level 3: *Proficient*.

TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

TWS Standard #5: Design for Instruction			
Indicator	**PK-6** **N = 15**	**SEC** **N = 8**	**SPED** **N = 7**
5.1 Alignment with Learning Goals/Objectives and Lesson Structure/Sequencing	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.50**	**Mean 3.57**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	50% (4)	57% (4)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	50% (4)	43% (3)
2.0 Rating	6% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
5.2 Accurate Representation of Content	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.63**	**Mean 3.29**
4.0 Rating	40% (6)	63% (5)	71% (5)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	37% (3)	29% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
5.3 Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Resources and Reflections	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.50**	**Mean 2.71**
4.0 Rating	40% (6)	50% (4)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	50% (4)	57% (4)
2.0 Rating	6% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)
1.0 Rating	6% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)
5.4 Use of Contextual Information and Data to Develop Appropriate Adaptations/Ways to Differentiate Learning	**Mean 3.27**	**Mean 3.63**	**Mean 3.14**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	63% (5)	43% (3)
3.0 Rating	33% (5)	37% (3)	29% (2)
2.0 Rating	20% (3)	0% (0)	29% (2)
Mean Overall	**3.31**	**3.56**	**3.17**

I. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually on Standard #5, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a level 3 or higher on Indicator 5.2. One (1) PK-6 student earned a level 1 on Indicator 5.3. One student (1) earned a level 2 on Indicator #5.1 and 5.3. Three (3) students earned a level 2 on Indicator 5.4.

<u>SEC:</u> All students (100%) earned a level 3 or higher on all four Indicators.

<u>SPED:</u> One (1) student earned a level 1 rating on Indicator 5.3. One student (1) earned a level 3 rating for Indicator 5.3 and two (2) students earned a level 2 rating on Indicator 5.4.

TWS: Rubric Scoring
Scale:
1 = Unacceptable
2 = Developing
3 = Proficient
4 = Exemplary

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning

Program	Average Score for Standard #6
PK-6 N = 15	3.04
SEC N = 8	3.12
SPED N = 7	3.0

TWS Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning			
Indicator	**PK-6 N = 15**	**SEC N = 8**	**SPED N = 7**
6.1 Alignment with Learning Goals and disaggregation of data	**Mean 3.07**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.14**
4.0 Rating	20% (3)	37% (3)	86% (6)
3.0 Rating	67% (10)	63% (5)	14% (1)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.2 Interpretation of Assessment Data	**Mean 3.07**	**Mean 3.25**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	13% (2)	37% (3)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	80% (12)	50% (4)	71% (5)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	13% (1)	14% (1)
6.3 Evidence of Impact on Student Learning and follow-up (remediation)	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 2.75**	**Mean 2.86**
4.0 Rating	20% (3)	13% (1)	14% (1)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	50% (4)	57% (4)
2.0 Rating	20% (3)	37% (3)	29% (2)
Mean Overall	**3.04**	**3.12**	**3.0**

J. The aggregate mean on Standard #6 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED was at or above Level 3: *Proficient*.

K. PK-6: Individually for Standard #6, two (2) students earned level 2 on Indicator 6.1, one (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 6.2, and three (3) students earned level 2 on Indicator 6.3.
SEC: All students earned level 3 or higher on Indicator 6.1. One (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 6.2 and three (3) students earned level 2 on Indicator 6.3.
SPED: All students earned a level 3 or higher on Indicator 6.1. One (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 6.2. Two (2) students earned level 2 on Indicator 6.3.

3. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations **Performance Standard #2: Instructional Planning** **Performance Standard #3: Instructional Delivery** **Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learning** This is a direct measure.	DEFINED – **Standard #2:** Assesses students in four areas within this standard which are aligned with specific VDOE Performance Standard Indicators: *2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.* *2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.* *2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.* *2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.* They are assessed using a four-column rubric, in which level 3 *Proficient* is the acceptable level of performance. *Rubric Performance Rubric:* 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable	Collection: Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017 and spring 2018. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2017-18 academic year.	1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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. 2) Findings: A. Aggregated means for PK-6, SEC, and SPED students on Standards #2, #3, and #4 by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and Self-Assessment were above the *Proficient* level. Across all programs, the CTs assessed the students the highest on all Standards.

Collection: Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017 and spring 2018. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2017-18 academic year.

PK-6: FOR ALL STANDARDS (N = 15)			
Standard	CT	US	SELF
2	3.33	3.30	3.23
3	3.43	3.39	3.32
4	3.53	3.32	3.32

SECONDARY: FOR ALL STANDARDS (N = 13)			
Standard	CT	US	SELF
2	3.65	3.50	3.06
3	3.60	3.52	3.17
4	3.67	3.52	3.19

SPED: FOR ALL STANDARDS (N = 10)			
Standard	CT	US	SELF
2	3.58	3.10	3.28
3	3.48	3.16	3.36
4	3.38	3.22	3.38

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

Standard 2: Instructional Planning			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self*
PK-6 *N = 15*	3.33	3.30	3.23
SEC *N = 13*	3.65	3.50	3.06
SPED *N = 10*	3.58	3.10	3.28

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary   2 = Developing
3 = Proficient   1 = Unacceptable

B. The aggregate mean on Standard #2 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient*. While the SEC students were assessed at the highest levels by the CTs and US, they self-assessed themselves at the lowest level.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING: *The teacher candidate plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective strategies, resources, (and data) to meet the needs of all students.*
for GRAD PK-6 Students N = 15 (CT); N = 15 (US); N = 15 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.13**	**Mean 3.2**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	27% (4)	40% (6)
3.0 Rating	53% (8)	60% (9)	40% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	13% (2)	20% (3)
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	**Mean 3.27**	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.07**
4.0 Rating	33% (5)	40% (6)	20% (3)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	60% (9)	67% (10)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	0% (0)	13% (2)
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.	**Mean 3.13**	**Mean 3.2**	**Mean 3.13**
4.0 Rating	27% (4)	33% (5)	40% (6)
3.0 Rating	60% (9)	53% (8)	33% (5)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	13% (2)	27% (4)
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.53**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	47% (7)	60% (9)
3.0 Rating	53% (8)	53% (8)	33% (5)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (1)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.33**	**3.30**	**3.23**

C. PK-6: Individually for Standard #2, students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 2.1 and 2.4 by their CTs. Students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 2.2 and 2.4 by their US. Students self-assessed themselves at level 2 on Indicator 2.1 (3), Indicator 2.2 (2), Indicator 2.3 (4), and Indicator 2.3 (1).
Indicator 2.4 had the highest scores for all three groups.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING: *The teacher candidate plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective strategies, resources, (and data) to meet the needs of all students.*
for GRAD SECONDARY Students N= 13 (CT); N = 13 (US); N = 13 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.	**3.62**	**3.38**	**2.85**
4.0 Rating	38% (5)	38% (5)	8% (1)
3.0 Rating	62% (8)	62% (8)	69% (9)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (3)
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	**3.77**	**3.46**	**2.92**
4.0 Rating	77% (10)	46% (6)	8% (1)
3.0 Rating	23% (3)	54% (7)	77% (10)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.	**3.62**	**3.46**	**2.92**
4.0 Rating	62% (8)	46% (6)	23% (3)
3.0 Rating	38% (5)	54% (7)	46% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	31% (4)
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.	**3.85**	**3.69**	**3.54**
4.0 Rating	85% (11)	69% (9)	54% (7)
3.0 Rating	15% (2)	31% (4)	46% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.65**	**3.50**	**3.06**

SEC: Individually, the SEC students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs and US. assessment. Three (3) self-assessed at level 2 for Indicator 2.1, two (2) for Indicator 2.2, and four (4) for Indicator 2.3.
Indicator 2.4 had the highest scores for all three groups.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING: *The teacher candidate plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective strategies, resources, (and data) to meet the needs of all students.*
For GRAD SPED Students N = 10 (CT); N=10 (US); N = 10 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.	**Mean 3.60**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.20**
4.0 Rating	60% (6)	20% (2)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	60% (6)	60% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	20% (2)	10% (1)
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.10**	**Mean 3.10**
4.0 Rating	50% (5)	10% (1)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	90% (9)	50% (5)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	20% (2)
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.	**Mean 3.60**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.40**
4.0 Rating	60% (6)	10% (1)	40% (4)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	80% (8)	60% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.	**Mean 3.70**	**Mean 3.30**	**Mean 3.40**
4.0 Rating	80% (8)	30% (3)	40% (4)
3.0 Rating	10% (1)	70% (7)	60% (6)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.58**	**3.10**	**3.28**

SPED: Individually, the CTs assessed one (1) student at level 2 on Indicator 2.2 and one (1) student on Indicator 2.4. The US assessed two (2) students at level 2 on Indicator 2.1 and one (1) student on Indicator 2.3. One (1) student self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 2.1 and two (2) students on Indicator 2.2.

Indicator 2.4 had the highest scores for all three groups.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

Standard 3: Instructional Delivery			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self*
PK-6 *N = 15*	3.43	3.39	3.32
SEC *N = 13*	3.60	3.52	3.17
SPED *N = 10*	3.48	3.16	3.36

D. The aggregate mean on Standard #3 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient* as assessed by the CTs, US, and self-assessment.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY: *The teacher candidate effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*
for GRAD PK-6 Students N = 15 (CT); N = 15 (US); N = 15 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.33**
4.0 Rating	33% (5)	33% (5)	40% (6)
3.0 Rating	53% (8)	53% (8)	53% (8)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	13% (2)	7% (1)
3.2 Builds upon students' existing knowledge and skills.	**Mean 3.60**	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.6**
4.0 Rating	60% (9)	53% (8)	66% (10)
3.0 Rating	40% (6)	47% (7)	27% (4)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	7% (1)
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs.	**Mean 3.27**	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.20**
4.0 Rating	40% (6)	33% (5)	40% (6)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	53% (8)	40% (6)
2.0 Rating	13% (2)	13% (2)	20% (3)
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies.	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.40**
4.0 Rating	53% (8)	53% (8)	47% (7)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	40% (6)	47% (7)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	7% (1)	7% (1)
3.6 Uses instructional technology and resources to enhance student learning.	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.07**
4.0 Rating	60% (9)	60% (9)	20% (3)
3.0 Rating	33% (5)	33% (5)	67% (10)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	7% (1)	13% (2)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.43**	**3.39**	**3.32**

E. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for Standard #3, students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.2 and 3.5 by their CTs. Students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicator 3.2 by their US. One (1) student self-assessed on Indicator 3.1, 3.2, and 3.5. Three (3) students self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 3.3 and two (2) students self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 3.6.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY: *The teacher candidate effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*
GRAD SECONDARY Students N= 13 (CT); N = 13 (US); N = 13 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.	**Mean 3.54**	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.31**
4.0 Rating	54% (7)	62% (8)	31% (4)
3.0 Rating	46% (6)	38% (5)	69% (9)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.2 Builds upon students' existing knowledge and skills.	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.54**	**Mean 3.31**
4.0 Rating	62% (8)	54% (7)	31% (4)
3.0 Rating	38% (5)	46% (6)	69% (9)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs.	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.46**	**Mean 2.92**
4.0 Rating	62% (8)	46% (6)	8% (1)
3.0 Rating	38% (5)	54% (7)	77% (10)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies.	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.23**
4.0 Rating	62% (8)	62% (8)	23% (3)
3.0 Rating	38% (5)	38% (5)	77% (10)
3.6 Uses instructional technology and resources to enhance student learning.	**Mean 3.62**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.08**
4.0 Rating	77% (10)	38% (5)	23% (3)
3.0 Rating	15% (2)	62% (8)	62% (8)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	15% (2)
1.0 Rating	8% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

SEC: Individually, one (1) student earned level 1 on Indicator 3.6 by the CT. On all the other four Indicators, 100% of students were assessed level 3 or higher by the CTs.
On all five Indicators, the US assessed 100% of the students at level 3 or higher.
Two (2) students self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 3.3 and 3.6.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	3.60	3.52	3.17

STANDARD 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY: *The teacher candidate effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order to meet individual learning needs.*
GRAD SPED Students N = 10 (CT); N=10 (US); N = 10 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.	**Mean 3.4**	**Mean 3.4**	**Mean 3.6**
4.0 Rating	50% (5)	40% (4)	60% (6)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	60% (6)	40% (4)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.2 Builds upon students' existing knowledge and skills.	**Mean 3.6**	**Mean 3.3**	**Mean 3.30**
4.0 Rating	60% (6)	30% (3)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	70% (7)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs.	**Mean 3.7**	**Mean 2.9**	**Mean 3.30**
4.0 Rating	70% (7)	0% (0)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	30% (3)	90% (9)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies.	**Mean 3.3**	**Mean 3.3**	**Mean 3.50**
4.0 Rating	40% (4)	30% (3)	50% (5)
3.0 Rating	50% (5)	70% (7)	50% (5)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.6 Uses instructional technology and resources to enhance student learning.	**Mean 3.4**	**Mean 2.9**	**Mean 3.10**
4.0 Rating	50% (5)	10% (1)	20% (2)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	70% (7)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	20% (2)	10% (1)

SPED: Individually, the CTs assessed 100% of the students at level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.2 and 3.3. One student earned level 2 on Indicator 3.1, 3.5, and 3.6.

The US assessed 100% of the students at level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and 3.5. One (1) student earned level 2 by the US on Indicator 3.3 and two (2) students earned level 2 on Indicator 3.6 by the US.

One (1) student self-assessed at level 2 for only one Indicator: 3.6. 100% of the students self-assessed at level 3 or higher for the four (4) other Indicators.

OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	3.48	3.16	3.36

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

Standard 4: Assessment of and for Learning			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self*
PK-6 *N = 15*	3.53	3.32	3.32
SEC *N = 13*	3.67	3.52	3.19
SPED *N = 10*	3.38	3.22	3.38

F. The aggregate mean on Standard #4 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient* as assessed by the CTs, US, and self-assessment.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 4 ASSESSMENT OF AND FOR LEARNING: *The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to students and/ or parents.*

GRAD PK-6 Students N = 15 (CT); N = 15 (US); N = 15 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	**Mean 3.4**	**Mean 3.13**	**Mean 3.33**
4.0 Rating	47% (7)	20% (3)	53% (8)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	73% (11)	27% (4)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	7% (1)	30% (3)
4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments.	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.13**
4.0 Rating	53% (8)	27% (4)	33% (5)
3.0 Rating	40% (6)	67% (10)	47% (7)
2.0 Rating	7% (1)	7% (1)	20% (3)
4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and instructional content.	**Mean 3.73**	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.67**
4.0 Rating	73% (11)	47% (7)	67% (10)
3.0 Rating	27% (4)	53% (8)	33% (5)
4.7 Gives constructive, timely, and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.13**
4.0 Rating	67% (10)	53% (8)	20% (3)
3.0 Rating	27% (4)	40% (6)	73% (11)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	7% (1)	7% (1)
1.0 Rating	7% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.53**	**3.32**	**3.32**

G. PK-6: Individually for Standard #4, 100% of the students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicator 4.4 by the CT. One (1) student earned level 1 on Indicator 4.7 by the CT. One (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 4.1 and 4.3 by the CT.

100% of the students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicator 4.4 by the US. One (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 4.1 and 4.3 by the US.

Students self-assessed themselves at level 3 or higher on Indicator 4.4. Three (3) students self-assessed at Level 2 for Indicator 4.1 and 4.3. One (1) student self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 4.7.

STANDARD 4 ASSESSMENT OF AND FOR LEARNING: *The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to students and/or parents.*
GRAD SECONDARY Students N= 13 (CT); N = 13 (US); N = 13 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	**Mean 3.46**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 2.92**
4.0 Rating	46% (6)	38% (5)	15% (2)
3.0 Rating	54% (7)	62% (8)	62% (8)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	23% (3)
4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments.	**Mean 3.77**	**Mean 3.46**	**Mean 3.23**
4.0 Rating	77% (10)	46% (6)	23% (3)
3.0 Rating	23% (3)	54% (7)	77% (10)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and instructional content.	**Mean 3.77**	**Mean 3.38**	**Mean 3.46**
4.0 Rating	77% (10)	38% (5)	46% (6)
3.0 Rating	23% (3)	62% (8)	54% (7)
4.7 Gives constructive, timely, and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	**Mean 3.69**	**Mean 3.85**	**Mean 3.15**
4.0 Rating	69% (9)	85% (11)	15% (2)
3.0 Rating	31% (4)	15% (2)	85% (11)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.67**	**3.52**	**3.19**

SEC: 100% of the students were assessed at level 3 or higher by both the CTs and US. Three (3) students self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 4.1.

30

STANDARD 4 ASSESSMENT OF AND FOR LEARNING: *The teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyzes, and uses all relevant data to measure student academic progress, guide instructional content and delivery methods, and provide timely feedback to students and/or parents.*
GRAD SPED Students N = 10 (CT); N=10 (US); N = 10 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	Mean 3.3	Mean 3.0	Mean 3.30
4.0 Rating	40% (4)	10% (1)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	50% (5)	80% (8)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	10% (1)	0% (0)
4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments.	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.2	Mean 3.30
4.0 Rating	40% (4)	20% (2)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	60% (6)	80% (8)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and instructional content.	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.4
4.0 Rating	50% (5)	40% (4)	50% (5)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	60% (6)	40% (4)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	10% (1)
4.7 Gives constructive, timely, and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.3	Mean 3.5
4.0 Rating	50% (5)	30% (3)	50% (5)
3.0 Rating	40% (4)	70% (7)	50% (5)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.38**	**3.22**	**3.38**

SPED: The CTs assessed 100% of the students at level or higher on Indicator 4.3. On indicators 4.1, 4.4, and 4.7, one (1) student was assessed at level 2 by the CTs.

The US assessed 100% of the students at level 3 or higher on Indicators 4.3, 4.4, and 4.7. One (1) student earned level 2 on Indicator 4.1.

100% of the students self-assessed at level or higher on Indicators 4.1, 4.3, and 4.7. One (1) student self-assessed at level 2 on Indicator 4.4.

| 4. *Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the "Candidate Dispositions Rubric:* The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: Class Preparation

This is an indirect measure | DEFINED: *The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: Class Preparation*
Target: (T)
Lessons or assignments are completed on time, accurately, and are of high quality. Shows a desire to pursue the intended learning at a deep level. Work shows evidence of personal reflection and revision. Uses an array of quality resources to add to the breadth and depth of the work.
Emerging: (E)
Lessons or assignments are completed on time and accurately. Work shows basic grasp of the intended purpose. Makes use of resources provided to complete work.
Unsatisfactory (U)
Lessons or assignments are incomplete or late. Uses personal knowledge rather than resources to complete work. | Collection: Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017 and spring 2018. 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 2017-18 academic year. | 1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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) Findings:
A. The aggregate mean for the PK-6, SEC, and SPED students by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment were below the *Target* level, except for the CT scores for the SEC students.

B. PK-6: Individually, both the CT and US scores were identical in that they assessed 80% of the students reaching *Target*.

SEC: The CT assessed 100% of the students at the *Target* level. Both the US and student self-assessments demonstrated 92% at the *Target* level. |

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: Class Preparation

Program	CT	US	SELF
PK-6 N = 15	2.80	2.80	2.73
SEC N = 13	3.0	2.92	2.92
SPED N=10	2.90	2.71	2.70

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: Class Preparation

PR	CT		US		Self	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 15	80% (12)	20% (3)	80% (12)	20% (3)	73% (11)	27% (4)
SEC N = 13	100% (13)	0% (0)	92% (12)	8% (1)	92% (12)	8% (1)
SPED N = 10	90% (9)	10% (1)	80% (8)	20% (2)	70% (7)	30% (3)

SPED: The CT assessed 90% of the students at *Target*, the US assessed 80% at *Target,* and 70% of students self-assessed at *Target.*
Overall, students self-assessed themselves lower than the CTs and US for the three programs.

The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: In-Class Performance	DEFINED: *The teacher candidate VALUES LEARNING: In-Class Performance* Target: (T) Displays energetic, positive, and supportive behaviors that result in engaged teaching and learning. Shows initiative and is able to apply knowledge to new situations and makes connections with previous learning. Emerging: (E) Displays supportive behaviors that result in appropriate teaching and learning. Some lack of initiative or inability to apply knowledge to new situations. Unsatisfactory (U) Inattentive in the classroom, which contributes to a lack of teaching and learning.	(see tables below)	C. The aggregate mean for the PK-6 and SPED students by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment were below the *Target* level. The SEC students self-assessed below *Target*. The CT and US assessed 100% of the SEC students at *Target*. D. PK-6: Individually, one (1) student was assessed at *Emerging* by the CT and one (1) student self-assessed at *Emerging*. The US assessed 100% of the students at *Target*. SEC: The CT and US assessed 100% of the students at *Target* while two (2) students self-assessed at *Emerging*. SPED: The CT assessed 100% of the students at *Target*, the US assessed one (1) student at *Emerging*, and two (2) students self-assessed at *Emerging*.

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: In-Class Performance

Program	CT	US	SELF
PK-6 N = 15	2.80	3.0	2.93
SEC N = 13	3.0	3.0	2.85
SPED N=10	2.90	2.71	2.80

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Learning: In-Class Performance

PR	CT		US		Self	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 15	93% (14)	7% (1)	100% (15)	0% (0)	93% (14)	7% (1)
SEC N = 13	100% (13)	0% (0)	100% (13)	0% (0)	85% (11)	15% (2)
SPED N = 10	100% (10)	0% (0)	90% (9)	10% (1)	80% (8)	20% (2)

| 5. 2017-18 **Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Preparation Alumni survey**

This is an indirect measure | DEFINED: Responses on a 5-point scale: 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent) | | | | | 1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> While the data was received after our May 2018 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2018 meeting.

2. <u>Findings:</u> Of all who completed the survey, 100% of the SEC and SPED students rated those three statements at the *highest* levels of the scale (4 and 5) for evaluating their preparation during the program. 80% of the PK-6 students ranked the highest on the scale for the first statement and 70% ranked the highest on the scale for the last two statements. |

Percentage of Students Rated "Good" or "Excellent"

Statement	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 10	SPED N = 6
Succeed in a job in your field	80	100	100
Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.	70	100	100
Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.	70	100	100

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results)***:**
(SEE Findings by program under each Student Learner Outcome)

    This is for all programs: This was the second year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and first time with the newly revised TWS rubric. On Standard #6 of the TWS, some of the programs scored level 3 so we will need to look at. 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 continued to provided positive feedback on the major changes made to this instrument

    We revised our Dispositions Rubric from 2016-17 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. The GSS results provided us with positive data that we are preparing our students to be successful in their profession; however, we will discuss why the PK-6 students have lower ratings. 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.

PK-6 Elementary Education: On the E-Portfolio standards assessed this year, they all reached 3.0 or higher, which is the Performance Standard target. The lowest of the three standards was #2: Instructional Planning. With two pieces of evidence submitted for each standard, we will need to further monitor if it is the instructional planning from course work or from student teaching. The Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessments showed that the PK-6 students earned the lowest scores on Standard #2 which supports the idea that their instructional planning is an area to highlight in our training sessions with the Cooperating Teachers and Mentor Teachers in terms of discussing how they are assessing the student teachers' instructional planning. On the Dispositions Rubric, the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors both assessed them similarly which could mean that they are seeing the same dispositions on an every day basis and during the five visits. The PIE results are lower than what we would like to see on these statements: Succeed in a job in your field (80%); Apply knowledge and skills to new situations (70%); and Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills (70%). These are lower than the previous year, so it will worthwhile to monitor these results as they come in to see how specific it was to this particular year.

SPED: On the E-Portfolio standards assessed this year, they all reached 3.0 or higher, is the Performance Standard target. The lowest of the three standards was #3: Instructional Delivery. This could be due to the SPED students having different instructional planning and therefore delivery, which can vary from other programs. This might be due to an inter-rater reliability issue our department will need to address during our CAEP reliability training sessions. The University Supervisor assessed the student teachers lowest out of the three groups (Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor, and self-assessment) on all three standards. This was no surprise since there appeared to be supervising and mentoring concerns between the University Supervisor and student teachers. This University Supervisor will no longer be working with our student teachers. On the Dispositions Rubric, the Cooperating Teachers assessed the student teachers higher than the University Supervisor and student self-assessment. Students tend to be harder on themselves and this is supported by the Cooperating Teachers, the people who saw them the most often on a daily basis, assessed them higher. The PIE results are great in

that the results showed 100% rating their ability as "good" or "great" on being able to: Succeed in a job in your field; Apply knowledge and skills to new situations; and Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.

Secondary Education: On the E-Portfolio standards assessed this year, they all reached 3.0 or higher, which is the Performance Standard target. The lowest of the three standards was tied at #3: Instructional Delivery and #4: Assessment of and for Learning. They scored significantly higher on Standard #2: Instructional Planning which could result from the collaboration between their methods courses' professors at Marymount for ED 337, ED 338, and ED 568, and ED 569. The students self-assessed themselves lower than both the University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on all three standards. The University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers were more closely aligned, and this can be an area to address during our training sessions. On the Dispositions Rubric, all students were assessed at the Target by the Cooperating Teachers, while one student fell below the Target of 3.0. The Cooperating Teachers assessed the student teachers higher than the University Supervisor and student self-assessment which might be more reflective on their progress since they saw them every day. The PIE results are great in that the results showed 100% rating their ability as "good" or "great" on being able to: Succeed in a job in your field; Apply knowledge and skills to new situations; and Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement <u>relative to assessment of outcome</u>**:**
    This is for all programs: One strength we have is that we have data from various instruments and from various stakeholders – current students, alumni, professors, University Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers. We are able to analyze the data from all of these and look for trends. An opportunity for improvement is to continue to work with, collaborate with, and train our University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on how to mentor and assess our Teacher Candidates during student teaching. Another opportunity for improvement is to continue discussions within the department on the quality of the evidence students submit for the Critical Assignments that get uploaded into their E-Portfolios. Additionally, as an opportunity for improvement, we will continue to have discussions on the areas in which the PK-6, Secondary, and SPED students were assessed in a similar manner and those in which they were not and to explore possible explanations.

PK-6: Even though the mean for Standard #2: Instructional Planning on the Summative Evaluation (assessed by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessment) was above the Target 3.0, it was the weakest area for this program. There were two students who received below a 3.0 rating. We will need to continue to identify any students at the midterm point receiving below a 3.0 and provide specific supports catered to his or her needs at that placement.

SPED: One of the challenges with the SPED placements is that their student population can vary greatly, and they need to be prepared to handle a diverse group of students with differing abilities. All of our SPED students achieved at the Target level and higher on their E-Portfolio standards which we are pleased with as a department. Since this is a strength, we have been discussing making a SPED course mandatory for both the PK-6 and SEC programs so that their expertise can be shared, and all programs can collaborate together to meet the needs of all students, in all settings.

Secondary Education: Since assessment is the weakest area for this program but have strong content knowledge, they will benefit from having additional activities in their methods courses that have them prepare a variety of assessments, both formative and summative, and to create a variety of choices that

allow students to demonstrate their knowledge in more than one way. As schools are moving away from traditional testing, students will need to be more aware of the performance-based assessments (PBA) given as a way to measure student learning.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements <u>for this year based on assessment of outcome:</u>
ALL PROGRAMS: An effective assessment process needs to ensure that the instruments used to collect the data to be analyzed is valid and reliable. With our on-going efforts to ensure that the data collected is effective, we will:
1. We will conduct a training session on grading evidence for the E-Portfolio Standards to provide us with data on our interrater reliability. This is also a requirement by CAEP that we document our inter-rater reliability efforts on program assessments.
2. We will create and pilot an on-line training module for our Mentor Teachers to help them better understand our instruments and how to assess their Teacher Candidates. This is an effort to help ensure inter-rater reliability on our program assessments.

PK-6 Elementary:
1. Since Standard #2 was the weakest in both the E-Portfolio and the Summative Evaluation conducted by the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors, we will have our elementary methods course professors discuss how their expectations for lesson planning to help ensure that all PK-6 in all five of the methods courses will have similar requirements and expectations on what effective instructional planning looks at the Target Level.
2. On the summative evaluation, Standard #2 was also the weakest. During our training sessions with our University Supervisors, we will discuss what their requirements are for this standard and instruct them to have this similar type of specific conversation with the Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers in the beginning of the semester on this standard to create a more standardized understanding of this standard.

SPED:
1. Since Standard #3 was the weakest on the E-Portfolio, we will watch as a department the videos submitted by the SPED students and conduct an inter-rater reliability on that standard to look for evidence that professors are assessing them differently and have discussions to attempt to calibrate our grading of these videos.

Secondary Education:
1. Three indicators dealing with assessment, Standard 2.1, Standard 4.1, and Standard 4.3 showed the lowest percentage of students at the Level 4: Exemplary level. In addition to the newly created assessment course that began for the 2018-19 admitted students, we will move a Critical Assignment on assessment into one of the methods courses (ED 566-69) to help strengthen this area for them.

Learning Outcome 2: Teacher candidates will demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.

<div align="center">

Assessment Activity

</div>

Outcome Measures *Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.*	Performance Standard *Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.*	Data Collection *Discuss the data collected and student population*	Analysis *1) Describe the analysis process.* *2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.*
1. *E-Portfolio Standard*: Standard 6: Professionalism • This is direct measure	DEFINED – **Standard #6:** *Evidence 1: Service Learning/Community Outreach* *Evidence 2: Student Teaching* Professional development and application to teaching in a one-page reflection.	Collection: 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. <table><tr><td colspan="2" align="center">**Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #6: Professionalism**</td></tr><tr><td>Programs</td><td align="center">Standard #6</td></tr><tr><td>*PK-6 N = 15*</td><td align="center">3.13</td></tr><tr><td>*SEC N = 13*</td><td align="center">3.38</td></tr><tr><td>*SPED N = 10*</td><td align="center">3.40</td></tr></table> E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations	1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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). Findings: A. The aggregate means on Standard #6 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED students met

2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.*

Acceptable Level: Students are assessed on their Critical Assignment and on their E-Portfolio evidence using a four-column rubric; in which level 3 "*Evidence Meets Expectations*" is the acceptable level of student performance.

Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Grade on E-Portfolio Standard #6: Professionalism

	Rubric Score			
Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 15	13% (2)	77% (13)	0% (0)	0% (0)
SEC N = 13	46% (6)	46% (6)	8% (1)	0% (0)
SPED N = 10	40% (4)	60% (6)	0% (0)	0% (0)

E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations
3 = Evidence Meets Expectations
2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations

B. PK-6: For Standard #6, individually, 100% of the students earned a level 3 or level 4 rating.

SEC: One (1) student earned level 2 rating, resulting in 92% meeting level 3 or 4.

SPED: !00% of the students earned a level 3 or 4 rating.

2.Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on Performance Standard #6: Professionalism *The teacher candidate maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.* This is a direct measure.	DEFINED – Standard #6: Assesses students in three areas within this standard which are aligned with specific VDOE Performance Standard Indicators: *6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success. 6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines. 6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills* They are assessed using a four-column rubric, in which level 3 *Proficient* is the acceptable level of performance.	Collection: Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017 and spring 2018. Data was collected through Google Docs and then analyzed in Excel. The scores below are averaged by licensure program for the 2017-18 academic year. Table below. *Rubric Performance Rubric:* 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable	1) Analysis Process: During our May 2018 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) Findings: A. The aggregate mean on Standard #6 for PK-6, SEC, and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient* as assessed by the CTs, US, and self-assessment.

Standard 6: Professionalism			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self*
PK-6 N = 15	3.64	3.51	3.64
SEC N = 13	3.82	3.79	3.74
SPED N = 10	3.70	3.40	3.63

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONALISM: *The teacher candidate maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*
GRAD PK-6 Students N = 15 (CT); N = 15 (US); N = 15 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	**Mean 3.53**	**Mean 3.47**	**Mean 3.67**
4.0 Rating	53% (8)	47% (7)	67% (10)
3.0 Rating	47% (7)	53% (8)	33% (5)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.67**	**Mean 3.93**
4.0 Rating	80% (12)	67% (10)	93% (14)
3.0 Rating	20% (3)	33% (5)	7% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills	**Mean 3.6**	**Mean 3.40**	**Mean 3.33**
4.0 Rating	60% (9)	47% (7)	40% (6)
3.0 Rating	40% (6)	47% (7)	53% (8)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	7% (1)	7% (1)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.64**	**3.51**	**3.64**

B. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for Standard #6, 100% of the students earned level 3 or higher on all three Indicators by their CTs and US, except one (1) student earned *Developing* by the US on Indicator 6.4. One (1) student self-assessed Indicator 6.4 at the *Developing* level.

Rubric Performance Rubric:
4 = Exemplary
3 = Proficient
2 = Developing
1 = Unacceptable

STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONALISM: *The teacher candidate maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

GRAD SECONDARY Students N= 13 (CT); N = 13 (US); N = 13 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	**Mean 3.92**	**Mean 3.69**	**Mean 3.77**
4.0 Rating	92% (12)	69% (9)	77% (10)
3.0 Rating	8% (1)	31% (4)	23% (3)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.	**Mean 3.92**	**Mean 4.00**	**Mean 3.92**
4.0 Rating	92% (12)	100% (13)	92% (12)
3.0 Rating	8% (1)	0% (0)	8% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills	**Mean 3.61**	**Mean 3.69**	**Mean 3.54**
4.0 Rating	69% (9)	69% (9)	54% (7)
3.0 Rating	23% (3)	31% (4)	46% (6)
2.0 Rating	8% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

SEC: Individually for Standard #6, 100% of the students earned level 3 or higher on all three Indicators by their CTs, US, and Self-Assessment, except one (1) student earned *Developing* by the CT on Indicator 6.4.

OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.82**	**3.79**	**3.74**

STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONALISM: *The teacher candidate maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes responsibility for and participates in professional growth that results in enhanced student learning.*

GRAD SPED Students N = 10 (CT); N=10 (US); N = 10 (Self)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.3**	**Mean 3.7**
4.0 Rating	80% (8)	40% (4)	70% (7)
3.0 Rating	20% (2)	50% (5)	30% (3)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	10% (1)	0% (0)
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.	**Mean 3.6**	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.90**
4.0 Rating	70% (7)	80% (8)	90% (9)
3.0 Rating	20% (2)	20% (2)	10% (1)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills	**Mean 3.7**	**Mean 3.1**	**Mean 3.30**
4.0 Rating	80% (8)	10% (1)	30% (3)
3.0 Rating	10% (1)	90% (9)	70% (7)
2.0 Rating	10% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)

SPED: Individually, one (1) student earned *Developing* on Indicator 6.2 and one on 6.4 by the CTs. One (1) student earned *Developing* on 6.1 by the US. 100% of students self-assessed at level 3 or higher for all three Indicators.

		OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	3.7	3.40	3.63	

| **3. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the Candidate Dispositions Rubric:** The teacher candidate VALUES COLLABORATION: Group Work/ Collaboration | DEFINED: *The teacher candidate VALUES COLLABORATION* <u>Target: (T)</u> Promotes collaboration by reflecting upon and generating new ideas. Actively advances success of the team through active participation, problem-solving and discussion, allowing all members to contribute.

<u>Emerging: (E)</u> Accepts group responsibility by collaborating. Accepts ideas of others. Relates adequately with others in sharing information and ideas for the success of the team.

<u>Unsatisfactory (U)</u> Puts forth minimal effort or fails to contribute or collaborate. Shows little regard for other people or their ideas. Does not | <u>Collection:</u> Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017 and spring 2018. 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 2017-18 academic year. | 1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> During our May 2018 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 Values Collaboration:</u>
A. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students were below *Target*. The aggregate means for the SEC students were below *Target* for the CT and Self-Assessment. The aggregate means for the SPED students were below *Target* for the CT and US.

B. <u>PK-6</u>: 80% of the students (12) earned |

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Collaboration: Group Work/Collaborative Learning			
Program	CT	US	SELF
PK-6 N = 15	2.80	2.80	2.80
SEC N = 13	2.85	3.0	2.85
SPED N=10	2.90	2.57	3.0

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Collaboration: Group Work/Collaborative Learning						
PR	CT		US		Self	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 15	80% (12)	20% (3)	80% (12)	20% (3)	80% (12)	20% (3)
SEC N = 13	85% (11)	15% (2)	100% (13)	0% (0)	92% (12)	8% (1)
SPED N = 10	90% (9)	10% (1)	70% (7)	30% (3)	100% (10)	0% (0)

| The teacher candidate VALUES PROFESSIONALISM: Communication | relate well with others or does not share information or ideas. DEFINED: **The teacher candidate VALUES PROFESSIONALISM** Target: (T) Consistently uses correct oral and written communication. Oral and written language is professional, respectful, and clear. Expresses ideas articulately.

Emerging: (E) Usually uses correct oral and written communication. Oral and written language is appropriate, respectful, and clear. Conveys ideas accurately.

Unsatisfactory (U) Uses incorrect or inappropriate oral and/or written communication. May use slang or insensitive language. Does not express ideas clearly. | SEC: Two (2) students were assessed at *Emerging* by the CTs and one (1) student self-assessed at *Emerging*. All US assessed 100% of the students at *Target*.
SPED: One (1) student was assessed at *Emerging* by the CT and three (3) students were assessed *Emerging* by the US. 100% of the students self-assessed at *Target*. | *Target* by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment.

2) Findings on Values Professionalism: Communication A. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students were below *Target* as assessed by all three groups. The aggregate means for the SEC students were below *Target* only for the Self-Assessment. The aggregate means for the SPED students were below *Target* for the US and Self-Assessment. B. PK-6: One (1) student (17%) earned *Emerging* by the CT and US, while two (2) students (13%) self-assessed at *Emerging*.

SEC: All CTs and US assessed 100% of the students at *Target*. One (1) student (8%) self-assessed at *Emerging*. |

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Professionalism: Communication

Program	CT	US	SELF
PK-6 N = 15	2.93	2.93	2.87
SEC N = 13	3.0	3.0	2.92
SPED N=10	3.0	2.86	2.80

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Professionalism: Communication

PR	CT		US		Self	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 15	93% (14)	7% (1)	93% (14)	7% (1)	87% (13)	13% (2)
SEC N = 13	100% (13)	0% (0)	100% (13)	0% (0)	92% (12)	8% (1)
SPED N = 10	100% (10)	0% (0)	90% (9)	10% (1)	80% (8)	20% (2)

SPED: The CTs assessed 100% of the students at *Target*. The US assessed one (1) student at *Emerging*. Two (2) students (20%) self-assessed at *Emerging*.

45

The teacher candidate VALUES PERSONAL INTEGRITY: Emotional control and responsibility	DEFINED: **The teacher candidate VALUES PERSONAL INTEGRITY** Target: (T) Always maintains composure regardless of circumstances. Respects the viewpoints of others and treats them with dignity even when not in agreement with them. Accountable and responsible for his/her own emotions and behaviors. Emerging: (E) Maintains basic control of emotions. May show emotional reaction but does not lose composure. Is able to listen to the perspectives of others. Is responsible for his/her emotions and behaviors. Unsatisfactory (U) Emotions are not under control. Is insensitive to others. Does not take personal responsibility for emotions and behaviors. Blames others or outside	

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Personal Integrity: Emotional Control & Responsibility

Program	CT	US	SELF
PK-6 N = 15	2.87	2.93	2.87
SEC N = 13	3.0	3.0	2.93
SPED N=10	2.70	2.86	2.90

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Personal Integrity: Emotional Control & Responsibility

PR	CT		US		Self	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 15	87% (13)	13% (2)	93% (14)	7% (1)	87% (13)	13% (2)
SEC N = 13	100% (13)	0% (0)	100% (13)	0% (0)	92% (12)	8% (1)
SPED N = 10	70% (7)	30% (3)	90% (9)	10% (1)	90% (9)	10% (1)

2) Findings on Values Personal Integrity: Emotional Control and Responsibility

A. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students were below *Target* as assessed by all three groups. The aggregate means for the SEC students were below *Target* only for the Self-Assessment. The aggregate means for the SPED students were below *Target* for all three groups.

B. PK-6: Two (2) students (13%) earned *Emerging* by the CT and one (1) student (7%) earned *Emerging* by the US, while two (2) students (13%) self-assessed at *Emerging*.

SEC: All CTs and US assessed 100% of the students at *Target*. One

	circumstances for loss of emotions or behavior.	SPED: The CTs assessed three (3) students (30%) at *Emerging*. The US assessed one (1) student (10%) at *Emerging*. One (1) student (10%) self-assessed at *Emerging*.	(1) student (8%) self-assessed at *Emerging*.
4. *2017-18 Graduating Student Survey - Evaluation of Preparation Alumni survey* This is an indirect measure	DEFINED: Students responded to the *Evaluation of Preparation* statements on a scale 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent).	**Percentage of Students Who Rated Good or Excellent for their Evaluation of Preparation** {{TABLE}}	1) Analysis Process: While the data was received after our May 2018 department meeting, the Student Learning Outcome Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2018 meeting. 2) Findings: 100% of SEC and SPED students rated these three questions in relation to their level of *Preparation* at the highest levels. 70% of the PK-6 students rated these three questions in relation to their level of *Preparation* at the highest levels.

Inner table:

Evaluation of Preparation Statement	PK-6 N = 10	SEC N = 10	SPED N = 6
Determine the most ethically appropriate response to a situation.	70	100	100
Understand the major ethical dilemmas in your field.	70	100	100
Work as part of an effective team.	70	100	100

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results)***:**
(SEE Findings by program under each Student Learner Outcome)

   For all programs: This was the second year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and first year of the newly revised TWS Rubric, so we are interested in beginning to look for trends in the data as more cycles of data come in. 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 continued to provided positive feedback on the major changes made to this instrument.

   We revised our Dispositions Rubric from 2016-17 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. The GSS results provided us with positive data that we are preparing our students to be successful in their profession but not as much as reported by the PK-6 students. 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.

PK-6 Elementary: All students were assessed at the Target (Evidence Meets Expectations = 3) and above for Standard #6 on their E-Portfolio. All students were assessed at the Proficient level and above by their CTs and US.

SPED: All students were assessed at the Target and above for Standard #6 on their E-Portfolio. All students were assessed at the Proficient level and above by their CTs and US.

Secondary Education: All but one student was assessed at the Target and above for Standards #6 on their E-Portfolio but 46% of the students assessed at the Exemplary level. The SEC program had the highest scores from their CTs and US.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement <u>relative to assessment of outcome</u>:

  <u>For all programs:</u> One strength we have is that we have data from various instruments and from various stakeholders – current students, alumni, professors, University Supervisors, and Cooperating Teachers. We are able to analyze the data from all of these and look for trends. An opportunity for improvement is to continue to work with, collaborate with, and train our University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers on how to mentor and assess our Teacher Candidates during student teaching. Another opportunity for improvement is to continue discussions within the department on the quality of the evidence students submit for the Critical Assignments that get uploaded into their E-Portfolios. Additionally, as an opportunity for improvement, we will continue to have discussions on the areas in which the PK-6, Secondary, and SPED students were assessed in a similar manner and those in which they were not and to explore possible explanations.

<u>PK-6 Elementary:</u> As a group, the mean score was below the Target level on Communication based upon the Disposition Rubric, with the same individual scoring at the Emerging Level (2.0). This will mean that additional emphasis for students on using accurate oral and written communication be in place for students who may be at this level before they start student teaching.

<u>SPED:</u> With the complexities of being a Special Education teacher, our department was pleased with 70-80% of our students being assessed by their CTs at the Exemplary level for Standard #6: Professionalism, which requires a great deal of communication with the school community to ensure student success. This expertise would be useful to share with the other programs.

<u>Secondary Education:</u> Our department is pleased with 92% of students being assessed at the Exemplary level by their CTs for 6.1 and 6.2 and 69% assessed by their CTs at the Exemplary level for 6.4, which was the same assessment provided by their US. One student was not assessed at the Target level (3.0) on their E-Portfolio. An opportunity for improvement is emphasizing the importance of the narrative portion of the E-Portfolio which can help explain how their professional development could be used in their classroom, rather than just stating what PD they attended and what they learned. We require them to take it a step further to explain how it could be used or explain why they don't see it working in their classroom.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements <u>for this year based on assessment of outcome</u>:
<u>For all programs:</u>
1. We will conduct a training session on grading evidence for the E-Portfolio Standards to provide us with data on our interrater reliability. This is also a requirement by CAEP that we document our inter-rater reliability efforts on program assessments.
2. We will create and pilot an on-line training module for our Mentor Teachers to help them better understand our instruments and how to assess their Teacher Candidates. This is an effort to help ensure inter-rater reliability on our program assessments.

PK-6 Elementary: The PK-6 classes will provide a concerted effort to identify and remediate students' communication skills and abilities when needed. This will help ensure that by the time they get to student teaching, their oral and written communication has been addressed and improved.

SPED: We are planning on making the Collaboration course a required course for both the PK-6 and SEC programs. This should provide the SPED students with additional opportunities to practice their communication skills with general education teachers, which makes a large part of their daily work load.

Secondary Education: The SEC program students are required to attend professional development during their student teaching as evidence to upload for their E-Portfolio. However, the reality is that not all PD they will attend will be in their content area, so they will need to explain how that PD will translate into useful strategies they can use in their content area, for Standard #6: Professionalism.

Appendices