

## STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

**PROGRAM: Education: Combined Programs (M.Ed.)** [Education – Elementary Education, PK-6 (M.Ed.); Education; Education – Secondary Education, Grades 6-12 (M.Ed.); Education – Special Education, Grades K-12 (M.Ed.)]

**SUBMITTED BY: Jessica Lewis and Lisa Turissini**

**DATE: 9/2019**

### Executive Summary: Description of Assessment Process

List *all* of the program’s learning outcomes, as of the assessment year’s catalog: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

Learning Outcome	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year (Y=Yes)	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	Y	2021 Planning on revising
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	Y	2021 Planning on revising
3. plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.	2018	X	2020 Planning on revising
4. demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.	2018	X	2020 Planning on revising

Provide a **brief** description of the assessment process used including how results are shared and discussed and strengths, challenges, and planned improvements to the **process**, providing evidence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment. If there is something that is impeding your ability to implement improvements, please comment on those issues (generally not more than two paragraphs, may use bullet points):

- Our department collects, analyzes, and discusses data collected from multiple measures. Two major points in which data is collected is at the end of the fall and spring semesters in which our teacher candidates complete their program with student teaching. Data is collected from the following: E-Portfolio and Student Teacher Summative Instrument.
- 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. 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. Faculty who are most clearly tied to the program area work to plan program improvements for the following year.

**Planned Improvement:**

- Our next planned improvement to the process of assessment is to **revise our Student Learner Outcomes** for next year to make them more succinct, measurable, and actionable. Previously, we created our SLOs based upon the national INTASC standards for teacher educators and teachers. While we still ground our program’s performance standards and performance assessments in the national and state standards, we will revise our SLO’s to avoid trying to encompass too many objectives and therefore avoid trying to measure and assess all of the data that we collect on our teacher candidates.

- 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 annual federal Title II Report, annual CAEP Report, and the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE) Bi-annual Report ensure 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 and our self-study report is due in January 2020. Depending upon the feedback we receive from CAEP, our programs will need to revise or implement additional actionable items.

### Closing the Loop: Progress on Planned Improvements from Prior Year

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

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p><b>Teacher candidates will plan for and implement a variety of effective instructional strategies and assessments in coordinated and engaging ways.</b></p>	<p><b>ALL PROGRAMS:</b> An effective assessment process needs to ensure that the instruments used to collect the data to be analyzed is valid and reliable. With our on-going efforts to ensure that the data collected is effective, we will:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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 assessment.</li> </ol> <p><b>PK-6 Elementary:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Since Standard #2 was the weakest in both the E-Portfolio and the Summative Evaluation conducted by the Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors, we will have our elementary methods course professors discuss how their expectations for lesson planning to help ensure that all PK-6 in all five of the methods courses will have similar requirements and expectations on what effective instructional planning looks at the Target Level.</li> <li>2. On the summative evaluation, Standard #2 was also the weakest. During our training sessions with our University Supervisors, we will discuss what their requirements are for this standard</li> </ol>	<p><b>ALL PROGRAMS:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our department conducted two training sessions on students' evidence uploaded to their E-Portfolio to help with inter-rater reliability. Faculty graded student work first individually in a Google doc, we discussed how and why they gave that assessment (on a scale of 1-4), and if any improvements were needed to improve the assignment.</li> <li>2. Our department piloted an on-line training module for the fall 2018 semester, solicited feedback, made revisions, and implemented the training module in Spring 2019.</li> </ol> <p><b>PK-6 Elementary:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is an on-going planned improvement as the methods teachers continue to meet to share and discuss lesson plan expectations.</li> <li>2. During our University Supervisor training meeting in September 2019, the data was shared and they discussed what they look for in</li> </ol>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>and instruct them to have this similar type of specific conversation with the Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers in the beginning of the semester on this standard to create a more standardized understanding of this standard.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since Standard #3 was the weakest on the E-Portfolio, we will watch as a department the videos submitted by the SPED students and conduct an inter-rater reliability on that standard to look for evidence that professors are assessing them differently and have discussions to attempt to calibrate our grading of these videos.</li> </ol> <p><b>Secondary Education:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three indicators dealing with assessment, Standard 2.1, Standard 4.1, and Standard 4.3 showed the lowest percentage of students at the Level 4: Exemplary level. In addition to the newly created assessment course that began for the 2018-19 admitted students, we will move a Critical Assignment on assessment into one of the methods courses (ED 566-69) to help strengthen this area for them.</li> </ol>	<p>Standard #2 in order to help with the inter-rater reliability.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Two training sessions were held in January 2019 to discuss what evaluators are looking for as evidence in this Standard. This discussion helped with inter-rater reliability of the grading of the E-Portfolio.</li> </ul> <p><b>Secondary Education:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The secondary methods course for fall 2019 will have a new assessment assignment designed to help with these particular indicators. All secondary education students take this class so they will all have the opportunity to practice these skills.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Teacher candidates will demonstrate leadership and collaboration by modeling ethical behavior and professional responsibility resulting in the highest levels of learner achievement.</b></p>	<p><b>For all programs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> <p><b>PK-6 Elementary:</b> The PK-6 classes will provide a concerted effort to identify and remediate students' communication skills and abilities when needed. This will help ensure that by the time they get to student teaching, their oral and written communication has been addressed and improved.</p>	<p><b>For all programs:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our department conducted two training sessions on students' evidence uploaded to their E-Portfolio to help with inter-rater reliability. Faculty graded student work first individually in a Google doc, we discussed how and why they gave that assessment (on a scale of 1-4), and if any improvements were needed to improve the assignment.</li> <li>Our department piloted an on-line training module for the fall 2018 semester, solicited feedback, made revisions, and implemented the training module in Spring 2019.</li> </ol> <p><b>PK-6:</b> This is an ongoing effort and will continue this year. For example, Standard 8 of the E-Portfolio (which includes written communication) and lesson plan presentations in various classes emphasizing oral presentation skills will continue to be a focus.</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p><b>SPED:</b> We are planning on making the Collaboration course a required course for both the PK-6 and SEC programs. This should provide the SPED students with additional opportunities to practice their communication skills with general education teachers, which makes a large part of their daily work load.</p> <p><b>Secondary Education:</b> The SEC program students are required to attend professional development during their student teaching as evidence to upload for their E-Portfolio. However, the reality is that not all PD they will attend will be in their content area, so they will need to explain how that PD will translate into useful strategies they can use in their content area, for Standard #6: Professionalism.</p>	<p><b>SPED:</b> The Collaboration course (ED 529) went through GRAD studies as a program revision for both PK-6 and SEC programs. This should have a positive impact; however, this will be the first year of the approved program change.</p> <p><b>Secondary Education:</b> This change was implemented in the Student Teaching Seminar when the professor reviewed expectations for this standard. Additionally, the prompt in the instructions was revised to include a one-page reflection paper to help ensure that students could explain how they envision implementing the professional development into their classroom.</p>

**Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:**

Comment:

Recommendations for Next Year’s Assessment Process: The teacher certification programs have been given approval to submit a combined assessment report with the understanding that results for each program will be discussed and analyzed separately. You have not done this. Be careful to report out analysis and plans for improvement by program. You might consider re-formatting the report so that each program is discussed. For example, “Interpretation of Results”: Elementary Education: Secondary Education: ... (and the same for planned improvements)

Response:

We resubmitted our report in December 2018 with the formatting that was requested and that is demonstrated in the section “Closing the Loop: Progress on Planned Improvements from Prior Year” of this report which delineates the three programs with specific planned improvements for each: PK, Special Education (SPED), and Secondary (SEC). We will continue to format this report to have the combined three programs.

**Outcomes Assessment 2018-2019**

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

<p><b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p><b>Result</b> <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p><b>1. E-Portfolio Standard 5: Learning Environment:</b> <i>The teacher candidate uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</i> <u>E-Portfolio Standard #5:</u> <u>Evidence 1: Critical Assignment</u> Behavior Plan with reflective essay or classroom management philosophy and application. <u>Evidence 2:</u> <u>Student Teaching</u> Video explaining and analyzing their classroom management routines and procedures to meet the standard. This is a direct measure</p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Evidence Meets Expectations</p> <p><b>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:</b> 4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Faculty members scored students' E-Portfolios at the end of the fall 2018 and spring 2019 semester of their student teaching. Students must enter two pieces of evidence: one from course work and one from their Student Teaching. Student scores are submitted into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to be disaggregated by program. The Assessment Coordinator and ECE Coordinator present the data for discussion and analysis in our May assessment meeting.</p>	<p><u>All Result charts for this Student Learning Outcome are found in the Appendix</u></p> <p><u>Result:</u> <b>PK-6:</b> The average mean was at target: 3.0; however, 20% (3 students) scored at the 2.0 level. The overall theme on the evidence from the narrative feedback was that their analysis and reflection on how their evidence met the standard was limited.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> The average mean was at 2.67, with one student receiving a 2.0 and two students receiving a 3.0. The narrative explanation for the 2.0 was a limited reflection and analysis on how the evidence met the standard.</p> <p><b>SECONDARY:</b> The average mean was 3.10, with no students receiving below a 3.0, with narrative comments citing the strength of their evidence.</p>
<p><b>2. Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Standard #1: Contextual Factors</b></p> <p><i>The teacher uses information about the learning/teaching context and student individual differences to set learning goals, plan instruction and assess learning.</i></p> <p>This is a direct measure</p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Proficient</p> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale: 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 4 = Exemplary</p>	<p><u>Collection:</u> Teacher Candidates submit their TWS to their seminar professor during the fall and spring semesters of their student teaching. The TWS is designed to evaluate candidate impact on student learning in the PK-12 classroom. TWS Standard #1 requires candidates to research, document, and reflect upon the contextual factors of their placement classroom.</p>	<p><u>Result:</u> <b>PK-6:</b> All average mean scores met or exceeded the target of 3.0, except for one student (2.6), with two indicators scoring at the 2.0 level.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> All three students' mean scores were above the target of 3.0, and only one student scored at the 2.0 for one indicator (1.5) within the standard.</p> <p><b>SEC:</b> All average mean scores met or exceeded the target of 3.0, with no student scoring below a 3.0 on any of the indicators.</p>

<p><b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p><b>Result</b> <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p><b>3. Student Teacher Summative:</b> <b>Standard #5: Learning Environment</b> <i>The teacher candidate uses resources, routines, and procedures to provide a respectful, positive, safe, student-centered environment that is conducive to learning.</i></p> <p>This is an indirect measure</p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Proficient Student Teaching Summative Rubric Scoring Scale: 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable</p>	<p><b>Collection:</b> Cooperating Teachers (CT), University Supervisors (US), and teacher candidates (SELF) completed an evaluation at the end of student teaching in fall 2018 and spring 2019. Data was collected through Google Docs, computed in Excel, and analyzed at the May 2019 department meeting.</p>	<p><b>PK-6:</b> While all average scores for all students were at or above the 3.0 for Standard 5 and on all four Indicators, one student scored at the 2.0 level on Indicator 5.2 and two students scored at the 2.0 level on Indicator 5.8.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> While all average scores for all students were at or above the 3.0 for Standard 5 and on all four Indicators, two different students scored at the 2.0 level; one on Indicator 5.2 and one on Indicator 5.4.</p> <p><b>SEC:</b> While all average scores for all students were at or above the 3.0 for Standard 5 and on all four Indicators, one student scored a 2.0 on Indicator 5.2.</p>

### **Interpretation of Results**

**Analysis and Implications:** *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

Data for this SLO was gathered from both direct and indirect measures which provides the department with multiple measures of their ability to meet Standard 5 of their program. The department discussed how scores overall increased on this standard due to revisions in the prompt on the assignment and also allowing video of their classroom management procedures without students if the school did not allow them to be in the videotape. However, this standard is one of the more challenging for our student teachers because it incorporates classroom management and building a respectful and culturally inclusive learning environment. The challenge is that the student teachers do not have much time before their full take-over and often implementing consistent classroom routines and policies takes time to develop, in addition to developing lesson plans that minimize classroom disruptions. Furthermore, this area may take years before in-service teachers feel confident in classroom management, let alone pre-service teachers during their student teaching. One programmatic change to come out of this analysis for our department was to revise the SLO that attempts to evaluate their classroom management effectiveness since results across all programs appeared similar in this area. However, we felt strongly that our department needs to explicitly embed classroom management techniques, strategies, and discussion throughout the entire program and not leave this crucial topic for the Classroom Management course that they take right before student teaching.

**PK-6:** For Standard #5 of the Student Teacher Summative, the Mentor Teachers (3.60) assessed the student teachers higher than the University Supervisors (3.47) and how the students self-assessed (3.50). This indicates that the person who sees the student teacher the most, assessed them higher, which is a positive sign. The two students who were assessed at the 2.0 level on two indicators were assessed by the University Supervisor at that level. While earning a 2.0 is acceptable for student teachers on indicators, it will be important to monitor if this is an issue of training on how to use the instrument or difference in expectations. University Supervisors do not see the student teachers on a daily basis so their assessment is based on less evidence than what the Mentor Teachers are able to observe. The highest indicator across all three groups was 5.4: *“Establishes a climate of trust by being fair, respectful, and enthusiastic”* and the lowest across all three groups was 5.8: *“Maximizes instructional learning time by working with*

*students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups”* which indicators inter-rater reliability on these areas and provides strong data on what is an area of strength and an area in need of improvement, as assessed by all three stakeholders.

**SPED:** There are three students to report on – one from Fall 2018 and two from Spring 2019. Based upon the limited number of students, we understand that the data is limited in what it can provide for programmatic changes or improvements. However, the qualitative and quantitative data revealed the following: For the overall Standard #5 of the Student Teacher Summative, the Mentor Teachers and the self-assessment had the same mean score (3.67), while the University Supervisors assessed them lower (3.42). One teacher was an on-site teacher who was assessed higher than the other two traditionally placed student teachers which could impact the final results. As for narrative feedback, it was suggested to continue to explore various ways to group students to maximize instructional time. This can be quite challenging for a special education classroom since it can take longer to learn how students learn best, with whom, the varied levels of skills of their students, and the IEP requirements.

**SECONDARY:** For Standard #5 of the Student Teacher Summative, the University Supervisors assessed them a little higher (3.55) higher than the Mentor Teachers (3.45) and the students indicated they assessed themselves lower (3.28). Secondary students tend to assess themselves lower than these two and this is a trend that is seen across the years which can indicate that they are harder on themselves, expect more of themselves, or realize they have more to learn. Their lowest TWS Indicator (1.4: Knowledge of Students’ Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, & Prior Learning) is no surprise since it a challenge in the secondary classroom that the students may not have an opportunity to observe their varied approaches to learning or have time to frequently assess their prior learning due to possible time constraints to cover the curriculum.

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

**PK-6:**

On the Student Teacher Summative, student teachers assessed with the lowest scores from their Mentor Teachers, University Supervisors, and on the self-assessment on: ***Indicator 5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.*** In addition to revising our SLO for this area, our program will focus on how effective lesson planning can help minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time in multiple classes.

**SPED:**

On the Student Teacher Summative, student teachers assessed with the lowest scores from their Mentor Teachers and on the self-assessment on: ***Indicator 5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.*** In addition to revising our SLO for this area, our program will focus on how effective lesson planning can help minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time in multiple classes.

**SEC:** On the Student Teacher Summative, student teachers assessed with the lowest scores from their Mentor Teachers, University Supervisors, and on the self-assessment on: ***Indicator 5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.*** In addition to revising our SLO for this area, our program will focus on how effective lesson planning can help minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time in multiple classes.

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

<p><b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p><b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p><b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i></p>	<p><b>Result</b> <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i></p>
<p><b>1. E-Portfolio Standard:</b></p> <p><u>Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</u> <i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</i></p> <p>This is a direct measure <u>E-Portfolio Standard #5:</u> <u>Evidence 1: Critical Assignment Unit Plan</u> <u>Evidence 2:</u> <u>Student Teaching</u></p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Evidence Meets Expectations</p> <p><b>E-Portfolio Performance Rubric:</b> 4 = Evidence Exceeds Expectations 3 = Evidence Meets Expectations 2 = Evidence Approaches Expectations 1 = Evidence Does Not Meet Expectations</p>	<p><b>Collection:</b> Faculty members score students' E-Portfolios at the end of the fall and spring semester of their student teaching. Student scores are submitted into a Google doc, which then gets downloaded into an Excel spreadsheet to be disaggregated by program. The Assessment Coordinator and ECE Coordinator present the data for discussion and analysis in our May assessment meeting.</p>	<p><u>All Result charts for this Student Learning Outcome are found in Appendix</u></p> <p><b>Result:</b> <b>PK-6:</b> The average mean was at target: 3.20, with no students scoring below a 3.0 on Standard #1.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> The average mean was at 3.33. with no students scoring below on 3.0 on Standard #1.</p> <p><b>SECONDARY:</b> The average mean was 3.80 with 80% of the students scoring at the 4.0 level.</p>
<p><b>2. TWS Standard 5: Design for Instruction:</b> <i>The teacher designs instruction for specific learning goals/objectives, student characteristics and needs, and learning contexts.</i></p> <p><b>5.2</b> <b>Accurate Representation of Content</b></p> <p>This is a direct measure</p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Proficient</p> <p>TWS: Rubric Scoring Scale: 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Developing 3 = Proficient 4 = Exemplary</p>	<p><b>Collection:</b> Teacher Candidates submit their TWS to their seminar professor during the fall and spring semester of their student teaching. The TWS is designed to evaluate candidate impact on student learning in the PK-12 classroom. Standard #5.2 requires candidates to present accurate content with a depth and breadth of the discipline during their TWS in their placement classroom.</p>	<p><b>PK-6:</b> The average mean score on 5.2 is 3.6 with no students scoring below a 3.0 on this Indicator.</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> The average mean score on 5.2 is 4.0 with all students scoring a 4.0 on this Indicator.</p> <p><b>SEC:</b> The average mean score on 5.2 is 3.7 with no students scoring below a 3.0 on this Indicator.</p>
<p><b>3. Student Teacher Summative:</b> <u>Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</u> <i>The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of the curriculum, subject content, and the developmental needs of students by providing relevant learning experiences.</i></p>	<p><b>TARGET:</b> Level 3: Proficient</p> <p>Student Teaching Summative Rubric Scoring Scale: 4 = Exemplary 3 = Proficient 2 = Developing 1 = Unacceptable</p>	<p><b>Collection:</b> Cooperating Teachers (CT), University Supervisors (US), and teacher candidates (SELF) completed an evaluation at the end of the student teaching internship in fall 2018 and spring 2019. Data was collected through Google Docs, computed in Excel, and analyzed at the May 2019 department meeting.</p>	<p><b>PK-6:</b> While all average mean scores on Standard #1 and on all four Indicators were at or above the target 3.0 level, two students scored at the 2.0 level on Indicator 1.2; one student on Indicator 1.4 (2.0); and one student on Indicator 1.7 (2.0).</p> <p><b>SPED:</b> While all average mean scores on Standard #1 and on all four Indicators were at or above the</p>

<b>Outcome Measures</b> <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	<b>Performance Standard</b> <i>Define the acceptable level of student performance.</i>	<b>Data Collection</b> <i>Discuss the process for collecting this data: who conducted the assessment, when, and how?</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Did you meet your target? What was the result?</i>
			target 3.0 level, one student scored at the 2.0 level on Indicator 1.7.  <b>SEC:</b> All average mean scores on Standard #1 and on all four Indicators were above the 3.0 level.

**Interpretation of Results**

**Analysis and Implications:** *What does this result tell you about the extent to which your students achieved this outcome? What are the strengths and weaknesses that this result highlights, and what are the implications for your curriculum or your program?*

Data for this SLO was gathered from both direct and indirect measures which provides the department with multiple measures of their ability to meet Standard 1 of their program. All numeric scores meet the department’s target but we also analyze the narrative comments provided by the University Supervisors, Mentor Teachers, Faculty, and student self-assessment. This standard focuses on the student teachers’ ability to learn the content they need to teach and create challenging lesson plans that match the developmental needs of their students. The student teachers often have to learn the content themselves first before deciding how best to teach the content to the current students in their classroom.

**PK-6:** PK-teachers are usually the ones teaching all of the major content areas and therefore need to be able to make connections between the subjects and to make real-world applications to help these younger students understand the content. Consequently, our students receive assignments that can demonstrate this ability. The E-Portfolio feedback on Standard #1 indicate that they have a strong ability to learn the curriculum and content, make connections to the academic and social abilities of their students, and to strive for higher-level thinking. The reality of student teaching is that they do not have as much time to learn the placement grade’s curriculum and therefore this may limit their ability to make interdisciplinary connections and real-world applications. This is all to be expected but an acknowledged challenge embedded in the student teaching experience.

**SPED:** The placement of the SPED student teacher will matter greatly since there are varied arrangements made for SPED students, in addition to that their certification is K-12. The content demands can vary greatly, documenting the intellectual abilities of the students can take longer to observe, and learning how to best use the assistants in the classroom takes time. Their scores and feedback on their evidence for Standard #1 of the E-Portfolio indicate that they can develop differentiated instruction for a variety of students’ needs, as demonstrated in their Critical Assignments. It is not surprising that when they are student teaching, it is more difficult to create differentiated instruction for students that they only observe for about two weeks before taking over as the lead teacher.

**SECONDARY:** It appears that the secondary education students have a strong content knowledge base but can learn how to differentiate that knowledge to meet the needs of all of students. The E-Portfolio comments on Standard #1 indicate their strong documentation of content knowledge through lesson planning in their Critical Assignment. Unlike a PK-6 teacher, Secondary education students do not have a lot of exposure to developing interdisciplinary lessons, either during the field experience hours or during student teaching. Therefore, it is not too surprising that they need to work on developing those interdisciplinary links within their content.

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

**PK-6:** Based upon both comments on the E-Portfolio and Student Teaching Summative, one area to continue to strengthen is the development of essential questions and higher-level questions into their lesson plans. This is linked to Indicator 1.2 of the Student Teacher Summative results: The Mentor Teachers, University Supervisors, and student self-assessment had the lowest overall mean for this Indicator, as well as having the fewest number of students assessing at the 4.0 level.

<b>Standard 5: Learning Environment</b>			
<b>Program</b>	<b>CT</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Self</b>
PK-6 N = 15	3.60	3.47	3.50
SPED N = 3	3.88	3.67	3.67
SEC N = 10	3.45	3.50	3.34

**SPED:** While difficult to make program improvements based upon three students, this year for the first time, SPED students will be required to take a secondary methods course which will bolster their secondary content, pedagogical content strategies, and how to incorporate higher-level thinking skills into instruction. This was the Student Teaching Summative Indicator (1.2 *Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction*) that the SPED students self-assessed themselves at the lowest (3.0) of the indicators for Standard 1: Professional Knowledge (mean score for SPED self-assessment on Standard #1: 3.25)

**SECONDARY:**

A goal is to continue to emphasize two areas in their secondary content methods courses: From the Student Teaching Summative, SEC students self-assessed themselves at the lowest (3.20) on Indicator (1.2 *Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction*) and their Mentor Teachers assessed them at the lowest on Indicator 1.3 *Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications* (3.20). The secondary content methods course will introduce an Interdisciplinary Project in the fall.

**Appendices** (please only include items that will help reviewers understand your process – for example, test questions, rubrics, survey questions, more detailed description of assessment measures, summary tables of survey results, etc.)

<b>TWS Standard #1: Contextual Factors</b>			
Indicator	PK-6 N = 15	SPED N = 3	SEC N = 10
<b>1.1 Knowledge of Community, School and Classroom Factors</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.60</b>
<b>1.2 Knowledge of and Characteristics of Students</b>	<b>3.40</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.80</b>
<b>1.3 Subgroup designation</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>4.0</b>
<b>1.4 Knowledge of Students' Varied Approaches to Learning, Skills, &amp; Prior Learning</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.40</b>
<b>1.5 Implications for Instructional Planning and Assessment</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.50</b>
<b>MEAN: Standard 1</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.66</b>

**SUMMARY DATA/TABLES FOR LEARNING OUTCOME #1**

<b>Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #5: Learning Environment</b>	
Programs	Standard #5
PK-6 N = 12	3.0
SPED N = 3	2.67
SEC N = 10	3.10

<b>STANDARD 5: Learning Environment GRAD PK-6 Students N= 15</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>CT</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Self</b>
<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>Mean 3.60</b>	<b>Mean 3.53</b>	<b>Mean 3.27</b>
<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>Mean 3.73</b>	<b>Mean 3.60</b>	<b>Mean 3.87</b>
<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>Mean 3.60</b>	<b>Mean 3.53</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>
<b>5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.</b>	<b>Mean 3.47</b>	<b>Mean 3.20</b>	<b>Mean 3.20</b>
<b>OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>3.50</b>

<b>STANDARD 5: Learning Environment GRAD SPED Students N= 3</b>			
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>CT</b>	<b>US</b>	<b>Self</b>
<b>5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.</b>	<b>Mean 3.33</b>	<b>Mean 3.33</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>
<b>5.4 Establishes a climate of trust by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.</b>	<b>Mean 4.0</b>	<b>Mean 3.33</b>	<b>Mean 4.0</b>
<b>5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>
<b>5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.</b>	<b>Mean 3.67</b>	<b>Mean 3.33</b>	<b>Mean 3.33</b>
<b>OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.67</b>

<b>STANDARD 5: Learning Environment GRAD SECONDARY Students N= 10</b>			
Indicator	CT	US	Self
5.2/5.3 Establishes clear expectations for classroom rules and procedures and enforces them consistently to minimize disruptions and maximize instructional time.	Mean 3.30	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.10
5.4 Establishes a climate of trust by being fair, caring, respectful, and enthusiastic.	Mean 3.60	Mean 3.70	Mean 3.70
5.5/5.6 Promotes cultural sensitivity and respects students' diversity, including language, culture, race, gender, and special needs.	Mean 3.50	Mean 3.60	Mean 3.10
5.8 Maximizes instructional learning time by working with students individually as well as in small groups or whole groups.	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.50	Mean 3.20
<b>OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>3.28</b>

<b>Standard 1: Professional Knowledge</b>			
Program	CT	US	Self
PK-6 N = 15	3.50	3.35	3.33
SPEDN = 3	3.92	3.42	3.25
SEC N = 10	3.35	3.63	3.40

### SUMMARY DATA/CHARTS FOR LEARNING OUTCOME #2

<b>TWS Standard 5: Design for Instruction 5.2 Accurate Representation of Content</b>	
Programs	Standard #5.2
PK-6 N = 15	3.60
SPED N = 3	4.0
SEC N = 10	3.70
<b>Portfolio Average Scores for Standard #1: Professional Knowledge</b>	
Programs	Standard #1
PK-6 N = 15	3.20
SPED N = 3	3.33
SEC N = 10	3.80

<b>STANDARD 1: Professional Knowledge GRAD PK-6 Students N= 15</b>			
Indicator	CT	US	Self
<b>1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.</b>	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.0	Mean 3.17
<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.</b>	Mean 3.67	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.33
<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>	Mean 3.53	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.50
<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>	Mean 3.53	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.60
<b>OVERALL Mean Score for STANDARD</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.33</b>

<b>STANDARD 1: Professional Knowledge GRAD SPED Students N= 3</b>			
Indicator	CT	US	Self
<b>1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.</b>	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.0
<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.</b>	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.67	Mean 3.33
<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>	Mean 3.67	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.33
<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>	Mean 4.0	Mean 3.33	Mean 3.33
<b>OVERALL Mean Score for STANDARD</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>3.25</b>

<b>STANDARD 1: Professional Knowledge GRAD SECONDARY Students N = 10</b>			
Indicator	CT	US	Self
<b>1.2 Integrates key content elements and facilitates students' use of higher-level thinking skills in instruction.</b>	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.50	Mean 3.20
<b>1.3 Demonstrates ability to link present content with past and future learning experiences, other subject areas, and real-world experiences and applications.</b>	Mean 3.20	Mean 3.50	Mean 3.40
<b>1.4 Demonstrates an accurate knowledge of the subject area(s) taught.</b>	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.80	Mean 3.60
<b>1.7 Demonstrates an understanding of the intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of the age group.</b>	Mean 3.40	Mean 3.70	Mean 3.40
<b>OVERALL Mean Score FOR STANDARD</b>	<b>3.35</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>3.40</b>