

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.

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

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



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	Scholarship	Leadership	Service	Ethics
Mission				
Hallmarks				
Education	- demonstrate <i>knowledge</i> of learner	demonstrate <i>leadership</i> and	demonstrate a deep	demonstrate leadership and
Student	development, learning differences, and	collaboration by modeling	understanding of content and	collaboration by <i>modeling</i>
Learning	learning environments to help all	ethical behavior and	the ability to draw upon content	ethical behavior and professional
Outcomes	learners meet high standards and reach	professional responsibility	knowledge to support learners in	responsibility resulting in the
	their full potential.	resulting in the highest levels of	accessing information and	highest levels of learner
	- plan for and implement a variety of	learner achievement.	applying knowledge in real world	achievement.
	effective instructional strategies and		settings to assure mastery of	
	assessments in coordinated and engaging		content.	
	ways.			

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.

Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement:

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

	inplemented its plained improvements nom 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.	 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. 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. 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 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. 	 We revised the evidence needed for Link #2 for Standard #5. Feedback was positive, and scores indicated an increase in meeting proficiency. The professors teaching these courses used the newly revised rubric for assessing their assignment for Link #1 on Standard #5. 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 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.	 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. We will be requesting through LAC and UCIC that two education courses receive an INQ designation and one education receive a W-I designation. 	 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. 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:	DATE TO	CRITICAL ASSIGNMENT /	EVALUATIVE				
Teacher candidates will:	BE	PORFOLIO EVIDENCE TO BE	INSTRUMENT TO BE				
	ASSESSED	ASSESSED	ASSESSED				
1. demonstrate knowledge of learner development, learning	2019	Standard 5: Learning Environment	US/CT Final Evaluation				
differences, and learning environments to help all learners		"Behavior Plan with reflective essay or	Standard 5:				
meet high standards and reach their full potential.		classroom management philosophy and	Learning Environment				
Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker		application" ED349, E452					
InTASC Standards 1, 2, 3: Learner and Learning		Teacher Work Sample: Task #1: Contextual					
1. Learning Development; 2. Learning Differences;		Factors					
3. Learning Environments							
2. demonstrate a deep understanding of content and the	2019	Standard 1: Professional Knowledge	US/CT Final Evaluation				
ability to draw upon content knowledge to support learners		"Evidence of Content Knowledge"	Standard 1: Professional				
in accessing information and applying knowledge in real		ED339, ED359	Knowledge				
world settings to assure mastery of content.							
Conceptual Framework: Critical Thinker							
InTASC Standards 4, 5: Content							
4. Content Knowledge; 5. Application of Knowledge							
3. plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional	2018	Standard 2: Instructional Planning	US/CT Final Evaluation				
strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging		"Unit Plan" ED329, ED357	Standard 2: Instructional				
ways.		Standard 3: Instructional Delivery	Planning				
Conceptual Framework: Effective Practitioner		"Variety of Instructional Strategies"	Standard 3: Instructional				
InTASC Standards 6, 7, 8: Instruction		ED310, ED311, PSY341	Delivery				
6. Assessment; 7. Planning for Instruction;		Standard 4: Assessment of and for Student	Standard 4: Assessment of and				
8. Instructional Strategies		Learning: "Variety of assessments"	for Student Learning				
		ED310, ED358					
		<u>Teacher Work Sample:</u> Task #2, #3, #4, #5, and #6					
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling	2018	Standard 6: Professionalism	US/CT Final Evaluation				
ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in		"Community Outreach/Service Learning"	Standard 6: Professionalism				
the highest levels of learner achievement.		ED250					
Conceptual Framework: Caring Professional							
InTASC Standards: 9, 10: Professional Responsibility							
9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice;							
10: Leadership and Collaboration							



Outcomes Assessment 2017-2018

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 C Discuss the data collect	Analysis 1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.		
1. E-Portfolio	DEFINED –	Collection: Faculty	y members score	students' E-Portfol	ios at the end of	1) Analysis Process:
Standard:	Standard #2:	the fall and spring	semesters. The se	cores are averaged j	per student, by	During our May 2018
• Standard #2:	Evidence 1: Critical	licensure program	, and then by per	centage for each lev	vel of the rubric.	department meeting, we
Instructional	Assignment	Student scores are	submitted into a	Google doc, which	then gets	dedicated time to review
<u>Planning</u>	Unit Plan (ED 329; ED	downloaded into a	an Excel spreadsh	eet to disaggregate	the data by	the data as a whole and
The teacher	357).	program. Before g	. 0	1	then by licensure area to	
candidate plans	Evidence 2: Student	meets to review th			help identify trends and	
using the Virginia	Teaching	then shares out the	eir scoring to help	areas in need of attention.		
0 0	Lesson Plan	graders.		Based upon this data, we		
Standards of		Portfolio A		or Standards #2, a	#3, and #4	craft our action plan for
Learning, the	E-Portfolio Performance	Program	Standard #2	Standard #3	Standard #4	the next year.
school's	Rubric:	PK-6 N = 9	3.0	3.11	2.56	
curriculum,	4 = Evidence Exceeds	SPED N = 2	3.5	3.0	3.0	<u>2) Findings:</u>
effective strategies,	Expectations					A. Across all standards,
resources, (and	3 = Evidence Meets					both the PK-6 and SPED
data) to meet the	Expectations	Portfolio Aver	age Scores for Sta	ndard #2: Instructi	ional Planning	students earned the lowest
/	2 = Evidence Approaches					ratings on Standard #4.
needs of all	Expectations	Programs		Standard #	2	
students.	1 = Evidence Does Not				B. The aggregate means on	
	Meet Expectations	PK-6 N = 9		3.0		Standard #2 for PK-6 and
		51111 1 2 5.5			SPED students met or	
						exceeded the Level 3:
						Evidence Meets Expectations.



		0	es of Student	•		n E-Portfolio	
	Acceptable Level:	Standard ;	#2: Instruction	nal Planning			
• <u>Standard 3:</u>	Students are assessed on						C. For Standard # 2,
Instructional	their Critical Assignment				c Score		Individually, the SPED
Delivery	and on their E-Portfolio	Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	students earned a Level 3
Denvery	evidence from Student	PK-6	11% (1)	78% (7)	11% (1)	0% (0)	or Level 4 rating. One (1)
The teacher candidate	Teaching using a four (4)	N = 9					PK-6 student (11%)
effectively engages	column rubric; in which	SPED	50% (1)	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	received Level 2 Evidence
students in learning	level 3 "Evidence Meets	N = 2					Approaches Expectations,
by using a variety of	Expectations" is the	E-Portfolio P	erformance Rubrid	c :			which resulted in 89% of
instructional strategies	acceptable level of student	4 = Evidence	e Exceeds Exp	oectations			the group's evidence
in order to meet	performance. However,	3 = Evidence	e Meets Expec	ctations			meeting or exceeding
individual learning	students must receive an		ce Approaches	1			expectations.
needs.	overall grade of 2.75 on all	1 = Evidence	e Does Not M	eet Expectatio	ons		
1100003.	seven standards of the E-						_
	Portfolio so students may	Portfolio	Average Score	es for Standar	d #3: Instruct	ional Delivery	00 0
	receive ratings below a 3.0	D			0. 1.1/		Standard #3 for PK-6 and
	on a particular standard.	Programs			Standard #	Ŧ	SPED students met or
	Our department goal is	<i>PK-6</i> N = 9)		3.11		- exceeded the Level 3:
	that all students submit	SPED N =			<i>Evidence Meets Expectations.</i>		
	evidence that get assessed	SPED N -	- 2		3.0		J
	with: "Evidence Meets	Dercentag	es of Student	Scores by Ru	ubric Grade or	F Portfolio	
	Expectations."		#3: Instruction				
	Standard #3:	Standard	HJ. Instruction	nai Denvery			
	Evidence 1: Critical Assignment			Rubric	c Score		E. For Standard # 3,
	Variety of Instructional	Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	Individually, the SPED
	Strategies (ED 509)	PK-6	22%	67%	11%	0%	students both earned a
	Evidence 2: Student	N = 9	(2)	(6)	(1)	(0)	Level 3 rating. One (1) PK-
	Teaching	SPED	0%	100%	0%	0%	6 student (11%) received
	Video demonstration of	N = 2	(0)	(2)	(0)	(0)	Level 2 Evidence Approaches
	THREE (3) instructional	II					<i>Expectations</i> , which resulted
	strategies used with your						in 89% of the group's
	students (1-3 minutes each).						evidence meeting or
							exceeding expectations.



Learning(ED 310 and ED 358)LearningEvidence 2: StudentThe teacherEvidence 2: StudentcandidateTeaching(systematically gathers, analyzes, and) uses all relevant data toPK-6 N = 9SPED N = 2Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learn	andard #4 2.56 3.0	4
Learning(ED 310 and ED 358)LearningEvidence 2: StudentTeachingTeachingVariety of Assessments $FK-6 N = 9$ SystematicallySPED $N = 2$ and uses allPercentages of Student Scores by Rubricelevant data toStandard #4: Assessment of and for Learning	2.56	.
Evidence 2: StudentEvidence 2: StudentTeachingSystematicallySystematicallyVariety of AssessmentsPrecentages of Student Scores by RubricPercentages of Student Scores by RubricStandard #4: Assessment of and for Learn		
andidate andidate systematically athers, analyzes, nd) uses all elevant data toTeaching Nariety of Assessments $IROTV = 1$ 		
Systematically athers, analyzes, nd) uses all elevant data to Variety of Assessments Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learn	3.0	
gathers, analyzes, and) uses all velevant data to Percentages of Student Scores by Rubric Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learn		
nd) uses allPercentages of Student Scores by Rubricelevant data toStandard #4: Assessment of and for Learn		
elevant data to Standard #4: Assessment of and for Learn	Grade on	E-Portfol
		L-I oftion
neasure student		
cademic Rubric Sco	re	
rogress, guide Program 4.0 3.0	2.0	1.0
structional PK-6 11% 33%	56%	0%
<i>ntent and</i> $N = 9$ (1) (3)	(5)	(0)
livery methods SPED 50% 0%	50%	0%
and provide $N=2$ (1) (0)	(1)	(0)
mely feedback		
o students).		
E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:		
4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations		
This is direct $3 = $ Evidence Meets Expectations		
measure 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations		
1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations		

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.



2. Teacher Work	DEFINED –			bers score Teacher Wo		
Sample (TWS)	Standard #2: The teacher		submit the assig			
	sets significant,		of their student to			
<u>Standard #2:</u>	challenging, varied and			d by the student teacher		
Learning Goals	appropriate learning			student teacher scores i		
and Objectives	goals/objectives.		0	ided into an Excel sprea	dsheet to disagg	, 0
		the data	by program.			help identify trends an
Standard #3:	Standard #3: The teacher		TWS Standard	s #2, #3, #4, #5, and	#6 by Program	areas in need of attent
Assessment Plan	uses multiple assessment		tandard	PK-6 N = 5	SPED N	= 2 Based upon this data,
0. 1 1 44	modes and approaches		2	3.53	3.50	craft our action plan f
<u>Standard #4:</u> Instructional	aligned with learning		3	3.68	3.20	the next year.
	goals/objectives to assess		4	3.33	3.50	2) Eindingen
Decision-Making	student learning before, during and after		5	3.35	3.13	<u>2) Findings:</u> A. The aggregate mean
Standard #5:	instruction.		6	3.13	2.83	for all Standards for b
Design for	instruction.				•	groups were above the
Instruction	Standard #4: The teacher					Proficient level except
mstruction	uses on-going analysis of			k Sample Scores by Pr		Standard #6 for the S
Standard #6:	student learning to make		Standard #2:	Learning Goals and C	bjectives	students.
Analysis of	instructional decisions.		Program	Average Score for S	tandard #2	
Student Learning			PK-6			
This is a Direct	Standard #5: The teacher		N = 5	3.53		B. The aggregate mean
Measure	designs instruction for		SPED			Standard #2 for PK-6
	specific learning		N = 2	3.50		SPED were above the
	goals/objectives, student					Level 3: Proficient.
	characteristics and needs,	TWO D	1	1		
	and learning contexts.		abric Scoring Sca	ale:		
		1 = 0na 2 = Dev	cceptable			
	<u>Standards #6:</u> The	2 = Dev 3 = Prof				
	teacher uses assessment					
	data to profile student	4 = Exert	mpiary			
	learning and communicate					
	information about student					
	progress and achievement.					



TWS Star	ndard #2: Learnin			
Indicator		PK-6	SPED	C. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for
2.4.01	01 11 1	N = 5	N = 2	Standard #2, 100% of the
	Challenge and	Mean	Mean	PK-6 students earned a 3
		3.60	3.0	or higher on Indicator #2.1 and #2.2. One (1)
4.0 Rating		60% (3)	0% (0)	PK-6 student did not meet
3.0 Rating		40% (2)	100% (2)	Indicator 2.3, which
2.0 Rating		0% (0)	0% (0)	resulted in 80% of the
	ess	Mean	Mean	group meeting that
For Students		3.60	3.50	Indicator.
0			1 1	SPED: Individually, the
0				SPED students earned a 3
0		0% (0)	0% (0)	or 4 on all three Indicators.
	ith State and/or	Mean	Mean	
Local Standards		3.40	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	
Togobor Work	Sampla Saaras by	Program for St	andard #3.	D. The aggregate means on Standard #3 for PK-6
		i iografii ior sta	and πJ .	and SPED were above the Level 3: <i>Proficient</i> .
Program		Level 5. Frojuleni.		
PK-6 N = 5 3.68				
SPED $N = 2$				
	Indicator2.1 Significance, Variety4.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 RatingProgramProgramPK-6 N = 5	Indicator2.1 Significance, Challenge and Variety4.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.2 Appropriateness For Students4.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating3.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 Rating2.0 RatingProgramProgramAverage $PK-6 N = 5$	IndicatorPK-6 N = 52.1 Significance, Challenge and VarietyMean 3.604.0 Rating 60% (3)3.0 Rating 40% (2)2.0 Rating 0% (0)2.2 AppropriatenessMean For StudentsFor Students3.604.0 Rating 60% (3)3.0 Rating 0% (0)2.2 AppropriatenessMean G0\% (3)For Students3.604.0 Rating 0% (0)2.3 Alignment with State and/or Local StandardsMean 3.404.0 Rating 0% (0)2.0 Rating 0% (0)2.0 Rating 0% (1)Mean Overall3.53Teacher Work Sample Scores by Program for Sta Assessment Plan Program ProgramPK-6 N = 53.68	N = 5 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) 4.0 Rating 60% (3) 50% (1) 3.0 Rating 40% (2) 50% (1) 3.0 Rating 60% (2) 50% (1) 2.0 Rating 0% (0) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 0% (0) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 0% (0) 0% (0) 4.0 Rating 80% (4) 100% (2) 3.0 Rating 0% (0) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 0% (1) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 0% (1) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 20% (1) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 20% (1) 0% (0) 2.0 Rating 20



	TWS Standard 3:	Assessment Plan	n	
	Indicator	PK-6 N = 5	SPED N = 2	E. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually,
<u>Standard #3</u> : The teacher uses multiple assessment modes and approaches	3.1 Alignment of pre/post assessments with Learning Goals/Objectives	Mean 3.8	Mean 3.5	100% of the PK-6 students earned a 3 or higher on all five Indicators.
aligned with learning	4.0 Rating	80% (4)	50% (1)	<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the
goals/objectives to assess	3.0 Rating	20% (1)	50% (1)	SPED students earned a 3
student learning before,	2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	or 4 on all five Indicators.
during and after instruction.	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)	41
	3.0 Rating	20% (1)	100% (2)	4
	2.0 Rating Mean Overall – Standard 3	0% (0) 3.68	0% (0) 3.2	41
	Mican Overall – Standard 5	3.08	3.2	J



Standard #4: The teacher	Teacher Work S Instructional De				
uses on-going analysis of	Program	Average S	Score for Standa	rd #4	F. The aggregate means on
student learning to make instructional decisions.	PK-6 N = 5	PK-6 N = 5 3.33			Standard #4 for PK-6 and
instructional decisions.	SPED N = 2		3.50		SPED were above the Level 3: <i>Proficient</i> .
		ndard #4: Instructi		U	
	Indicator		PK-6 N = 5	$\frac{\text{SPED}}{\text{N}=2}$	
	4.1 Pre-Assessme	nt Analysis	Mean 3.2	Mean 3.5	G. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually, 100% of the PK-6 students
	4.0 Rating		40% (2)	50% (1)	earned a 3 or higher on all
	3.0 Rating		40% (2)	50% (1)	two (2) Indicators. One student earned a Level 2
	2.0 Rating		20% (1)	0% (0)	rating on Indicator 4.1,
	4.2 Sound Profess /Pedagogy	sional Practice	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.5	resulting in 80% of that group meeting or exceeding Indicator 4.1.
	4.0 Rating		40% (2)	50% (1)	<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the
	3.0 Rating		60% (3)	50% (1)	SPED students earned a 3
	2.0 Rating		0% (0)	0% (0)	or 4 on all three Indicators.
	4.3 Modifications Adjustments Bas Student Learning	ed on Analysis of	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	



specific learning goals/objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts. $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Standard #5: The teacher designs instruction for	Teacher Work S Design for Instr	ample Scores by Program for Standard #5: uction	
characteristics and needs, $PK-6 N = 5$ 3.35 SPED were above the	goals/objectives, student		Average Score for Standard #5	H. The aggregate means on Standard #5 for PK-6 and
and learning contexts. SPED N = 2 3.13	characteristics and needs,		3.35	SPED were above the
	and learning contexts.	SPED N = 2	3.13	Level 3: Proficient.



Standard #5: The teacher	TWS Standard #5: Design			
designs instruction for	Indicator	PK-6	SPED	
specific learning		N = 5	N = 2	
goals/objectives, student	5.1 Alignment with Learning	Mean	Mean	I. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually on
characteristics and needs,	Goals/Objectives and Lesson Structure/Sequencing	3.2	3.0	Standard #5, 100% of the
and learning contexts.	4.0 Rating	400/ (2)	097 (0)	PK-6 students earned a 3
		40% (2)	0% (0)	or higher on Indicator 5.2
	3.0 Rating	40% (2)	100% (2)	and 5.3. One (1) PK-6
	2.0 Rating	20% (1)	0% (0)	student (the same student) earned a 2 on Indicator 5.1
	5.2 Accurate Representation of Content	Mean	Mean	and 5.4.
		3.4	3.0	<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the
	4.0 Rating	40% (2)	0% (0)	SPED students earned a 3
	3.0 Rating	60% (3)	100% (2)	or 4 on all four Indicators.
	2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	5.3 Use of a Variety of Instructional		N	
	Strategies, Activities, Resources and	Mean 3.6	Mean 3.0	
	Reflections	5.0	5.0	
	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	Mean	Mean	
	Adaptations/Ways to Differentiate Learning	3.2	3.5	
	4.0 Rating	400/ (2)	E00((1)	
	0	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:Theteacher uses assessmentdata to profile studentlearning and communicateinformation about studentprogress 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	$\frac{\text{SPED}}{\text{N}=2}$					
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. <u>PK-6</u>: 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. <u>SPED</u>: 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	DEFINED –	Collection: Cooper	ating Teachers an	d University Sur	ervisors completed	1) Analysis Process:		
Teacher (CT),	Standard #2: Assesses		an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017					
University	students in four areas		and spring 2018. Data was collected through Google Docs and then					
Supervisor (US),	within this standard which	analyzed in Excel. 7	The scores below	are averaged by l	icensure program	dedicated time to review		
and Self-	are aligned with specific	for the 2017-18 aca			1 0	the data as a whole and		
Assessment	VDOE Performance					then by licensure area to		
Evaluations	Standard Indicators:	PK-	6: FOR ALL ST	ANDARDS (N	= 9)	help identify trends and		
	2.1 Uses student learning data	Standard	СТ	US	SELF $(N = 8)$	areas in need of attention.		
Performance	to guide planning.	2	3.11	3.08	3.50	Based upon this data, we		
Standard #2:		3	3.14	3.29	3.58	craft our action plan for		
Instructional	2.2 Plans time realistically for	4	3.15	2.97	3.41	the next year.		
Planning	pacing, content mastery, and							
	transitions.	SPEI	D: FOR ALL ST	ANDARDS (N	= 2)	2) <u>Findings:</u>		
Performance		Standard	СТ	US	SELF	A. Aggregated means for		
Standard #3:	2.3 Plans for differentiated	2	3.88	3.13	3.63	PK-6 and SPED students		
Instructional	instruction.	3	3.70	3.40	3.50	on Standards #2, #3, and		
Delivery		4	3.75	3.25	3.63	#4 by the Cooperating		
	2.4 Aligns lesson objectives to					Teachers, University		
<u>Standard #4:</u>	the school's curriculum,					Supervisors, and self-		
Assessment of	assessments, and student					assessment were above the		
and for Learning	learning needs.	St	andard 2: Instru	ctional Plannin	g	<i>Proficient</i> level, except for		
This is a direct	They are assessed using a	Program	СТ	US	Self (N = 8 PK-6)	one area. The PK-6 aggregate mean on Standard #4 fell below the		
measure.	four-column rubric, in which level 3 <i>Proficient</i> is the acceptable level of	PK-6 N = 9	3.11	3.08	3.50	<i>Proficient</i> Level (2.97).		
	performance.	SPED $N = 2$	3.88	3.13	3.63	B. The aggregate mean on Standard #2 for PK-6 and		
	Rubric Performance Rubric: 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable	1 2	<i>ubric:</i> = Developing = Unacceptable			SPED was above Level 3: <i>Proficient</i> .		



' Arlington, Virg	ginia							
		STANDARD 2: INSTRUCTIONAL				C. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for		
	Rubric Performance Rubric:		plans using the Virginia Standards of Learning, the school's curriculum, effective					
	4 = Exemplary		strategies, resources, (and data) to meet the needs of all students.					
	3 = Proficient	for MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT);	earned a Level 3 or higher					
	2 = Developing	T 1'	OT	TIO	0.10	on Indicators 2.1 and 2.3		
	1 = Unacceptable	Indicator	CT	US	Self	by their CTs. Students		
	-	2.1 Uses student learning data to	Mean	Mean	Mean	earned a Level 3 or higher		
		guide planning.	3.2	2.89	3.50	on Indicators 2.2 and 2.4		
		4.0 Rating	22% (2)	0%	50% (4)	by their US. Students self-		
		3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	50% (4)	assessed themselves at a		
		2.0 Rating	0% (0)	11% (1)	0% (0)	Level 3 or higher on		
		2.2 Plans time realistically for	Mean	Mean	Mean	Indicators 2.1, 2.3, and 2.4.		
		pacing, content mastery, and	3.0	3.11	3.38			
		transitions.						
		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	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		instruction.	3.1	3.00	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			
			3.11	3.08	3.50			



	UG SPED N=2IndicatorCTUS				
1 - Onacceptable 2.1 Us	ses student learning data ide planning.	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.0	Mean 3.0	
4.0 Rz	ating	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
3.0 Rz	ating	50% (1)	100% (2)	100% (2	
2.0 Ra	ating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
pacin	ans time realistically for g, content mastery, and itions.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.5	
4.0 Ra	ating	100% (2)	50% (1)	50% (1)	
3.0 Rz	ating	0% (0)	50% (1)	50% (1)	
2.0 Ra	ating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	ans for differentiated action.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.0	Mean 4.0	
4.0 Ra	ating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2	
3.0 Ra	ating	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)	
2.0 Ra	ating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
the so assess	ligns lesson objectives to chool's curriculum, sments, and student ing needs.	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.0	Mean 4.0	
4.0 Rz	ating	100% (2)	0% (0)	100% (2	
3.0 Rz	0	0% (0)	100% (2)	0% (0)	
2.0 Rz	ating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	
	RALL MEAN SCORE STANDARD	3.88	3.13	3.63	

<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the SPED students earned a Level 3 or higher on all four Indicators by their CTs, US, and selfassessment.



Rubric Performance Rubric: $4 = Exemplary$	Stand	ard 3: Instruct	ional Delivery		D. The aggregate mean on
3 = Proficient 2 = Developing	Program	СТ	US	Self	Standard #3 for PK-6 and SPED was above Level 3:
1 = Unacceptable	PK-6 N = 9	3.14	3.29	3.58	<i>Proficient</i> as assessed by the CTs, US, and self-
	SPED $N=2$	3.70	3.40	3.50	assessment.



Artington, virginia	Rubric Performance Rubric:	STANDARD 3 INSTRUCTIONAL effectively engages students in learning by usin order to meet individual learning needs.	ıg a variety of i	nstructional str		E. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually for
	4 = Exemplary	for MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT)				Standard #3, students
	3 = Proficient	Indicator	СТ	US	Self	earned a Level 3 or higher
	2 = Developing	3.1 Engages and maintains	Mean	Mean	Mean	on Indicators 3.2, 3.3, and
	1 = Unacceptable	students in active learning.	3.0	3.33	3.63	3.6 by their CTs. Students
		4.0 Rating	11 % (1)	33% (3)	63% (5)	earned a Level 3 or higher
		3.0 Rating	78% (7)	67% (6)	37% (3)	on Indicators 3.1, 3.2, and
		2.0 Rating	11% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	3.6 by their US. Students
		3.2 Builds upon students'	Mean	Mean	Mean	self-assessed themselves at
		existing knowledge and skills.	3.2	3.11	3.5	
		4.0 Rating	22% (2)	11% (1)	63% (5)	a Level 3 or higher on
		3.0 Rating	78% (7)	89% (8)	24% (2)	Indicators 3.1, 3.3, 3.5, and
		2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	13% (1)	3.6.
		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	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		instructional strategies.	3.1	3.56	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	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		and resources to enhance student learning.	3.3	3.44	3.75	
		4.0 Rating	33% (3)	44% (4)	76% (6)	
		3.0 Rating	67% (6)	54% (5)	24% (2)	
		OVERALL Mean Score FOR	3.14	3.29	3.58	
		STANDARD				



	Arlington, Virginia								
			STANDARD 3 INSTRUCTIONAL DELIVERY: The teacher candidate						
	Rubric Performance Rubric:		effectively engages students in learning by using a variety of instructional strategies in order						
	4 = Exemplary	to meet individual learning needs.	SPED: Individually, the						
	3 = Proficient	UG SPED N=2	SPED students earned a						
	2 = Developing	Indicator	СТ	US	Self	Level 3 or higher on all			
	1 = Unacceptable	3.1 Engages and maintains	Mean	4.0	4.0	four Indicators by their			
	r – Onacceptable	students in active learning.	3.5	4.0	4.0	CTs, US, and self-			
		4.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	100% (2)	assessment except for one			
		3.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	student who self-assessed			
		2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)				
		3.2 Builds upon students'	Mean	Mean	Mean	at Level 2 for Indicator 3.6.			
		existing knowledge and skills.	3.5	3.0	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	Mean	Mean	Mean				
		meet the students' needs.	4.0	3.0	4.0				
			4.0	5.0	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	Mean	Mean	Mean				
		instructional strategies.	4.0	3.5	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	Mean	Mean	Mean				
		student learning.	3.5	3.5	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	3.70	3.40	3.50				
		FOR STANDARD							
L									



Arlington, Virginia					
Rubric Performance Rubric:	Standard 4	: Assessment o	f and for Lear	ning	_
4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient	Program	СТ	US	Self	F. The aggregate mean on
2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable	PK-6 <i>N</i> = 9	3.15	2.97	3.41	 Standard #4 for PK-6 and SPED was above Level 3: <i>Proficient</i> as assessed by the
	SPED $N=2$	3.75	3.25	3.63	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	СТ	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. <u>PK-6:</u> 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 selfassessed themselves at a Level 3 or higher on Indicators 4.1, 4.4, and 4.7. One (1) student selfassessed themselves at Level 2 for Indicator 4.3.



Artington, Virginia	Rubric Performance Rubric: 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing	STANDARD 4 ASSESSMENT OF A teacher candidate systematically gathers, analyz student academic progress, guide instructional co timely feedback to students and/or parents. UG SPED N=2	<u>SPED:</u> Individually, the SPED students earned a			
	1 = Unacceptable	Indicator	СТ	US	Self	Level 3 or higher on all
		4.1. Uses assessment data (pre-, formative, and summative) to inform and guide instruction.	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.0	Mean 3.5	four Indicators by their CTs, US, and self-
		4.0 Rating	50% (1)	0% (0)	50% (1)	assessment except for one
		3.0 Rating	50% (1)	100% (2)	50% (1)	student who self-assessed at Level 2 for Indicator 4.3.
		2.0 Rating	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	at Level 2 for indicator 4.3.
		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	



Arlington, Virginia									
4. Cooperating	DEFINED: <i>The teacher</i>			rating Teach					1) Analysis Process:
Teacher (CT),	candidate VALUES	an evalua	n evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2017						During our May 2018
University	LEARNING: Class	and sprin	ng 2018. S	tudents con	npleted a	self-assessn	nent on the	same	department meeting, we
Supervisor (US),	Preparation	instrume	nt. Data v	vas collected	l th <mark>r</mark> ough	Google Do	ocs and the	n analyzed	dedicated time to review
and Self-	Target: (T)	in Excel.	The scor	es below are	e averageo	l by licensu	re program	for the	the data as a whole and
Assessment	Lessons or assignments	2017-18	academic	year.					then by licensure area to
Evaluations on	are completed on time,			-					help identify trends and
the "Candidate	accurately, and are of high	By Pro	oram: M	ean Averag	es of Rat	ings on Di	isposition	Values	areas in need of attention.
Dispositions	quality. Shows a desire to			Preparatio			opoornoin	1 41 47 6 5	Based upon this data, we
Rubric:	pursue the intended	Progr	0	СТ		US	SELF (N	=8: PK-6)	crafted our action plan for
The teacher	learning at a deep level.	PK-6 N		2.67		2.67	· · · ·	.63	the next year.
candidate	Work shows evidence of	SPED I		3.0		2.0		.50	
VALUES	personal reflection and			5.0		2.0	2	.50	<u>2) Findings:</u>
LEARNING:	revision. Uses an array of								A. The aggregate means
Class Preparation	quality resources to add to								for the PK-6 and SPED
	the breadth and depth of	By Pro	aram. Pe	rcentage of	fRating	on Dispos	sition Val	1166	students by the CTs, US,
	the work.	•	0	Preparatio	0		5111011, Vai	ucs	and Self-Assessment were
This is an indirect	Emerging: (E)	PR	0	TT TT		US	SELE (N	=8: PK-6)	below the <i>Target</i> level,
measure	Lessons or assignments		,			00		0.11(0)	except for the CT scores
	are completed on time		Т	Е	Т	Е	Т	Е	for the SPED students.
	and accurately. Work	DIZ (
	shows basic grasp of the	PK-6 N = 9	67%	33%	67%	33%	62%	38%	B. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually, the
	intended purpose. Makes		(6)	(3)	(6)	(3)	(5)	(3)	scores across all three
	use of resources provided	SPED	100%	0%	0%	100%	50%	50%	groups were very similar
	to complete work.	N = 2	(1)	(0)	(0)	(2)	(1)	(1)	with approximately 67%
	<u>Unsatisfactory (U)</u>								meeting Target.
	Lessons or assignments								SPED: Both SPED
	are incomplete or late.								students were assessed at
	Uses personal knowledge								the <i>Emerging</i> Level while
	rather than resources to								one (1) self-assessed at
	complete work.								<i>Emerging</i> . The CT assessed
									both at the Target Level.



The teacher	DEFINED: <i>The teacher</i>								C. The aggregate means for
candidate	candidate VALUES		By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition: Values					the PK-6 students by the	
VALUES	LEARNING: In-Class	Learni	Learning: In-Class Performance					US and Self-Assessment	
LEARNING:	Performance	Pro	gram	СТ		US	SEI	LF N =8	were at the <i>Target</i> level and
In-Class	<u>Target: (T)</u> Displays aparentia	PK-6 N	J = 9	2.89)	3.0		3.0	the aggregate mean by the
Performance	Displays energetic,	SPED I	N=2	3.0		2.50		3.0	CTs was below the <i>Target</i>
	positive, and supportive behaviors that result in								☐ level.
									The aggregate means for
	engaged teaching and learning. Shows initiative								the SPED students by the
	and is able to apply								CTs and Self-Assessment
	knowledge to new								were at the <i>Target</i> level and
	situations and makes	By Pro	gram: Per	rcentage o	of Ratings	s on Dispo	sition: Val	ues	the aggregate mean by the
	connections with previous	Learni	ng: In-Cla	ass Perform	mance				US was below the <i>Target</i>
	learning.	PR	C	Т	т	JS	Self I	VI - 0	level.
	icurring.			, 1		5	3011 I	N = 0	D. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually, only
	Emerging: (E)		Т	Е	Т	Е	Т	Е	one (1) student received
	Displays supportive	PK-6	89%	11%	100%	0%	100%	0%	<i>Emerging</i> across all three
	behaviors that result in	N = 9	(8)	(1)	(9)	(0)	(8)	(0)	groups.
	appropriate teaching and	SPED	100%	0%	50%	50%	100%	0%	<u>SPED:</u> Individually, only
	learning. Some lack of	N = 2	(2)	(0)	(1)	(1)	(2)	(0)	one (1) student was
	initiative or inability to								assessed at the <i>Emerging</i>
	apply knowledge to new								level, which was by the US.
	situations.								
	<u>Unsatisfactory (U)</u>								
	Inattentive in the								
	classroom, which								
	contributes to a lack of								
	teaching and learning.								

WARYMOUN UNIVERSIT Arlington, Virginia				
5. 2017-18	DEFINED: Responses			1) Analysis Process:
Graduating	on a 5-point scale: 1	Percentage of Students Rated "Go	od" or "Excellent"	While the data was
Student Survey -	(Poor) to 5 (Excellent)			received after our May
Evaluation of			MDS PK-6 & SPED	2018 department
Preparation		Statement	N = 11	meeting, the Student
Alumni survey				Learning Outcome
				Report, with these
		Succeed in a job in your field	100	findings, are shared with
				the department during
This is an indirect		Apply knowledge and skills to new	100	the October 2018
measure		situations.		meeting.
		Solve problems in your field using	100	
		your knowledge and skills.		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
L				program.

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)

MADVMOUNT

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 relative to assessment of outcome:

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 for this year based on assessment of outcome:

- 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.

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.	Disci	Data Collection uss 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	DEFINED –	Collection: Faculty	members score students' E-Portfolios at the	1) Analysis Process:
Standard:	Standard #6:		spring semesters. The scores are averaged per	During our May 2018
Standard 6:	Evidence 1: Service		e program, and then by percentage for each	department meeting,
Professionalism	Learning/Community	level of the rubric.	Student scores are submitted into a Google	we dedicated time to
	Outreach	doc, which then get	s downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to	review the data as a
• This is direct	Evidence 2: Student	disaggregate the dat	a by program. Before grading each semester's	whole and then by
measure	Teaching	E-Portfolios, our de	epartment meets to review the rubric, scores	licensure area to help
	Professional	sample student wor	k individually, and then shares out their	identify trends and
	development and	scoring to help prov	vide inter-reliability among graders.	areas in need of
	application to			attention. Based upon
	teaching in a one-page	Portfolio Average	e Scores for Standard #6: Professionalism	this data, we crafted
	reflection.			our action plan for the
		Programs	Standard #6	next year.
	Acceptable Level:	PK-6 N = 9	3.0	
	Students are assessed	SPED $N = 2$	3.5	<u>2). Findings</u> :
	on their Critical	E-Portfolio Perform	nance Rubric:	A. The aggregate
	Assignment and on	4 = Evidence Exce	eds Expectations	means on Standard #6
	their E-Portfolio	3 = Evidence Meet		for PK-6 and SPED
	evidence using a four-	2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations		students met or
	column rubric; in		Not Meet Expectations	exceeded the Level 3:
	which level 3 "Evidence		1	Evidence Meets
	Meets Expectations" is			Expectations.



Arlington, Virginia	I						
	the target level of						
	student performance.						
		Percentag	ges of Studen	t Scores by]	Rubric Grade	e on E-	
		Portfolio	Standard #6:	Professiona	ılism		
							B. For Standard # 6,
				Rubrid	c Score		individually, the SPED
		Program	4.0	3.0	2.0	1.0	students earned a
		PK-6	22%	56%	22%	0%	Level 3 or Level 4
		N = 9	(2)	(5)	(2)	(0)	rating. Two (2) PK-6
		SPED	50%	50%	0%	0%	students (22%)
							received Level 2
		N = 2	(1)	(1)	(0)	(0)	Evidence Approaches
							Expectations, which
			Performance				resulted in 78% of the
		4 = Evident	ce Exceeds E	xpectations			
		3 = Evident	ce Meets Exp	ectations			group's evidence
		2 = Eviden	ce Approache	s Expectation	15		meeting or exceeding
			ce Does Not				expectations.
				1			



Arlington, Virginia			
2.Cooperating	DEFINED –	Collection: Co	operati
Teacher (CT),	Standard #6: Assesses	completed an e	valuatio
University	students in three areas	internship in fal	ll 2017
Supervisor (US),	within this standard	through Google	e Docs
and Self-	which are aligned with	below are avera	ged by
Assessment	specific VDOE	academic year.	
Evaluations on	Performance Standard		
Performance	Indicators:		Stand
Standard #6:	6.1 Collaborates and	Program	6
Professionalism	communicates effectively	U	
The teacher	within the school	PK-6	2
candidate maintains	community to promote	N = 9	3.
a commitment to	students' well-being and	SPED	
professional ethics,	success.	N = 2	4
communicates	6.2 Adheres to federal	Rubric Performan	ce Rubr
effectively, and takes	and state laws, school	4 = Exemplary	
responsibility for	policies and ethical	3 = Proficient	1 =
and participates in	guidelines.		
professional growth that results in	6.4 Sets goals for		
enhanced student	improvement of knowledge		
	and skills		
learning.			
This is a direct			
measure.			
	They are assessed		
	using a four-column		
	rubric, in which level		
	3 Proficient is the		
	acceptable level of		
	performance.		
	r		

ting Teachers and University Supervisors ion at the end of the student teaching and spring 2018. Data was collected s and then analyzed in Excel. The scores y licensure program for the 2017-18

Standard 6: Professionalism									
Program	CT	US	Self PK-6 (N = 8)						
PK-6 N = 9	3.30	3.59	3.71						
$\frac{\text{SPED}}{\text{N}=2}$	4.0	3.17	3.33						

pric:

Developing

= 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 and SPED was above Level 3: Proficient as assessed by the CTs, US, and selfassessment, except that 100% of the SPED students were assessed at Exemplary by the CT.



Arlington, Virginia						0 000 0 0 0 0 0		
		STANDARD 6: PROFESSIONAL				B. <u>PK-6:</u> Individually		
	Rubric Performance	maintains a commitment to professional ethics, communicates effectively, and takes for Standard #6, 100%						
	Rubric:	responsibility for and participates in profess	ional growth i	that results in	e enhanced	of the students earned		
	4 = Exemplary	student learning. level 3 or higher on all						
	3 = Proficient	MDS PK-6 Students N= 9 (CT); N				three Indicators by		
	2 = Developing	Indicator	СТ	US	Self	their CTs and US. One		
	1 = Unacceptable	6.1 Collaborates and				(1) student self-		
	i onacceptable	communicates effectively within	Mean	Mean Mean 3.3 3.56	Mean	assessed Indicator 6.1 at the <i>Developing</i> level.		
		the school community to	3.3		3.50			
		promote students' well-being	5.5	5.50	5.50			
		and success.						
		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	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		laws, school policies and ethical	3.4		4.00			
		guidelines.	5.4	5.70				
		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	Mean	Mean	Mean			
		of knowledge and skills	3.2	3.44	3.63			
		_	5.2	3.44	5.05			
		4.0 Rating	22% (2)	44% (4)	63% (5)			
		3.0 Rating	78% (7)	56% (5)	37% (3)			
		OVERALL Mean Score FOR	3.3	3.59	3.71			
		STANDARD						



Arlington, Virginia						
	Rubric Performance					
	Rubric:	maintains a commitment to professional ethics,	SPED: Individually,			
	4 = Exemplary	takes responsibility for and participates in profe	essional gron	th that resu	lts in	100% of the students
	3 = Proficient	enhanced student learning.				earned level 3 or
	2 = Developing					higher on all three
	1 = Unacceptable	UG SPED N=2	Indicators by their			
		Indicator		US	Self	CTs, US, and self-
		6.1 Collaborates and communicates				
		effectively within the school	Mean	Mean	Mean	assessment.
		community to promote students'	4.0	3.0	4.0	
		well-being and success.				
		4.0 Rating	100%	0%	100%	
			(2)	(0)	(2)	
		3.0 Rating	0%	100%	0%	
			(0)	(2)	(0)	
		2.0 Rating	0%	0%	0%	
			(0)	(0)	(0)	
		6.2 Adheres to federal and state				
		laws, school policies and ethical	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		guidelines.	4.0	3.5	4.0	
		0	100%	50%	100%	
		4.0 Rating				
		20 D .:	(2)	(1)	(2)	
		3.0 Rating	0%	50%	0%	
			(0)	(1)	(0)	
		6.4 Sets goals for improvement of	Mean	Mean	Mean	
		knowledge and skills	4.0	3.5	3.5	
			1000/	500/	E00/	
		4.0 Rating	100%	50%	50%	
			(2)	(1)	(1)	
		3.0 Rating	0%	50%	50%	
			(0)	(1)	(1)	
		OVERALL MEAN SCORE FOR	4.0	3.33	3.83	
		STANDARD				



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, problemsolving 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. <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 selfassessment 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 Collaboration: Group Work/Collaborative LearningProgramCTUSSELF (PK-6: N = 8)

Tiogram	CI	05	51211° (1 K-0. IV = 0
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	С	Т	JS	Self (PK-6: =8)			
	Т	Е	Т	Е	Т	Е		
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)		
<u>2)</u> Findi	ngs on Va	lues Colla	boration:					

B. <u>PK-6</u>: 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. <u>SPED</u>: 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.

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 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 Program Target: (T) PK-6 N = 9Consistently uses correct oral and written SPED N=2communication. 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. the *Emerging* Level.

By Program: Mean Averages of Ratings on Disposition:
Values Professionalism: CommunicationProgramCTUSSELFN = 8PK-6 N = 92.892.782.88SPED N= 23.02.503.0

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

PR	СТ		US		Self N =8	
	Т	Е	Т	Е	Т	Е
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 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.

<u>2) Findings on Values Professionalism: Communication</u>
B. <u>PK-6:</u> 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.

<u>SPED</u>: 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.



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.

	of Ratings on D notional Contro	-	
Program	СТ	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	СТ		US		Self N =8	
		Т	Е	Т	Е	Т	Е
	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. <u>PK-6</u>: 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. <u>SPED</u>: 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 <u>Personal Integrity:</u> <u>Emotional Control and</u> <u>Responsibility</u> 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	DEFINED: Students responded to the <i>Evaluation of Preparation</i> statements on a scale 1 (Poor) to 5 (Excellent).	Percentage of Students Who their Evaluation of Preparatio	1) <u>Analysis Process:</u> While the data was received after our May 2018		
Preparation Alumni survey		Evaluation of Preparation Statement	MDS PK-6 & SPED N = 11	department meeting, the SLO Report, with these findings,	
This is an indirect measure		Determine the most ethically appropriate response to a situation.	100	are shared with the department during the October 2018	
		Understand the major ethical dilemmas in your field.	100	meeting.	
		Work as part of an effective team.	100	2) <u>Findings:</u> A. 100% of the PK-6 and SPED students	
				rated their level of <i>Preparation</i> at the highest levels.	

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 relative to assessment of outcome:



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 for this year based on assessment of outcome:

- 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.