



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019

(Due: May 24, 2019)

Program: _____ Education Minor _____

Date report completed: ___5/22/19_____

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 each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (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.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

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> reported on prior to this cycle? (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 (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency 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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed in 2018-2019. Teacher Education uses	2018-2019; because the state accrediting bodies for teacher education	See table 1 (below); program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance would take up	All students admitted to TEP, 2018-2019; all students completing TEP, 2018-	Expectations include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive	In general, results indicated that a) mean ratings for program completers	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this	1. Keep changes in ED 301 for classroom management and further support it with other methods classes during later stages of the program. 2. Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to

<p>the term “Standards” for program SLOs because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. Standards/SLOs are included in the Assessment Plan and table 1 (below). See comments.</p>	<p>require the program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students’ eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2018-2019</p>	<p>over 50 pages of space so are not included. Complete performance rubrics are available on the TEP web site at https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teacer-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.</p>	<p>2019; first year teachers in 2018-2019(grads in 2017-2018). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2019 are not complete at the date of this report and are not included (PP scores have not been returned by ETS); first year teacher data for last year’s grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards and avg. ratings by the group should be >3.00, b) 100% of program completers and >80% of individual students during the year who took the exam receive passing scores and c) >80% of graduates and their supervisors’/ principals’ ratings of performance are proficient (3.00 or >) and avg. ratings are >3.00 on evaluations of all standards for the group</p>	<p>were almost always above 3.00; however, mean ratings for program completers as well as ratings of graduates’ supervisors were lowest for standards focusing on classroom management (1.1, 1.2, 1.3); b) 100% of program completers had passing exam scores however, the pass rates on the new elementary exam have dropped significantly; and c) mean ratings by graduates’ and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00. See table 1 for details.</p>	<p>information did indicate strengths and weaknesses within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). Weaknesses in goal 1 (classroom management) are consistent wth last year. These indicate a continued need to focus on improving instruction related to SLOs 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. One reason these might not have shifted much in one year is because the primary push for classroom management is in coursework that happens early in the program. We continue to see a decrease in the pass rates on the required state tests. This is alarming for elementary especially. Part of the problem is that the state has had 3 different versions of the test over 3 years. That has made it difficult to track. Thankfully, it appears</p>	<p>watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---	---	--

				<p>after one year of teaching.</p> <p>All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed</p>		<p>that the state has settled on PRAXIS as the sole test provider and that the versions of the test that are in place now will stay that way. We will continue to examine this issue carefully to see if a more aggressive intervention strategy might help.</p>	

Comments on part I: The program has identified 8 goal areas that summarize the SLOs for all teacher education candidates. Within each of these goal areas are 5-10 more program standards, aligned with the Colorado Performance Standards, as well as the standards of professional and learned societies, and performance on the standards is the crucial level of assessment in terms of student outcomes, not program goals. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>) that outline in considerable detail the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each standard. Also included on the rubrics are benchmarks for performance at three different points in the program – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. Ratings based on this evidence are completed by faculty using a scale of 1-4, with a rating of 3.00 an indication of “proficient” on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at admission to education and program completion based on multiple types and sources of evidence.

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 1: Uses democratic principles to create communities of learners that assure positive social interactions, collaboration, and cooperation</i></p> <p>1.1 Organizes, allocates, and manages resources of time, space, activities, and attention, as well as establishing routines and procedures to create a learning environment characterized by developmentally appropriate student behavior, efficient use of time, and active and equitable acquisition of knowledge, skills, and understanding. CO 5.1</p> <p>1.2 Monitors and analyzes the classroom environment and applies appropriate intervention strategies and practices to enhance social relationships, student motivation and engagement, and productive work, including: CO 5.</p> <p>1.3 Establishes and consistently applies accepted disciplinary practices in the school environment that promote positive student growth. CO 5.2</p> <p>1.4 Nurtures, on the part of students, positive behavior and those moral standards necessary for personal, family, and community well-being. CO 8.2</p> <p>1.5 Models and articulates the democratic ideal to students, including the school's role in developing productive citizens and the school's role in teaching and perpetuating the principles of a democratic republic. CO 8.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 90% of students were in the “developing” or higher range, the benchmark for this outcome.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Although mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of 3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 1 , ratings on 1 standard/outcome was found to be among the lowest rated in the program for proficiency (standard 1.3 on applying consistent discipline); 3/48 or 6.25% of 2018-2019 program completers did not meet proficiency on one or more standards. Secondary student teachers overall received the lowest ratings (mean 3.28), then elementary student teachers (mean rating of 3.52), finally K-12 teachers received a mean rating of 3.55.</p>
<p><i>Goal 2: Creates learning experiences that make content knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students.</i></p> <p><u>K-12 Literacy: 2.1-2.5</u></p> <p>2.1 Plans and organizes reading instruction based on ongoing assessment. CO 1.1</p> <p>2.2 Develops phonological and linguistic processes related to reading including: phonemic awareness; concepts about print (e.g., print match, directionality); systematic, explicit phonics; other word identification strategies, and spelling instruction. CO 1.2</p> <p>2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategies for a variety of genre, literary response and analysis, content area literacy, and student independent reading. CO 1.3</p> <p>2.4 Supports reading through oral and written language development including: developing oral English proficiency in students; development of sound writing practices in students, including language usage, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and spelling; the relationships among reading, writing, and oral language; vocabulary development, and the structure of standard English. CO 1.4</p> <p>2.5 Utilizes Colorado Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction. CO 1.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proficiency Profile (PP) • Faculty Recommendations • Field Experience Teacher Evaluations • GPA in math, composition, and speech courses • Cumulative GPA at admission • GPA in major at admission to student teaching • Licensure Exam Scores • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> When compared to regional comprehensive institutions nationally, Fall 2018 TEP students scored near or just above the national group for each of the seven subtests and for overall performance on the PP (overall, 431 compared to the norm of 430). Note: Spring 2019 PP scores were close to but a bit better than fall. The average CSU-Pueblo student performance was 439 compared to the national norm of 437, and was at or above the average on each of the seven subtests.</p> <p>Cum GPA (3.35) was above the GPA required (2.600), and down slightly from last year (3.38). Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.6), math (2.9), and speech (3.6) exceeded benchmarks, and all are steady or just slightly down from last year.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results																													
<p><u>Mathematics: 2.6, 2.7</u> 2.6 Develops in students an understanding and use of: number systems and number sequences, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and functions and use of variables. CO 2.1 2.7 Utilizes Colorado Academic Standards in Mathematics for the improvement of instruction. CO 2.2 <u>Knowledge of Content: 2.8-2.11</u> 2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction. CO 4.4 2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all Colorado academic standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on content standards.CO 4.2 2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning. CO 4.1, 4.3 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching Ratings by Supervisors after one Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p>Although small numbers makes it difficult to disaggregate for all teaching areas, the table below demonstrates the variability in results across teaching areas. Average scores of students in PE, Spanish, and English were below the national averages.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1304 511 1915 743"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Mean GPA</th> <th>Mean Overall PP Score</th> <th>Mean Math GPA</th> <th>Mean Writing GPA</th> <th>Mean Speech GPA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>El Ed</td> <td>3.36</td> <td>439</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>3.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-12</td> <td>3.30</td> <td>436</td> <td>2.6</td> <td>3.5</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-12</td> <td>3.47</td> <td>442</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean eportfolio ratings by faculty of outcomes were in the “developing” range for 90% of students, with 10% not meeting this benchmark at admission. Weaknesses in writing were noted for all of those not meeting the benchmark. No clear differences were noted across students from different teaching area.</p> <p><u>At admission to student teaching:</u> 100% of program completers passed their licensure exams; however, differences existed across programs. The overall pass rate (all takers included – students who take the test numerous times have a big effect on this statistic), first time pass rate, and highest score pass rate (determined by summing the scores for the last test score for individual students) for all students were: 38% (overall), 68% (1st), and <u>82% (last)</u>. Pass rates varied within majors with some areas including small numbers of test takers.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of</p>							Mean GPA	Mean Overall PP Score	Mean Math GPA	Mean Writing GPA	Mean Speech GPA	El Ed	3.36	439	2.8	3.8	3.7	K-12	3.30	436	2.6	3.5	3.5	7-12	3.47	442	3.0	3.9	3.8
	Mean GPA	Mean Overall PP Score	Mean Math GPA	Mean Writing GPA	Mean Speech GPA																										
El Ed	3.36	439	2.8	3.8	3.7																										
K-12	3.30	436	2.6	3.5	3.5																										
7-12	3.47	442	3.0	3.9	3.8																										

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
		3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 2; 96%-100% of all student teachers received ratings of “proficient” or “advanced” on all standards. However, when disaggregating performance, some standards were among the highest rated and some the lowest. Overall, students received relatively low ratings for their performance on standard 2.2.

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 3: Creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected, appreciated, and celebrated.</i></p> <p>3.1 Employs a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social level of each student, and chooses teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes.</p> <p>3.2 Creates lessons and activities that differentiate instruction, operating at multiple levels to meet individual student needs.</p> <p>3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them, assuring all students are treated in an equitable and fair manner.</p> <p>3.4 Designs and/or modifies standards-based instruction in response to diagnosed student needs, including the needs of exceptional learners and English language learners. Appropriate provisions may include time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned, communication, and response modes. CO 6.2</p> <p>3.5 Utilizes his/her understanding of educational disabilities and giftedness and their effects on student learning in order to individualize instruction for these students. CO 6.3</p> <p>3.6 Develops and applies individualized education plans as required by law. CO 6.5</p> <p>3.7 Teaches students within the scope of a teacher’s legal responsibilities and students’ educational rights, and follows procedures as specified in state, federal, and local statutes. CO 6.4</p> <p>3.8 Uses specific knowledge of student medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior. CO 6.7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 90% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome. Low ratings were mostly related to students simply not including or having incomplete work and/or artifacts in the portfolio so that faculty had to award lower ratings.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Overall mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.2 to 3.9 for standards in this area. Among all students, performance was strongest on standards 3.3. and 3.7. Patterns of strengths/weaknesses varied for the 3 groups; for secondary and K-12 teachers, Goal 3 standards were among the lowest rated of all outcomes, but elementary teachers showed strengths in this area. Although 3 (7%) students received ratings <3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors and showed no discernable pattern.</p>
<p><i>Goal 4: Ensures, through the use of standards and informal and formal assessment activities, the continuous development of all learners.</i></p> <p>4.1 Utilizes valid and reliable assessment tools that are aligned with standards and benchmarks and that assess meaningful learning in all content areas. CO 3.2</p> <p>4.2 Locates, develops and utilizes a variety of informal and formal assessments, including rubrics. Examples of assessments may include observation, portfolios of student work, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, projects, student self-assessments, peer assessment, and standardized tests. CO 3.3</p> <p>4.3 Accurately documents, in an ongoing manner, and reports the effects of various teaching strategies on individual and group performance relative to content standards through observation of classroom interactions, questioning, and analysis of student work. CO 3.4/5.7</p> <p>4.4 Uses assessment data as a basis for standards-based</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 75% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome. Weaknesses in developing rubrics and incomplete assessment information in lesson plans were the most commonly referenced areas for improvement.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers exceeded 3.5 for all standards in Goal 4. Among different student groups, Elementary Education students scored the highest on standards in Goal 4 (3.70). K-12 and secondary students were rated significantly lower overall at about 3.5. For all groups, performance on standard 4.8 was a strength. Performance on standards 4.2 and 4.6 were weaknesses.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>instruction in each domain of responsibility, meeting current learner needs and leading to next level of development, raising the academic performance level of individuals and of a group of students, over time, to a higher level. CO 1.1, 3.5, 5.4</p> <p>4.5 Applies technology in a variety of ways to chart, track, and analyze data, including assessment of student learning.</p> <p>4.6 Collects data on individual learner achievement (e.g., academic, social, cognitive) and is accountable for each student’s learning. CO 6.6</p> <p>4.7 Prepares students for the Colorado Assessment Program (CSAP) and other assessments of educational achievement. CO 3.7</p> <p>4.8 Ensures that instruction is consistent with school district priorities and goals, the Colorado Academic Standards, and the 1999 Colorado Accreditation Program. CO 3.8</p>	<p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 5: Constructs and uses pedagogy to maximize the intellectual, social, physical, and moral development of all students.</i></p> <p><u>Pedagogy: 5.1-5.6, 5.10</u></p> <p>5.1 Maximizes student learning by incorporating student centered strategies: CO 6.1</p> <p>5.2 Demonstrates a wide variety of instructional strategies that promote learning -- creating and implementing plans which include all essential lesson components: CO 3.1</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, and units based on commercial basal materials. CO 3.1</p> <p>5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and ensures attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards. CO 5.5</p> <p>5.5 Provides effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance relative to content standards. CO 3.6</p> <p>5.6 Uses multiple, alternative teaching strategies and materials matched to different student needs (e.g., developmental stages, learning styles, and interests). CO 6.1</p> <p>5.10 Works in cooperation with library, media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information literacy skills into the curriculum to accomplish standards-based learning activities. CO 5.6</p> <p><u>Technology: 5.7-5.9</u></p> <p>5.7 Applies technology to the delivery of standards-based instruction. CO 7.1</p> <p>5.8 Uses technology to increase student achievement. CO 7.2</p> <p>5.9 Instructs students in basic technology skills. CO 7.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for students on this goal were in the “developing” range or above for 70% of students. This is up a little bit from last year. This goal area is traditionally difficult for students. It is focused on pedagogy and planning. The reasons for the low ratings that still persisted were consistent with past years and varied: incomplete lesson plans and failure to develop accurate indirect/inquiry and cooperative learning plans. Additionally, for students with low ratings on this goal, some were admitted with reservations, requiring a formal support plan to address the issues.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.35 (secondary) to 3.75 (El Ed) for Goal 5 (K-12 students averaged 3.56). Across all standards for Goal 5, standards 5.3 and 5.10 were weaknesses for students in some groups. Although 3 students (7%) received ratings <3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern). Strength areas included standards 5.5, 5.7, and 5.8.</p>
<p><i>Goal 6: Is a reflective decision maker, incorporating understandings of educational history, philosophy, and inquiry, as well as the values of the democratic ideal.</i></p> <p>6.1 Responds to the following laws, regulations, and policies in a professional manner: federal and state constitutional provisions; federal executive, legislative and legal influences; state roles of the governor, legislature, and State Board of Education; local school districts, boards of education and boards of cooperative educational services; non-traditional and non-public schools, including charter schools, religious schools, and home schooling; and public sector input from business, advocacy groups, and the public.</p> <p>6.2 Has developed a personal philosophy of education, incorporating concepts from historical and contemporary educational philosophies and educational research, from the United States and other countries, and acts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 80% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome. Reasons for low ratings varied but generally reflected incomplete and missing information and incomplete reflections for the goal rather than difficulties with proficiency. Becoming reflective practitioners is another traditionally difficult area for beginning teachers. They are more concerned about getting through the lesson without embarrassment than the learning that is happening.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>consistently with this philosophy.</p> <p>6.3 Is able to seek answers to teaching questions and clearly state positions on educational issues and support them with theory, practice, and research.</p> <p>6.4 Continually examines, reflects, and modifies own educational practices and performances and accesses professional development options necessary to improve performance.</p> <p>6.5 Draws upon a variety of sources as supports for development as a learner and a teacher, including colleagues and professional literature. CO 8.5</p>	<p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At program completion:</u> Performance on standards in this area continued to be strengths for most students. Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.50 (7-12) to 3.89 (Elementary) for Goal 6 (K-12 students averaged 3.68 for standards in Goal 6). Although 1 (2%) received ratings <3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the small number prevented any kind of generalizable analysis.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 7: Creates communities of learning by working collaboratively with colleagues, families, and other members.</i></p> <p>7.1 Involves parents and guardians effectively as participants and partners in student learning, establishing respectful and productive relationships. CO 5.4</p> <p>7.2 Communicates a variety of assessment results, and their implications to students, parents, guardians, professionals, administrators, and community in order to collaboratively plan the learner’s program. CO 5.9</p> <p>7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate information. CO 7.3</p> <p>7.4 Makes links with community resources and learners' other environments to foster student learning.</p> <p>7.5 Is sensitive and responsive to clues of student distress, actively listening and advocating for students, and seeking outside help as needed and appropriate to remedy problems. CO 8.2</p> <p>7.6 Establishes rapport with students, maintaining professional, positive relationships.</p> <p>7.7 Participates in collegial activities such as school functions, interdisciplinary team teaching, and curriculum development designed to make the schools a productive learning environment.</p> <p>7.8 Participates successfully as a member of a team, sharing, encouraging, & accepting responsibilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 91% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome, exceeding the program’s goal for performance.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.50 (7-12) to 3.92 (Elementary) for Goal 7. Mean ratings on standards 7.6 and 7.8 indicate that these continued to be strengths for teachers in all 3 groups (mean ratings all above 3.7). For Secondary students, other standards in Goal 7 showed relatively weak performance when compared to other program outcomes. Interestingly, no students were rated below a 3, even though the overall average (especially for 7-12 students) was lower than most other goal areas.</p>
<p><i>Goal 8: Models the professional and ethical responsibilities of the education profession.</i></p> <p>8.1 Follows the ethical standards of the education profession. CO 8.2</p> <p>8.2 Consistently exhibits a strong work ethic, assuming responsibility for oneself and others in the learning community; is punctual and on-time for all responsibilities. CO 8.2</p> <p>8.3 Demonstrates the behavioral and emotional stability required of professional educators.</p> <p>8.4 Acts in a caring manner towards K-12 students, peers, and other members of the learning community.</p> <p>8.5 Models an excitement for teaching and learning, advocating teaching as a worthy career and describing various career paths in local, state, national, and education, including international options, higher education, public, and private education. CO 8.4</p> <p>8.6 Respects the input of others, including supervisors, and attempts to incorporate feedback to grow professionally.</p> <p>8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence.</p> <p>8.8 Is well-groomed and dresses in a professional manner.</p> <p>8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2019.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio rating for students for goal 8 standards was 3.2, the highest overall rating for all goal areas. This is to be expected, as performance on this goal (related to student dispositions for teaching) should be more developed earlier in the program. This average is the same as we saw last year on this goal. Among all students, only 3 received a rating lower than 2.00 on goal 8.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers on Goal 8 were the highest for any goal area as well, ranging from 3.70 (Secondary) to 3.85 (elementary). Average ratings for each group for each standard were all >3.60 and no students had ratings less than 3.0.</p>

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) or other issues did you address in this cycle? 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 column H and/or feedback?	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?
<p>SLO 1.1-1.3 1.1. Organizes, allocates, and manages resources of time, space, activities, and attention, as well as establishing routines and procedures to create a learning environment characterized by developmentally appropriate student behavior, efficient use of time, and active and equitable acquisition of knowledge, skills, and understanding. CO 5.1 1.2. Monitors and analyzes the classroom environment and applies appropriate intervention strategies and practices to enhance social</p>	<p>2017-2018</p>	<p>Revise content of ED 301 course that has a focus on classroom management to address the weaknesses identified by the data.</p>	<p>The department met as a team to discuss changes to the classroom management instruction in ED 301. Specific suggestions were agreed upon and made by the two instructors for that course during the 2018-2019 academic year.</p>	<p>Classroom management plans for the ED 301 students during the 2018-2019 year seemed to be stronger. Evaluations by cooperating teachers did show an increase in average ratings for these SLOs for <u>admitted</u> students. However, these increased ratings weren't seen in program completers yet because it will take about 2 years for students to progress through the rest of the program.</p>

<p>relationships, student motivation and engagement, and productive work, including: CO 5. 1.3. Establishes and consistently applies accepted disciplinary practices in the school environment that promote positive student growth. CO 5.2</p>				
<p>SLOs 2.3, 2.6, and 2.10 2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategies for a variety of genre, literary response and analysis, content area literacy, and student independent reading. 2.6 Develops in students an understanding and use of: number systems and number sequences, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and functions and use of variables. 2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning.</p>	<p>2017-2018</p>	<p>Examine the content in courses related to SLOs 2.3, 2.6, and 2.10 and address the weaknesses identified in 2017-2018.</p>	<p>Representatives from the Teacher Education Program met with representatives from the content departments in social studies, English, and math to discuss content in required courses. The discussions ended up covering both the knowledge candidates need in their respective disciplines, but also how aligned it is to the new PRAXIS tests. Teacher Ed shared the expectations of the PRAXIS tests with the departments so that courses could be changed. In the end, only minor changes were made to the content courses, but some important changes were made to the methods courses.</p>	<p>Average ratings on these SLOs went up from last year. They were no longer in the lower tier of average ratings for our program, so we feel like the changes yielded positive results. The comprehensive approach across departments was key.</p>

<p>Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>2017-2018</p>	<p>Examine the content in courses related to PRAXIS content areas.</p>	<p>Representatives from the Teacher Education Program met with representatives from the content departments in social studies, English, and math to discuss content in required courses. The discussions ended up covering both the knowledge candidates need in their respective disciplines, but also how aligned it is to the new PRAXIS tests. Teacher Ed shared the expectations of the PRAXIS tests with the departments so that courses could be changed. In the end, only minor changes were made to the content courses, but some important changes were made to the methods courses.</p>	<p>Pass rates for most licensure areas are strong. The elementary social studies test continues to be a problem area. We have decided to attend some meetings with CDE and ETS to delve into our PRAXIS data more thoroughly to see if they can offer additional help. We have attended one of those meetings and have another scheduled for the upcoming year. The first meeting was not as useful as we hoped, but this second meeting is supposed to provide additional information. We may need to continue to meet with social studies to discuss options. Finally, we are hoping the new Title V grant that we received, which has funds for PRAXIS tutors, will also help.</p>
--	------------------	--	--	---

Comments on part II: