Colorado State University Pueblo

Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019

(Due: May 24, 2019)

Program:___M.Ed._____

Date report completed: ___5/24/19_____

Completed by:___Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean_____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for <u>each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program</u> (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before May 24, 2019. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html. Thank you.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2019-2020 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> assessed? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
All 9 SLOs were assessed: 1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge related to teaching assignment and the application of content knowledge to classroom instruction and assessment. 2. Demonstrate professional growth in	2018-2019 (all SLOs are assessed each year)	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the *M.Ed. Handbook* (https://www.c	All program completers in 2018-2019	All (100%) program completers should a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of	See Table 1 below for all average ratings across all SLOs. 2018-2019 results indicated that all but two students	Although all mean ratings showed student proficiency was on the average above 5.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses for particular standards.	For SLO 7 on understanding system change models and trends in education, the Associate Dean will meet with graduate faculty and make them aware of the lower ratings on this goal. The group will develop a plan for how to infuse more about system change models into the M.Ed.

the application of scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement. 3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning. 4. Research, locate and interpret educational research in best practices in teaching. 5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development. 6. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change. 7. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school		supueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/_doc/forms-and-documents/tep-grad-handbook.pdf) and are attached to this report. Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.		performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) 80% or > should receive passing scores on licensure exams, and c) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (5.0) or > and avg. ratings of >5.00 on self evaluations	received proficient ratings on all SLOs; mean ratings were well above 5.00 for each goal; b) 100% of all test takers had passing scores; and c) mean self ratings by graduates on all items were 5.00 or greater. Too few graduates allowed for disaggregation of data by emphasis area.	Strengths of the program continued in Goal 1, with some new strengths appearing in Goals 2 and 8. Lowest rated areas included Goals 3, 4, and 7. These results are partly the same as previous years, but also partly different. For example, Goal 2 went from being average last year to a strength this year. Goals 3 and 4 were also some of the more lower-rated areas last year, but showed some growth. Goal 7 dropped significantly, though, so will be the focus of our improvement. A new instructor in one of our Core courses (ED 503) may be related to this drop.	course work (likely the Core). If students have better artifacts to be reviewed for that goal, the ratings should go up.

change and current research and trends in school change 8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels. 9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.						

Comments on part I: The program has 9 goals that form the SLOs for all master's candidates. Goal 1 focuses on content knowledge in the candidate's emphasis area, and more specific "standards" for this area are aligned with the Colorado Academic content Standards for endorsement areas. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available in the *Graduate Handbook* beginning on page 46 at https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/_doc/forms-and-documents/tep-grad-handbook.pdf) that outline the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each goal area. Ratings based on this evidence are completed using a scale of 1-8, with a rating of 5.00 an indication of "proficient" on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at program completion by faculty based on multiple types and sources of evidence in the candidate's eportfolio and oral defense. The limited number of program completers in most emphasis areas limited further disaggregation of assessment data.

Table 1. Average M.Ed. Student Ratings by Goal Area

Goal	Overall Faculty Rating (Scale of 1-8)	Overall Self-Evaluation Rating (Scale of 1-5)
1	6.90	4.11
2	6.76	4.09
3	6.44	4.28
4	6.49	4.37
5	6.52	4.43
6	6.64	4.61
7	6.41	4.39
8	6.78	4.43
9	6.67	4.67

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2018-2019 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning. 4. Research, locate and interpret educational research in best practices in teaching.	2017-2018	Infuse more best practices related to assessment and how to be a critical consumer of educational research into the Core. Each Core course has a significant emphasis on using research and is at the heart of SLO 4.	For SLO 3 on assessment, the Associate Dean met with graduate faculty and made them aware of the lower ratings on this goal. The group developed a plan for how to infuse more best practices related to assessment into the M.Ed. course work. The faculty also planned to make sure that the Core courses are taught with more emphasis on how to be a critical consumer of educational research. Specifically, the emphasis was to be on having students generate better artifacts so that ratings go up.	Average ratings on this SLO went from 6.31 in 2017-2018 to 6.44 in 2018-2019. This change is significant and brings the average ratings to levels that are much more in line with other SLOs and it is no longer the lowest-rated area.

Comments on part II:

Appendix C

Matrices Used in Evaluating the Portfolio

General Rules for Assessing Performance

1. It is the responsibility of the candidate's mentor, as the content expert, to rate the content for Standard 1 (first dimension) and to make that evaluation available to other members of the team in TEIMS. This should be done prior to the final seminar.

2. Other members of the team should review the portfolio and assign temporary ratings for standards 1-10 prior to the seminar, noting qualities leading to the ratings on the draft document. Ratings should be assigned from 1-8, in increments of .25 (e.g., 3.0. 3.25, 3.50, 3.75).

3. In addition, faculty should develop questions they want to address at the seminar. Faculty should plan to meet briefly prior to the beginning of the seminar to review these questions and general concerns/questions related to the portfolio. Preferably, this could be done electronically at an earlier time.

4. At the meeting, faculty should bring their rating sheets. The candidate's performance at the seminar will affect the ratings for a number of these standards.

5. After completion of the seminar, faculty should meet and review their findings. ALTHOUGH ALL RATINGS PRIOR TO THIS MEETING SHOULD BE COMPLETED INDEPENDENTLY, this review should come to a consensus about the rating for each standard. Disagreement will be noted by the chair of the candidate's committee.

6. The faculty will inform the candidate of the disposition of each standard and any changes needed for recommendation for graduation.

7. The consensus information will be recorded in TEIMS by the candidate's sponsor.

1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge related to teaching assignment and the application of content knowledge to classroom instruction and assessment. Note: Application of Content Knowledge is evaluated in Standard 8.

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
Depth & Breadth of Knowledge	• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • Propositions/and or artifact(s) are not present and/or do not address the assignment requirements • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: • Propositions and/or artifact(s) are present but may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • (At the seminar) candidate explains propositions superficially and/or the relationship between the proposition and research cited • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	• Performance demonstrates candidate can meet the content standards for an initial license in the area based on the ratings of faculty member in that area (proficient evidence presented on all CDE standards or proficient evidence presented on content program standards) • Proposition(s) are conceptually sound and important generalization(s) related to content area • (At the seminar) candidate clearly explains propositions and the relationship between the proposition and research cited Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on the majority of standards rated by the content mentor. Proposition(s) and bibliography demonstrate exceptional skills and application of research.	☐
	GPA is a <2.5 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA <3.0 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA is a minimum of 3.0 to 3.5 for completed courses in emphasis area	GPA in courses in emphasis area is >3.5; the highest rating should be assigned for a GPA of 4.0.	☐
	NOTE: This criterion is not applied if there is no required exam for the content area. No evidence of licensure exam Received a score of <220		Licensure exam scaled score is a minimum of 220	Licensure exam scaled score is a minimum of 220 and passed all sections of the PLACE exam (3s and 4's) and received at least 2 4s	☐
Growth in Knowledge	No evidence presented or evidence does not address the standard	• Evidence does not demonstrate change in learning/performance • Evidence in reflection/rationale is superficial or includes errors in thinking or analysis of artifact	Artifact(s) and/or rationale/reflection demonstrate a change in content knowledge from time entered program until program completion.	Artifact(s) and or rationale/reflection demonstrate exceptional growth, either in depth of growth of content knowledge or in the number of areas of change.	☐

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
	List qualities that are not passing:		List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:	List qualities that are advanced:	

OVERALL RATING

2. Demonstrate professional growth in the application of scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	

• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program
• No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal
• Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused
	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience
	• Propositions and/or reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research
	• Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research
		• Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program
		• Presents artifact(s) that demonstrate include application of scientifically based practice AND <u>changes</u> in teaching in at least one of the following areas based on educational research in that area:
		  o Literacy
		  o Instructional Technology
		  o Differentiation of Instruction
		• Artifact(s) must demonstrate changes in teaching as well as research that informed practice
		• Rationale/reflection demonstrates understanding of own knowledge base and research applied
		• Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research
		• Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.
			Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on one or more bulleted item at the left.
			
			A rating at the highest level should be based on exceptional performance in more than one of the bulleted areas.
				☐

List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change teaching and learning.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	Developing (3-4)	Proficient (5-6)	Advanced (7-8)	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience • Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	Performance on proposition(s) and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program Evidence is included that demonstrates all of the following: • More than one means of assessing student learning is included • Candidate aggregates student performance and accurately draws conclusions • Reflection/rationale demonstrates changes in teaching based on evaluation of data Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research. Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on at least one of the bulleted items at the left A rating at the highest level should be assigned if evidence also includes artifacts that were not generated as requirements for a course or for the program.	
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

4. Research, locate and interpret educational research in best practices in teaching. OVERALL RATING: _____

	NOT PASSING		PASSING		RATING
	Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
Critically Reading & Applying Research	• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • Propositions are not present and/or do not address the assignment requirements • (At the seminar) candidate cannot explain propositions • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience • Propositions are present but may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • (At the seminar) candidate explains propositions superficially and/or the relationship between the proposition and research cited • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program , including: • Citing relevant research from a variety of sources • Accurately analyzing and synthesizing research • Integrating relevant research and theory from multiple sources and across courses • Applying research for self-directed inquiry and for own problem-solving • Making authentic connections to practice • Integrating theoretical, philosophical, and research sources • Analyzing and synthesizing research related to emphasis area • Explaining propositions by expanding on theory, research, and practice • Integrating theories and research into own thinking	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left	☐
Action Research	No action research included and/or action research is incomplete Rationale/reflection is not included or may be described as superficial/incoherent or conceptually confused	Action research is present but includes sufficient errors that result in Errors occur in analysis of data and/or rationale/reflection that limit effectiveness of research	Investigates educational problem by completing all components of an action research project, analyzing data and drawing accurate conclusions about practice Rationale/reflection with research demonstrates changed patterns in thought and action with regard to the connections between research and practice Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on action research	☐
Comments	**List qualities that are not passing:**		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

4. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program: • No evidence is presented or evidence is not directly related to the standard • Rationale is not present, incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: • Evidence limited to course generated products/research • Artifact(s) do not provide sufficient evidence related to the standard • Rationale and/or propositions are superficial and/or may not be defensible based on current research	Performance on artifact(s) and proposition meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program including • Planning and implementing quality professional growth opportunities for other teachers • Participation in collaborative leadership to address educational challenges • Participation formally and informally in appropriate professional learning communities and teams to improve educational practice Rationale/reflection and/or artifact demonstrate effectiveness of professional development on educational practice of colleagues Rationale is keyed to impact of professional growth in leadership abilities on professional self-efficacy and self-worth Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left. The range of activities and quality of the activity should be considered in assigning a rating in the advanced range. A rating at the highest level should require evidence of involvement effective professional development beyond expectations in courses.	
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

5. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	

• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program
• No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal
• Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused
	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience:
	• Reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research
	• Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research
		1. Candidate's reflection meets expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program and
		    • Describes value of experience on thinking and practice
		    • Utilizes reflection to change own practice of teaching
		    • Illustrates relationship among research/theory, own practice and student achievement
		    • Refers to changes in patterns in thought and action with regard to own practice
		    • Identifies patterns of program impact on practice
		    • Identifies directions for future inquiry and development
		    • Candidate must demonstrate at lest 4/6 expectations.
		
		1. Artifact(s) or proposition addresses use of technology in self-assessment or collaboration for change.
		
		Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research
		
		Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.
			Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted items at the left.
			
			A rating of the highest level must demonstrate exceptional performance on both #1 and #1.
				☐

List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

6. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: • Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	• Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program • Both the artifact(s), its rationale/reflection, and proposition(s) all demonstrate the ability to accurately analyze and synthesize current research and trends in school change Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance in analyzing and synthesizing research. A rating at the highest level would address research/trends related to candidate's emphasis area or may include artifacts that are not related to course or program requirements.	
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

7. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience • Propositions and/or reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	• Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program • Artifact(s) clearly demonstrates improvement in student achievement to high levels • Artifact(s) disaggregates data for individual students and demonstrates improvement in achievement for students with various learning characteristics • Reflection demonstrates understanding of relationship between student learning and teaching/learning activities Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on bulleted items at the left. Exceptional performance should present some research base for change.	☐
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that indicate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

8. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience • Reflections may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research • Propositions may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research	Performance on propositions and artifact(s) meet expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program demonstrate candidate can assume responsibility and leadership in school change through <u>at least two</u> of the following: • Artifact that demonstrates leadership in change • Artifact demonstrates a plan that would lead to school reform • Involvement in school, district, or discipline activities that impact school change outside one's own classroom (collaborative work, presentation, grant writing, etc.) • Artifact that verifies effect on at least one aspect of school change • Rationale explains relationship of research to own efforts Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted item at the left; includes some verification of the effect of own efforts on school change. Some evidence is included that was not generated as a requirement in a course.	☐
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that are proficient:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	