MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY
Arlington, Virginia

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: UNDERGRADUATE Teacher Education Program (MDS PK-6; Special Education K-12)
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 460, ED 460E, and ED 460S) for the Student Learning Assessment Report. All reporting of evaluation ratings is completed electronically through a Google Survey to eliminate error, keep evaluations confidential, and speed the process of analysis of data. This data is compiled in the Education Database on the "S" drive of the School of Education and Human Services in the Education folder under Assessment. The database is managed by the Clinical Experiences Coordinator for Education and is password controlled. Only the Chair of the Department, the Assessment Coordinator of the Department, and the Clinical Experiences Coordinator have access.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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

Multidisciplinary Studies

This major is designed specifically for students seeking teaching licensure in either elementary education (grades PK-6) or special education: general curriculum (grades K-12).
Upon successful completion of the multidisciplinary studies program, students will be able to
- 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 subject matter and draw upon content knowledge to support learners to access information and apply knowledge in real world settings to assure mastery of content;
- plan for and implement a variety of instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways; and
- demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.

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

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

Multidisciplinary Studies with Special Education (K-12) Teaching Licensure (B.A. in Multidisciplinary Studies)

This program allows students to complete a baccalaureate degree in multidisciplinary studies and also be licensed to teach grades special education K-12. Students pursuing licensure in this manner complete all requirements necessary for Virginia licensure, including field experiences and student teaching, at the end of four years.

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

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1. demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning differences, and learning environments to help all learners meet high standards and reach their full potential.	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 progressions for teachers. Knowledge of the learner and learning, content, instructional practice, and professional responsibility provide the foundation of our course work and field experiences. Our undergraduate program supports this mission by offering a rigorous four-year licensure program, which makes us one of the few universities in Virginia that offer this type of expedited career path. The extremely high employment rate of our students upon graduation is a testament to the rigor and preparation they receive while here.

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

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

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

- Both a strength and a challenge of our assessment system for the Teacher Education Programs in the Education Department is that it plays an essential role, not only for internal accountability but also for the requirements of our accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP, formerly NCATE) and to satisfy the requirements of our programs to maintain approval by the Virginia Department of Education. The Title II Report ensures that we collect, certify, and track Teacher Education students' enrollment and pass rates on the licensure exams. Our CAEP site visit will take place in the fall 2020 semester so our data collection has already begun for this accreditation report. We are also required to submit an annual report documenting on progress on continuous improvement. We focus the gathering of summative assessment data on the products and evaluations of the capstone experience: Student Teaching Seminar. Since the ultimate outcome for

Teacher Education students is their performance in the classroom, 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 E-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 at the end of the student teaching semester . 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 Teacher Candidates 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 Teacher Candidates 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 PK-6 Teacher Candidates, 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 Teacher Candidates.

<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 program 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 program area. Data is then analyzed at specific learner outcomes that are chosen for the reporting year per program area. Faculty who are most clearly tied to the program 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 452 and ED 349 courses (Classroom Management for Student Teachers) will meet to discuss the E-Portfolio assignment for Link 1 to make any revisions or updates based upon the revised rubric for that standard. 3. Rubrics will be revised for both the E-Portfolio and Teacher Work Sample. We will be moving from a three-column rubric to a four-column rubric and we will be revising the language used for each of the distinctive levels to comply with CAEP levels of sufficiency. 4. The Dispositions Rubric will be revised so that it better aligns with the student teaching experiences, rather than heavily aligning with the experiences of a classroom student.	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. 4. The Dispositions Rubric was revised during summer 2017 to better incorporate the experiences of both the classroom student and the student teacher.
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.	1. Rubrics will be revised for both the E-Portfolio and Teacher Work Sample. We will be moving from a three-column rubric to a four-column rubric and we will be revising the language used for each of the distinctive levels to comply with CAEP levels of sufficiency. 2. We will be requesting through LAC and UCIC that two education courses receive an INQ designation and one education receive a W-I designation.	1. 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. 2. We did not focus our efforts here since we had to get through UCIC two (2) program changes, a change to the Education Minor, and changes to the four (4) Secondary Licensure programs. However, we are putting a proposal for DSINQ for ED 200 in fall 2018.

Provide a response to last year's University Assessment Committee review of the program's learning assessment report:
x Report Accepted as Submitted: Received Exemplary on *all six* areas of the Academic Assessment Evaluation Rubric

MARYMOUNT UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE 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**	<u>Standard 5: Learning Environment</u> **"Behavior Plan with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy and application"** ED349, E452 <u>Teacher Work Sample:</u> **Task #1: Contextual Factors**	**US/CT Final Evaluation** <u>**Standard 5:**</u> **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**	<u>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</u> **"Evidence of Content Knowledge"** ED339, ED359	**US/CT Final Evaluation** <u>**Standard 1: Professional**</u> **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**	<u>Standard 2: Instructional Planning</u> **"Unit Plan"** ED329, ED357 <u>Standard 3: Instructional Delivery</u> **"Variety of Instructional Strategies"** ED310, ED311, PSY341 <u>Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student Learning:</u> **"Variety of assessments"** ED310, ED358 <u>Teacher Work Sample:</u> **Task #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6**	**US/CT Final Evaluation** <u>**Standard 2: Instructional**</u> **Planning** <u>**Standard 3: Instructional**</u> **Delivery** <u>**Standard 4: Assessment of and**</u> **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**	<u>Standard 6: Professionalism</u> **"Community Outreach/Service Learning"** ED250	**US/CT Final Evaluation** <u>**Standard 6: Professionalism**</u>

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

Assessment Activity

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 329; ED 357). Evidence 2: Student Teaching Lesson Plan E-Portfolio Performance Rubric: 4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations	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. **Portfolio Average Scores for Standards #2, #3, and #4** | Program	Standard #2	Standard #3	Standard #4	 |---|---|---|---| | PK-6 N = 9	3.0	3.11	2.56	 | SPED N = 2	3.5	3.0	3.0	 **Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #2: Instructional Planning** | Programs	Standard # 2	 |---|---| | *PK-6 N = 9*	3.0	 | *SPED N = 2*	3.5		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. Across all standards, both the PK-6 and SPED students earned the lowest ratings on Standard #4. B. The aggregate means on Standard #2 for PK-6 and SPED students met or exceeded the Level 3: *Evidence Meets 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.

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.*"
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).

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

	Rubric Score			
Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 9	11% (1)	78% (7)	11% (1)	0% (0)
SPED N = 2	50% (1)	50% (1)	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

Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #3: Instructional Delivery

Programs	Standard #
PK-6 N = 9	3.11
SPED N = 2	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 = 9	22% (2)	67% (6)	11% (1)	0% (0)
SPED N = 2	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)	0% (0)

C. For Standard # 2, Individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or Level 4 rating. One (1) PK-6 student (11%) received Level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 89% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding expectations.

D. The aggregate means on Standard #3 for PK-6 and SPED students met or exceeded the Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.*

E. For Standard # 3, Individually, the SPED students both earned a Level 3 rating. One (1) PK-6 student (11%) received Level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 89% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding 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 310 and ED 358) Evidence 2: Student Teaching Variety of Assessments	*(tables below)*		F. The aggregate means on Standard #4 for PK-6 students fell below the Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations* and the SPED students met the Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.* G. For Standard # 4, individually, one SPED student earned a Level 2 rating and one earned a Level 4. Five (5) PK-6 students (56%) received Level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 44% 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 = 9	2.56
SPED N = 2	3.0

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 = 9	11% (1)	33% (3)	56% (5)	0% (0)
SPED N = 2	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (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

2. *Teacher Work Sample (TWS)*	DEFINED –	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.
Standard #2: Learning Goals and Objectives	**Standard #2:** The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals/objectives.		

Standard #2: The teacher sets significant, challenging, varied and appropriate learning goals/objectives.

Standard #3: Assessment Plan

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: Instructional Decision-Making

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

Standard #5: Design for Instruction

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

Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning
This is a Direct Measure

Standards #6: The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.

TWS Standards #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6 by Program		
Standard	PK-6 N = 5	SPED N = 2
2	3.53	3.50
3	3.68	3.20
4	3.33	3.50
5	3.35	3.13
6	3.13	2.83

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #2: Learning Goals and Objectives	
Program	Average Score for Standard #2
PK-6 *N = 5*	3.53
SPED *N = 2*	3.50

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

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 both groups were above the Proficient level except for Standard #6 for the SPED students.

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

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 = 5	SPED N = 2
2.1 Significance, Challenge and Variety	Mean 3.60	Mean 3.0
4.0 Rating	60% (3)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.2 Appropriateness For Students	Mean 3.60	Mean 3.50
4.0 Rating	60% (3)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.3 Alignment with State and/or Local Standards	Mean 3.40	Mean 4.0
4.0 Rating	80% (4)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)
Mean Overall	3.53	3.50

C. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for Standard #2, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on Indicator #2.1 and #2.2. One (1) PK-6 student did not meet Indicator 2.3, which resulted in 80% of the group meeting that Indicator.
<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the SPED students earned a 3 or 4 on all three Indicators.

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

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #3: Assessment Plan	
Program	Average Score for Standard #3
PK-6 N = 5	3.68
SPED N = 2	3.20

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

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

TWS Standard 3: Assessment Plan		
Indicator	**PK-6** **N = 5**	**SPED** **N = 2**
3.1 Alignment of pre/post assessments with Learning Goals/Objectives	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	80% (4)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	20% (1)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.2 Clarity of Criteria and Standards for Student Performance	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	80% (4)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	20% (1)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.3 Variety of Modes and Approaches to Assessment	**Mean 3.4**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	60% (3)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.4 Formative Assessments	**Mean 3.6**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	60% (3)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.5 Adaptations to your assessments based on students' needs	**Mean 3.8**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	80% (4)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	20% (1)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
Mean Overall – Standard 3	**3.68**	**3.2**

E. PK-6: Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on all five Indicators.
SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a 3 or 4 on all five Indicators.

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

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #4: Instructional Decision-Making	
Program	Average Score for Standard #4
PK-6 N = 5	3.33
SPED N = 2	3.50

TWS Standard #4: Instructional Decision-Making		
Indicator	**PK-6** **N = 5**	**SPED** **N = 2**
4.1 Pre-Assessment Analysis	**Mean** **3.2**	**Mean** **3.5**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)
4.2 Sound Professional Practice /Pedagogy	**Mean** **3.4**	**Mean** **3.5**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	60% (3)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
4.3 Modifications/ Adjustments Based on Analysis of Student Learning	**Mean** **3.4**	**Mean** **3.5**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	60% (3)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)
Mean Overall	**3.33**	**3.50**

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

G. PK-6: Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on all two (2) Indicators. One student earned a Level 2 rating on Indicator 4.1, resulting in 80% of that group meeting or exceeding Indicator 4.1. SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a 3 or 4 on all three Indicators.

Standard #5: The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals/objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.	**Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #5: Design for Instruction**	H. The aggregate means on Standard #5 for PK-6 and SPED were above the Level 3: *Proficient*.

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #5: Design for Instruction

Program	Average Score for Standard #5
PK-6 N = 5	3.35
SPED N = 2	3.13

Standard #5: The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals/objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.	TWS Standard #5: Design for Instruction			I. PK-6: Individually on Standard #5, 100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on Indicator 5.2 and 5.3. One (1) PK-6 student (the same student) earned a 2 on Indicator 5.1 and 5.4. SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a 3 or 4 on all four Indicators.
	Indicator	PK-6 N = 5	SPED N = 2	
	5.1 Alignment with Learning Goals/Objectives and Lesson Structure/Sequencing	Mean 3.2	Mean 3.0	
	4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)	
	3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)	
	2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)	
	5.2 Accurate Representation of Content	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.0	
	4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)	
	3.0 Rating	60% (3)	100% (2)	
	2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	5.3 Use of a Variety of Instructional Strategies, Activities, Resources and Reflections	Mean 3.6	Mean 3.0	
	4.0 Rating	60% (3)	0% (0)	
	3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)	
	2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	5.4 Use of Contextual Information and Data to Develop Appropriate Adaptations/Ways to Differentiate Learning	Mean 3.2	Mean 3.5	
	4.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)	
	3.0 Rating	40% (2)	50% (1)	
	2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)	
	Mean Overall	3.35	3.13	

Standards #6: The teacher uses assessment data to profile student learning and communicate information about student progress and achievement.

Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning	
Program	**Average Score for Standard #6**
PK-6 N = 5	3.13
SPED N = 2	2.83

TWS Standard #6: Analysis of Student Learning		
Indicator	**PK-6 N = 5**	**SPED N = 2**
6.1 Alignment with Learning Goals and disaggregation of data	**Mean 3.2**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)
6.2 Interpretation of Assessment Data	**Mean 3.2**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)
6.3 Evidence of Impact on Student Learning and follow-up (remediation)	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 2.5**
4.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	60% (3)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	20% (1)	50% (1)
Mean Overall	**3.13**	**2.83**

J. The aggregate mean on Standard #6 for PK-6 was above Level 3: *Proficient*. The aggregate mean for SPED was below Level 3: *Proficient*.

K. PK-6: Individually for Standard #6, 80% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on all three Indicators. One student (the same student) earned a Level 2 on all three Indicators.
SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a 3 on Indicators 6.1 and 6.2. One SPED student 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 and SPED students on Standards #2, #3, and #4 by the Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessment were above the *Proficient* level, except for one area. The PK-6 aggregate mean on Standard #4 fell below the *Proficient* Level (2.97).

B. The aggregate mean on Standard #2 for PK-6 and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient*. |

Collection table content:

PK-6: FOR ALL STANDARDS (N = 9)			
Standard	**CT**	**US**	**SELF (N = 8)**
2	3.11	3.08	3.50
3	3.14	3.29	3.58
4	3.15	2.97	3.41

SPED: FOR ALL STANDARDS (N = 2)			
Standard	**CT**	**US**	**SELF**
2	3.88	3.13	3.63
3	3.70	3.40	3.50
4	3.75	3.25	3.63

Standard 2: Instructional Planning			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self (N = 8 PK-6)*
PK-6 N = 9	3.11	3.08	3.50
SPED N = 2	3.88	3.13	3.63

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

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 MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT); N = 9 (US); (Self = 8)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.	**Mean 3.2**	**Mean 2.89**	**Mean 3.50**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	0%	50% (4)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	50% (4)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.11**	**Mean 3.38**
4.0 Rating	11% (1)	11% (1)	50% (4)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	37% (3)
2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	13% (1)
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.	**Mean 3.1**	**Mean 3.00**	**Mean 3.50**
4.0 Rating	11% (1)	22% (2)	50% (4)
3.0 Rating	89% (8)	56% (5)	50% (4)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	22% (2)	0% (0)
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.	**Mean 3.1**	**Mean 3.33**	**Mean 3.63**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	33% (3)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	67% (6)	67% (6)	37% (3)
2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.11**	**3.08**	**3.50**

C. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for Standard #2, students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 2.1 and 2.3 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 a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 2.1, 2.3, and 2.4.

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.*
UG SPED N=2

Indicator	CT	US	Self
2.1 Uses student learning data to guide planning.	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	100% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.2 Plans time realistically for pacing, content mastery, and transitions.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.3 Plans for differentiated instruction.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 4.0**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to the school's curriculum, assessments, and student learning needs.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 4.0**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.88**	**3.13**	**3.63**

SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs, US, and self-assessment.

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

Standard 3: Instructional Delivery			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self*
PK-6 *N = 9*	3.14	3.29	3.58
SPED *N= 2*	3.70	3.40	3.50

D. The aggregate mean on Standard #3 for PK-6 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 MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT); N = 9 (US); (Self = 8)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.33**	**Mean 3.63**
4.0 Rating	11 % (1)	33% (3)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	67% (6)	37% (3)
2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.2 Builds upon students' existing knowledge and skills.	**Mean 3.2**	**Mean 3.11**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	11% (1)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	24% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs.	**Mean 3.1**	**Mean 3.00**	**Mean 3.63**
4.0 Rating	11% (1)	22% (2)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	89% (8)	56% (5)	37% (3)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	22% (2)	0% (0)
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies.	**Mean 3.1**	**Mean 3.56**	**Mean 3.38**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	67% (6)	37% (3)
3.0 Rating	67% (6)	22% (2)	63% (5)
2.0 Rating	11% (1)	11% (1)	0% (0)
3.6 Uses instructional technology and resources to enhance student learning.	**Mean 3.3**	**Mean 3.44**	**Mean 3.75**
4.0 Rating	33% (3)	44% (4)	76% (6)
3.0 Rating	67% (6)	54% (5)	24% (2)
OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD	**3.14**	**3.29**	**3.58**

E. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for Standard #3, students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.2, 3.3, and 3.6 by their CTs. Students earned a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and 3.6 by their US. Students self-assessed themselves at a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, and 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.*
UG SPED N=2

Indicator	CT	US	Self
3.1 Engages and maintains students in active learning.	**Mean 3.5**	**4.0**	**4.0**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.2 Builds upon students' existing knowledge and skills.	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
3.3 Differentiates instruction to meet the students' needs.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 4.0**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)
3.5 Uses a variety of effective instructional strategies.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)
3.6 Uses instructional technology and resources to enhance student learning.	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 2.50**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	50% (1)	0% (0)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	50% (1)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.70**	**3.40**	**3.50**

SPED: Individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs, US, and self-assessment except for one student who self-assessed at Level 2 for Indicator 3.6.

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 = 9*	3.15	2.97	3.41
SPED *N= 2*	3.75	3.25	3.63

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

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.*
for MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT); N = 9 (US); (Self = 8)

Indicator	CT	US	Self
4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	**Mean 3.10**	**Mean 2.89**	**Mean 3.25**
4.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	24% (2)
3.0 Rating	89% (8)	89% (8)	76% (6)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)
4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments.	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 2.89**	**Mean 3.25**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	0% (0)	37% (3)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	50% (4)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	11% (1)	13% (1)
4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and instructional content.	**Mean 3.20**	**Mean 3.00**	**Mean 3.38**
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	0% (0)	37% (3)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	100% (9)	63% (5)
4.7 Gives constructive, timely, and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	**Mean 3.10**	**Mean 3.11**	**Mean 3.75**
4.0 Rating	11% (1)	11% (1)	76% (6)
3.0 Rating	89% (8)	89% (8)	24% (2)
OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD	**3.15**	**2.97**	**3.41**

G. PK-6: Individually for Standard #4, 100% of the students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs. Students earned a Level 3 on Indicators 4.4 and 4.7 by their US. Students self-assessed themselves at a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 4.1, 4.4, and 4.7. One (1) student self-assessed themselves at Level 2 for Indicator 4.3.

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.*
UG SPED N=2

Indicator	CT	US	Self
4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.5**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	50% (1)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
4.3 Uses a variety of assessment strategies and instruments.	**Mean 3.5**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 3.0**
4.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	50% (1)
4.4 Aligns student assessment with established curriculum standards and instructional content.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 3.0**	**Mean 4.0**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)
4.7 Gives constructive, timely, and frequent feedback to students on their learning.	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 4.0**	**Mean 4.0**
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	100% (2)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**3.75**	**3.25**	**3.63**

<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs, US, and self-assessment except for one student who self-assessed at Level 2 for Indicator 4.3.

| 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: ... | 1) Analysis ... |

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.

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

Program	CT	US	SELF (N =8: PK-6)
PK-6 N = 9	2.67	2.67	2.63
SPED N=2	3.0	2.0	2.50

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

PR	CT		US		SELF (N =8: PK-6)	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 9	67% (6)	33% (3)	67% (6)	33% (3)	62% (5)	38% (3)
SPED N = 2	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)

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 for the PK-6 and SPED students by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment were below the *Target* level, except for the CT scores for the SPED students.

B. PK-6: Individually, the scores across all three groups were very similar with approximately 67% meeting *Target.* SPED: Both SPED students were assessed at the *Emerging* Level while one (1) self-assessed at *Emerging.* The CT assessed both at the *Target* Level.

| 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. | (tables below) | C. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students by the US and Self-Assessment were at the *Target* level and the aggregate mean by the CTs was below the *Target* level.
 The aggregate means for the SPED students by the CTs and Self-Assessment were at the *Target* level and the aggregate mean by the US was below the *Target* level.

 D. PK-6: Individually, only one (1) student received *Emerging* across all three groups.
 SPED: Individually, only one (1) student was assessed at the *Emerging* level, which was by the US. |

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

Program	CT	US	SELF N =8
PK-6 N = 9	2.89	3.0	3.0
SPED N=2	3.0	2.50	3.0

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

PR	CT		US		Self N =8	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 9	89% (8)	11% (1)	100% (9)	0% (0)	100% (8)	0% (0)
SPED N = 2	100% (2)	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)	100% (2)	0% (0)

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)	**Percentage of Students Rated "Good" or "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% rated those three statements at the *highest* levels of the scale (4 and 5) for evaluating their preparation during the program.
		Statement	MDS PK-6 & SPED N = 11	
		Succeed in a job in your field	100	
		Apply knowledge and skills to new situations.	100	
		Solve problems in your field using your knowledge and skills.	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 both programs: This was the second year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and first year with our newly revised TWS so we look forward to having more data cycles come in to begin to look for trends in and across programs. As a department we will continue discussion some of the areas our students were assessed lower at, for example Standard #4 (Assessment) on the E-Portfolio, and monitor that area. We created a new course on Assessment last year since it was a trend we noticed but those students won't be ready to student teach for another two years. 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 to help mentor, support, and assess them.

    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. We are overall pleased with our results but will continue to monitor and discuss any needed and appropriate changes to help improve the individual student and overall group scores for each measurement outcome.

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

For both 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 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 and SPED students were assessed in a similar manner and those in which they were not.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements <u>for this year based on assessment of outcome</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.

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.

<u>Assessment Activity</u>

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*: <u>Standard 6:</u> Professionalism • This is direct measure	DEFINED – <u>Standard #6:</u> <u>Evidence 1: Service Learning/Community Outreach</u> <u>Evidence 2: Student Teaching</u> Professional development and application to teaching in a one-page reflection. <u>Acceptable Level:</u> 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	<u>Collection:</u> Faculty members score students' E-Portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semesters. The scores are averaged per student, by licensure program, and then by percentage for each level of the rubric. Student scores are submitted into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to disaggregate the data by program. Before grading each semester's E-Portfolios, our department meets to review the rubric, scores sample student work individually, and then shares out their scoring to help provide inter-reliability among graders. <table><tr><td colspan="2">**Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #6: Professionalism**</td></tr><tr><td>Programs</td><td>Standard #6</td></tr><tr><td>*PK-6 N = 9*</td><td>3.0</td></tr><tr><td>*SPED N = 2*</td><td>3.5</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) <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:</u> A. The aggregate means on Standard #6 for PK-6 and SPED students met or exceeded the Level 3: *Evidence Meets Expectations.*

the target level of student performance.

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

Program	Rubric Score			
	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0
PK-6 N = 9	22% (2)	56% (5)	22% (2)	0% (0)
SPED N = 2	50% (1)	50% (1)	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. For Standard # 6, individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or Level 4 rating. Two (2) PK-6 students (22%) received Level 2 *Evidence Approaches Expectations*, which resulted in 78% of the group's evidence meeting or exceeding expectations.

2.*Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on <u>Performance Standard #6: Professionalism</u>* *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.	<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. 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. **Standard 6: Professionalism** (table below) *Rubric Performance Rubric:* 4 = Exemplary 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 1 = Unacceptable	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:</u> A. The aggregate mean on Standard #6 for PK-6 and SPED was above Level 3: *Proficient* as assessed by the CTs, US, and self-assessment, except that 100% of the SPED students were assessed at *Exemplary* by the CT.

Standard 6: Professionalism			
Program	*CT*	*US*	*Self* *PK-6 (N = 8)*
PK-6 N = 9	3.30	3.59	3.71
SPED N = 2	4.0	3.17	3.33

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.* **MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT); N = 9 (US); (Self = 8)**	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. One (1) student self-assessed Indicator 6.1 at the *Developing* level.

Indicator	CT	US	Self
6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	Mean 3.3	Mean 3.56	Mean 3.50
4.0 Rating	33% (3)	56% (5)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	67% (6)	44% (4)	25% (2)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	12% (1)
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.78	Mean 4.00
4.0 Rating	56% (5)	78% (7)	100% (8)
3.0 Rating	44% (4)	22% (2)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills	Mean 3.2	Mean 3.44	Mean 3.63
4.0 Rating	22% (2)	44% (4)	63% (5)
3.0 Rating	78% (7)	56% (5)	37% (3)
OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD	3.3	3.59	3.71

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.*				SPED: Individually, 100% of the students earned level 3 or higher on all three Indicators by their CTs, US, and self-assessment.

UG SPED N=2

Indicator	CT	US	Self
6.1 Collaborates and communicates effectively within the school community to promote students' well-being and success.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.0	Mean 4.0
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)
2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
6.2 Adheres to federal and state laws, school policies and ethical guidelines.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.5	Mean 4.0
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	50% (1)	100% (2)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	50% (1)	0% (0)
6.4 Sets goals for improvement of knowledge and skills	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.5
4.0 Rating	100% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)
3.0 Rating	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)
OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR STANDARD	**4.0**	**3.33**	**3.83**

3. Cooperating Teacher (CT), University Supervisor (US), and Self-Assessment Evaluations on the Candidate Dispositions Rubric:	DEFINED: **The teacher candidate VALUES COLLABORATION**	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.

Target: (T)
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.

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

Unsatisfactory (U)
Puts forth minimal effort or fails to contribute or collaborate. Shows little regard for other people or their ideas. Does not relate well with others or does not share information or ideas.

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Collaboration: Group Work/Collaborative Learning

Program	CT	US	SELF (PK-6: N =8
PK-6 N = 9	2.89	2.78	2.88
SPED N= 2	3.0	2.50	3.0

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Collaboration: Group Work/Collaborative Learning

PR	CT		US		Self (PK-6: N =8)	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 9	89% (8)	11% (1)	78% (7)	22% (2)	88% (7)	12% (1)
SPED N = 2	100% (2)	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)	100% (2)	0% (0)

2) Findings on Values Collaboration:
B. PK-6: Individually, the CT assessed one (1) and the US assessed two (2) students at the *Emerging* level and one (1) student self-assessed at the *Emerging* level.
SPED: Both SPED students were assessed at the *Target* level by the CTs and Self-Assessments. The US assessed one (1) student at the *Emerging* Level.

2) Findings on Values Collaboration:
A. The aggregate means for the SPED students by the CTs and Self-Assessment were at the *Target* level and the aggregate mean by the US was below the *Target* level. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment were all below the *Target* level.

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.

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values Professionalism: Communication			
Program	CT	US	SELF N =8
PK-6 N = 9	2.89	2.78	2.88
SPED N= 2	3.0	2.50	3.0

By Program: Percentage of Ratings on Disposition: Values Professionalism: Communication						
PR	CT		US		Self N =8	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 9	89% (8)	11% (1)	78% (7)	22% (2)	88% (7)	12% (1)
SPED N = 2	100% (2)	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)	100% (2)	0% (0)

2) Findings on Values Professionalism: Communication
B. PK-6: Individually, the CT assessed one (1) and the US assessed two (2) students at the *Emerging* level and one (1) student self-assessed at the *Emerging* level.
SPED: Both SPED students were assessed at the *Target* level by the CTs and Self-Assessments. The US assessed one (1) student at the *Emerging* Level.

2) Findings on Values Professionalism: Communication
A. The aggregate means for the SPED students by the CTs and Self-Assessment were at the *Target* level and the aggregate mean by the US was below the *Target* level. The aggregate means for the PK-6 students by the CTs, US, and Self-Assessment were all below the *Target* level.

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 circumstances for loss of emotions or behavior.

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

Program	CT	US	SELF N =8
PK-6 N = 9	2.78	3.0	2.75
SPED N= 2	3.0	2.5	2.50

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

PR	CT		US		Self N =8	
	T	E	T	E	T	E
PK-6 N = 9	78% (7)	22% (2)	100% (9)	0% (0)	88% (7)	12% (1)
SPED N = 2	100% (2)	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)	50% (1)	50% (1)

2) Findings on Values Personal Integrity: Emotional Control and Responsibility
B. PK-6: Individually, the CT assessed two (2) students at the *Emerging* level and one (1) student self-assessed at the *Emerging* level. The US assessed all students at the *Target* level.
SPED: Both SPED students were assessed at the *Target* level by the CTs, the US assessed one (1) student at the *Emerging* level, and one (1) student self-assessed at the *Emerging* Level.

2) Findings on Values Personal Integrity: Emotional Control and Responsibility
A. The aggregate mean for the PK-6 students by the CTs was at the Target level. The aggregate means by the US and Self-Assessment were below the *Target* level.

The aggregate means for the SPED students by the CTs were at the *Target* level and the aggregate means by the US and Self-Assessment was below the *Target* level.

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**		1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> While the data was received after our May 2018 department meeting, the SLO Report, with these findings, are shared with the department during the October 2018 meeting. 2) <u>Findings:</u> A. 100% of the PK-6 and SPED students rated their level of *Preparation* at the highest levels.
		Evaluation of Preparation Statement	**MDS PK-6 & SPED N = 11**	
		Determine the most ethically appropriate response to a situation.	100	
		Understand the major ethical dilemmas in your field.	100	
		Work as part of an effective team.	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 both programs: This was the second year of our new E-Portfolio rubric and first year with our newly revised TWS rubric. 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 to help mentor, support, and assess them.
    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. We are overall pleased with our results but will continue to monitor and discuss any needed and appropriate changes to help improve the individual student and overall group scores for each measurement outcome.

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

For both 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 and SPED students were assessed in a similar manner and those in which they were not.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements <u>for this year based on assessment of outcome:</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.

Appendices