

Early Childhood Education

2019 Assessment Plan

Person Responsible: Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean

Teacher Education Program

College of Education, Engineering, & Professional Studies

Table of Contents

Mission and Goals.....	2
SLOs and Curriculum	3
Assessment Processes	7
Key Assessment Summary Tables.....	4, 9, 21

Mission and Goals

Program Mission

The Early Childhood Education (ECE) major, which leads to a B.S. degree, is designed to provide a strong education for future early childhood education professionals (teachers, day care workers, etc.). Core requirements build upon students' experiences in General Education to provide both breadth and depth in the arts and humanities, English, math, sciences, and social sciences. Students completing this program acquire a foundation of knowledge in the liberal arts and the skills to apply strong content knowledge in designing curriculum and instruction within ECE settings. The program was explicitly designed to meet the needs of ECE professionals and offers both a general emphasis and a K-3 licensure emphasis for those who want to teach in Colorado public schools.

In designing the Early Childhood Education major, faculty aligned courses, course content, requirements, and assessments with the *Colorado Early Learning & Development Guidelines (Rule 8.01)*, *Colorado Academic Standards, Rules for the Administration of the Educator Licensing Act of 1991, Senate Bill 154* (which specifies the standards required for teachers by the Colorado commission on Higher Education), and the *Teacher Quality Standards* for all Colorado teachers.

An Early Childhood Education program supports both the role and mission of CSU-Pueblo as a *regional, comprehensive university with moderately selective admissions standards. The University shall offer a broad array of baccalaureate programs with a strong professional focus and a firm grounding in the liberal arts and sciences. The University shall also offer selected masters level graduate programs. (Colorado Statutes 23-55-101)*

Moreover, the mission statement for CSU-Pueblo adopted by the Board of Governors of the Colorado State University system is as follows: *CSU-Pueblo's success will be measured by the resilience, agility, and problem-solving abilities of our diverse student population and the ways in which our graduates are able to navigate work in a rapidly changing world.* As the Early Childhood Education major addresses strong liberal arts education and the need to prepare quality teachers and other ECE professionals, the program directly fulfills the mission of CSU-Pueblo. CSU-Pueblo has a long tradition of collaboration with PK-12 schools and has provided leadership in educational reform in the region. To meet its mission, CSU-Pueblo must be sensitive to the needs of our youngest citizens, forming them with the best care and education possible.

Program Goals

At CSU-Pueblo, teacher education is a campus wide responsibility, and overall program goals reflect components of both the Early Childhood Education major and Education minor. It is the purpose of the Early Childhood Education major to insure that students will develop breadth and depth of knowledge of the liberal arts, and it is the responsibility of the Education minor to insure students become proficient at transforming this knowledge into curriculum and instruction for young children.

It is the joint responsibility of both the major and minor to prepare future teachers and ECE professionals to evaluate information critically, to study and research independently, and to communicate knowledge effectively. The following four program goals have been established for the Early Childhood Education degree. Goal 1 is largely the responsibility of the Early Childhood Education major and Goal 4 the responsibility of the Education minor; benchmarks for Goals 2 and 3 have been designed to be addressed across the entire degree program.

1. **Acquisition of Knowledge.** Acquire a broad knowledge of the liberal arts and sciences including an understanding of the significant ideas, concepts, structures and values within disciplines and mastering content knowledge in all areas taught in early childhood education: the arts, math, literature and language, social sciences, sciences, and child development and learning.
2. **Construction of Knowledge.** Construct knowledge through critical and analytical thinking, independent thinking, reasoned judgment, mature values, and imagination.
3. **Communication of Knowledge.** Communicate knowledge by effectively writing in academic and practical formats, speaking in a variety of settings, and utilizing technology as a tool for communication.
4. **Application of Knowledge.** Apply knowledge by using multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts; using different viewpoints, theories, “ways of knowing,” and methods of inquiry in the teaching of subject matter content; evaluating curriculum for comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness; engaging students in generating knowledge and testing hypotheses through inquiry; developing and using curricula that encourage students to see and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives; and creating interdisciplinary learning experiences.

SLOs and Curriculum

The four goals listed above are aligned with the standards of three accrediting bodies for teacher education (*Colorado Department of Education, Colorado Commission on Higher Education/Department of Higher Education, and the Colorado Early Learning & Development Guidelines*) into program performance standards, which are the specific student learning outcomes of the program. Teacher Education has 64 outcomes, which it assesses and monitors for all students. Table 1 (below) lists the Early Childhood Education goals and the specific student learning outcomes that align with these goals. Included are only those learning outcomes that relate to the four goals of the major, and additional outcomes that address pedagogy or other teaching standards are not included.

Table 1. Alignment of SLOs with ECE Goals and Other External Standards

Teacher Education Performance Standard (SLO)	Aligned Course Work	ECE Goal	CDE Perf. Standard	PreK-3 Model Content Standards	CDE 8.02 Content Standard	CCHE Criterion
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.	ENG 130 ED 351 ECE 440	Goal 4	CO 1.3	Literacy Standards 2, 4	8.02(1)(a)	
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.	ENG 101 ENG 102 COMR 103 ECE 440	Goal 4	CO 1.4	Literacy Standards 1, 3, 4	8.02(1)(a)	
2.5 Utilizes Colorado Model Content Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction.	ENG 101 ENG 102 ECE 440 ED 351	Goal 4	CO 1.5	Literacy Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
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.	MATH 109 MATH 360 MATH 361 ECE 463	Goal 4	CO 2.1	Math Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
2.7 Utilizes Colorado Model Content Standards in Mathematics for the improvement of instruction.	MATH 109 MATH 360 MATH 361 ECE 463	Goal 4	CO 2.2	Math Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction.	ENG 101 ENG 102 ECE 440 ED 351 MATH 109 MATH 360	Goal 4	CO 4.4	Math & Literacy Standards	8.02(1)(a)	

Teacher Education Performance Standard (SLO)	Aligned Course Work	ECE Goal	CDE Perf. Standard	PreK-3 Model Content Standards	CDE 8.02 Content Standard	CCHE Criterion
	MATH 361 ECE 463					
2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all Colorado model content standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on content standards.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 4	CO 4.2	All Content Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 4	CO 4.1, 4.3	All Content Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which he is preparing to teach. For ECE, content areas include: social studies, world language, science, music, and visual arts.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 1		All Content Standards	8.02 1(a)	4.02 4.07 4.08
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.	ECE 101 ECE 102 ECE 103 ECE 425 PSYCH 151	Goal 1		All Content Standards	8.02(2)(b) 8.02(2)(c)	4.08 (gender)
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.	ECE 420 ECE 425	Goal 2 Goal 4			8.02(1)(b) 8.02(2)(c)	4.08
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.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 2 Goal 4	CO 3.1	All Content Standards	8.02(1)(a)	
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.	All general education pathways courses in the program	Goal 2	CO 5.6	Literacy Standard 4	8.02(1)(a)	

Teacher Education Performance Standard (SLO)	Aligned Course Work	ECE Goal	CDE Perf. Standard	PreK-3 Model Content Standards	CDE 8.02 Content Standard	CCHE Criterion
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.	ECE 101 ECE 102 ECE 103 ECE 425 PSYCH 151	Goal 4	CO 5.5	All Content Standards	8.02(2)(a) 8.02(2)(b)	
6.5 Draws upon a variety of sources as supports for development as a learner and a teacher, including colleagues and professional literature.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 2	CO 8.5		8.02(6)	
7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate information.	Many courses prepare students for this	Goal 3	CO 7.3		8.02(4)(d)	
8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence.	All courses prepare students for this	Goal 2			8.02(6)	
8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level.	ENG 101 ENG 102 ECE 440 COMR 103	Goal 3			8.02(4)(d)	4.02

Assessment Processes

Overview of CSU-Pueblo Performance-Based Assessment Program

The design of CSU-Pueblo's teacher education assessment system, including the assessment of outcomes of the Early Childhood Education major, has been driven by four guiding principles: 1) the system should reliably result in the identification of students who meet established criteria for admission to education, for retention in teacher education, and for admission to student teaching; 2) it should provide additional ongoing, formative information on individual student progress and identify specific student problems and needs in order to allow support and remediation necessary for success; 3) it should provide summative information on student proficiency on all performance-based standards; and 4) the process should ensure ongoing program improvement by providing reliable and valid information on the program's successes and weaknesses related to student performance, as well as other criteria required by university, state and federal reporting agencies.

Syllabi for all courses in teacher education are available electronically on the I: drive; these demonstrate important components of program assessment -- alignment of each course with program standards/the Colorado standards, benchmarks to be met in each course (course objectives), and all course and field experience requirements aligned with the performance standards.

CSU-Pueblo's performance-based assessment program has five components:

1. Program standards/student outcomes related to the Early Childhood Education major, aligned with the *Colorado Academic Standards* for each teaching area, the *Colorado Teacher Quality Standards*, as well as the standards of professional (*Colorado Early Learning & Development Guidelines*). These are included in Table 1;
2. A process for evaluating student performance in an ongoing manner, as well as structured evaluations at three crucial transition points in the program – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. A summary of the timing of assessment is displayed in Table 2;
3. A number of evaluations tools. The *Student Performance Inventory* is a series of rubrics that describes the student outcomes and proficiency requirements related to each standard that will be assessed as students' progress through the program (available online at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>);
4. A reporting system for documenting and monitoring student progress; and
5. A system for using the data collected to inform the program of strengths and weaknesses.

Component I: Performance Standards and Evaluation Criteria

The Early Childhood Education program is an integrated major and minor – and the goals of the program include knowledge standards directly. The student outcomes of the Early Childhood Education major are a subset of the student outcomes (standards) of the Teacher Education Program (TEP). A copy of all of these standards is available on the program’s website: <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html> . The specific outcomes related to the Early Childhood Education major are included in Table 1 in this document.

Two levels of “Benchmarks” for each standard have been articulated – 1) course objectives which faculty have aligned with course content, activities, assignments, and fieldwork requirements, with student performance assessed by faculty and field experience teachers; and 2) benchmarks for three transition points – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. These benchmarks are included on the program's *Student Performance Inventory*. Benchmark performance is officially evaluated and recorded at admission to education and at program completion. Prior to the beginning of student teaching, students self evaluate their performance on benchmarks and record this self-assessment. At the beginning of student teaching, supervisors review the student portfolio, officially evaluate 1-2 standards, and give students oral and written feedback on meeting important benchmarks for admission to student teaching. Proficiency on meeting each standard is the final “benchmark” and is the goal for successful completion of teacher education and recommendation for state licensure.

Documentation of the articulation of standards across the program, as well as the specific teaching/learning activities, student assignments, and, in many cases, the course-embedded assessments used to evaluate student performance on these benchmarks, is available on the TEP website (<https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>).

Component II: Process for Evaluation

The assessment program has been developed to provide reliable and valid information on

1. Student performance and skills essential for future success at three important transition points -- admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion;
2. Individual student progress throughout the program in order to identify specific problems and needs and ensure support and remediation necessary for success;
3. Graduates’ and their supervisors’ attitudes towards proficiency on performance standards and preservice program quality; and

4. Overall teacher education program successes and weaknesses, information that supports on-going program improvement.

1. Evaluation at Transition Points

CSU – Pueblo’s evaluation process is designed with in-depth reviews of knowledge and performance at three key points or transitions in each student’s career – at application for admission to teacher education, at application for admission to student teaching, and during student teaching/program completion. These assessments are supplemented by frequent, ongoing end-of-semester evaluations of student progress student progress through evaluations in early field experiences and monitoring of the student’s GPA. Information from these evaluations also becomes evidence evaluated at transition points.

At each transition point, faculty, with input from K-12 teachers in partner schools, review a body of evidence and draw conclusions about student readiness for the next stage in becoming a teacher. In order to increase the validity and reliability of information used to make important decisions, the program has identified multiple data sources and measures, including standardized test scores, ratings of student performance by faculty and K-12 teachers, and evaluation of student work samples. Table 2 displays information on the timing of assessment for each Early Childhood Education outcome.

Table 2. Summary of Timing for Formal, Recorded Evaluation of ECE SLOs (Done Yearly)

<i>Goals & SLOs</i>		<i>Admission to Education</i>	<i>Ongoing Assessment</i>	<i>Admission to Student Teaching</i>	<i>Program Completion</i>	<i>First Year Studies</i>	
<i>ECE Goal</i>	<i>SLO</i>					<i>Graduate</i>	<i>Supervisor</i>
4	2.3		X		X	X ³	X ³
4	2.4		X		X	X ³	X ³
4	2.5		X		X		
4	2.6		X		X		
4	2.7		X		X		
4	2.8		X		X		
4	2.9	X	X		X	X	X
4	2.10	X	X		X	X ³	X ³
1	2.11	X	X	X	X	X	X
1	3.1	X	X		X	X	X
2	3.3		X		X	X	
2, 4	5.3		X		X		
4	5.4		X		X		
2	5.10	X	X		X		X
2	6.5	X	X		X		
3	7.3	X	X		X	X	
2	8.7	X	X		X		
3	8.9	X	X		X		

1. Admission to Education

After completing a minimum of 45 credit hours (and a minimum 2.6 cumulative GPA), students may enroll in ED 301: Frameworks of Teaching (ED 560 for post-baccalaureate students). During enrollment in this class, preservice students learn the basics of standards-based instruction, assessment, and classroom management and apply these skills in an early field experience. They also complete their formal application for admission to teacher education. This application comes in 2 parts – submission of formal documents (recommendations, transcripts, *MAPP* scores), which are initially reviewed and summarized on an admission to education checklist by office staff, and submission of an electronic portfolio with evidence referenced to admission requirements. Table 3 summarizes the body of evidence evaluated at Admission to Education. A description of the requirements for the portfolio is included in *the CSU-Pueblo Teacher Education Handbook* and detailed information on the content of the portfolio is included in a table in the appendices to the report.

Multiple Measures

To ensure a reliable and valid assessment system, faculty monitor multiple measures of students' performance for admission to education. Categories of data include:

1. *Course completion and course grades in general education, the content area, and skills areas.* Students submit all transcripts to the program, and grades in English, speech, mathematics, ED 301/ED 560, and cumulative GPA are evaluated.
2. *Ratings of performance by faculty in teacher education (TEP) and in the arts and sciences (on program recommendation forms).* Recommendation forms are distributed to faculty by students and returned to the Teacher Education Office. Questions relate to dispositions for teaching (e.g., work ethic, honesty) as well as evaluation of writing, speaking, and knowledge in the content area.
3. *Ratings of potential for teaching by field experience teacher (on web-based recommendation forms).* A web-based evaluation completed by the field experience teacher with whom the candidate has during the semester. The tool requests information on dispositions for teaching, the student's performance on benchmarks of selected performance standards, and a final recommendation for potential for becoming a teacher. Field experience teachers also provide written feedback on two lessons taught by preservice students; these are included in the electronic portfolio.
4. *Writing samples* (academic writing, teaching plans, and reflections in the teaching portfolio).
5. *Teaching/speech samples* (video clip of teaching).

6. *Standardized test scores of general education and basic skills in writing, math, and reading (MAPP).* The program administers the *Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)*, a test of general education developed by the Educational Testing Service (<http://www.ets.org>). The test provides normative and criterion referenced information on skills in general education (Social Science, Humanities, Science) as well as basic skills (Math, Written Expression, Critical Reading), Critical Thinking, and an Overall Rating of Performance.

At the present time, MAPP performance is used as one of the multiple measures in evaluating general education and basic skills in the portfolio assessment process (e.g., the writing score is used as one of the pieces of information in evaluating a student's writing), and the program has not developed a "qualifying" score for admission to education based on *MAPP* performance. Previous to administering the MAPP, the program administered the *Academic Profile* (its predecessor at ETS) and had gathered information to develop a qualifying score based on the score's correlation with students' success in the program (ability to pass the licensure exam and GPA). However, with ETS's switch to *MAPP*, TEP has begun to gather data again and plans to correlate these data with students' future success in the program and establish qualifying scores. However, ETS does not return data in a timely manner, and faculty often do not have scores returned at the time portfolios are reviewed for admission to education. If the Teacher Education Program (TEP) does implement qualifying scores in the future, it will require students to take the *MAPP* earlier in the program.

7. *Performance assessment based on artifacts in the student's electronic portfolio.* The program has developed an electronic portfolio system that allows students to link performance evidence to program standards. Faculty can access these portfolios on the web, rating and providing feedback on proficiency on the standards. Students have access to this assessment information, which is automatically downloaded into the Teacher Education Information Management System (TEIMS) and becomes a part of the program's system for monitoring individual student performance and program quality.
8. *Formal recommendation for admission from a faculty member in teacher education and from the field experience teacher.* The faculty member evaluating the portfolio and the field experience teacher with whom the candidate worked during ED 301/ED 560 both are required to recommend/not recommend the candidate for admission to education based on their understanding of the candidate's potential for becoming a teacher.

Table 3. Summary of body of evidence on student performance measures evaluated at Admission to Education. Items in **boldface** are absolute requirements for admission to education. Failing to meet these always result in an automatic denial.

Standard	Multiple Measures	Source of Information	Performance Required
8.9 A Written Expression	1. Completion of English Composition I and II (C or better)	Transcript	C or better in both for admission
	2. <i>MAPP</i> Written Expression Subtest Score	<i>MAPP</i>	Part of <i>Body of Evidence</i> resulting in overall rating at Admission
	3. Ratings of Proficiency by 3 Faculty & Cooperating Teacher	Ratings on Recommendations of Faculty & Cooperating Teacher	Ratings of “2” or better
	4. Evaluation of writing samples in portfolio	Portfolio Writing Samples	Ratings of “2” or better
8.9 B Oral	1. Completion of SPCOM 103	Transcript Review	“B” or better or “C” and passing score on Oral Proficiency Exam
	2. Ratings of Proficiency by 3 Faculty & Cooperating Teacher	Evaluation Form	Ratings of “2” or better
8.9 C Mathematics	1. Completion of Math 109 or Math 109 and Math 156, or Math 121 or higher math required of program ²	Transcript Review	MATH 109 = “B” or better or “C” or better in higher math or “C” or better in two math courses²
	2. <i>MAPP</i> Mathematics Subtest Score	<i>MAPP</i>	Part of <i>Body of Evidence</i> resulting in overall rating at Admission
2.11 Knowledge in Content Area	1. Ratings of Proficiency by Faculty	Evaluation Form	Ratings of “2” or better
	2. Grades in Content Area	Transcript Review	Part of <i>Body of Evidence</i> resulting in overall rating at Admission

Standard	Multiple Measures	Source of Information	Performance Required
	3. <i>MAPP</i> General Score/Area Scores (for Elementary Education Students)	<i>MAPP</i>	Part of <i>Body of Evidence</i> resulting in overall rating at Admission
2.11 General Ed. Knowledge	1. Cumulative GPA		Transcript Review 2.60 or higher¹
	2. <i>MAPP</i> General Score/Area Scores	<i>MAPP</i>	Part of <i>Body of Evidence</i> resulting in overall rating at Admission
2.9, 3.3, 6.5, 7.3, 8.7, Performance Benchmarks (Standards Assessment)	<p>Below are the BENCHMARKS for standards at admission to education. Numbers indicate their alignment with the CSU-Pueblo Standards:</p> <p>2.9 Utilizes the Colorado Standards in planning and aligning instruction, including writing of lesson plan objectives in content areas based on standards and benchmarks</p> <p>3.3 Treats all students in an equitable and fair manner, as reported by self and others, and can investigate own personal biases that may limit educational equity for all children and suggests</p> <p>6.5 Utilizes a variety of sources, including professional literature and feedback from instructor and cooperating teacher to grow as a professional</p> <p>7.3 Uses email and online tools to communicate and manage information</p> <p>8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence</p>	<p>Please see the rubrics used for assessment of standards for the specific information evaluated for each standard.</p> <p>Portfolio Work samples: Management assignment, evaluations by peer and teacher of lessons, evaluation of peer's teaching, videotape of teaching, Field Experience Teacher Evaluation Form, lesson plans, transcripts, recommendations, <i>MAPP</i>, writing samples, reflections, rubric, software evaluations, case study, research paper; examples of discussion boards</p>	Ratings of "2" or better on CSU-Pueblo standards in Goals 1-7 and ratings of "3" or better on Pueblo standards for Goal 8

¹ In all cases, the GPA is based on courses at CSU-Pueblo. GPA for transfer students and post-baccalaureate candidates who have not completed 12 credit hours at the institution is calculated as the cumulative GPA for all courses completed at other institutions. Once a student completes 12 hours at CSU-Pueblo, his/her GPA is calculated as a CSU-Pueblo GPA.

Process of Assessment

Students complete the process of applying to education throughout the semester that they are enrolled in ED 301/ED 560. Early in the semester they submit written documentation of CBI checks, health clearance, recommendations from faculty (which may not be complete until the end of the semester), unofficial transcripts from all attended institutions, and advising information. These are reviewed by office staff who record information in the candidates' files and return the documents to students. At the end of the semester, students resubmit this information along with their electronic portfolio, which they have been completing throughout the term.

Electronic portfolios are located on CSU-Pueblo's intranet and are accessible to students via the web using their own private pin. Web shots from a student's Admissions/Frameworks portfolio are included below. The portfolio requires students to link required materials (such as lesson plans) to specific program standards, to choose among other exhibits that they believe best demonstrate their proficiency for other standards, and to complete written reflections that demonstrate their understanding of the standards, their own strengths and weaknesses, and future goals.

Students may submit the portfolio for review and informal feedback by faculty, but they formally submit it for assessment when they apply for admission. When the portfolio is submitted for assessment, it becomes "frozen" and may not be changed. At this point, another form of the portfolio becomes available to the student. This "Teacher Education Portfolio," which now includes all program standards, not just those evaluated at admission to education, is the portfolio students will continue to build during their remaining time in the program. The system automatically transfers all of the documents in the first (Admissions) portfolio. TEP "freezes" the Admissions portfolio as part of its own assessment process, allowing the program to evaluate "value added" effects of methods courses and student teaching.

Faculty Review

All faculty participate in the admission to education process. At the end of the semester, each TEP faculty member is assigned the assessment materials/applications for four to five candidates and given access to the students' electronic portfolios. Adjunct faculty who have taught and/or evaluated portfolios for the program may also be assigned to evaluate portfolios for students depending on the number of students applying for admission. Faculty evaluate the body of evidence described in Table 3, recording an overall rating for level of proficiency for each teaching standard on a scale of 1-4 and providing written feedback .

This scale is described on the matrices used to assist in evaluating performance, with ratings of “2” indicating “developing” proficiency, the level expected of students beginning their experiences in becoming teachers. However, ratings of “3” or “4” (“proficient” or “advanced”) are expected for ratings on dispositions (work ethic, honesty, open mindedness, etc.). Copies of two matrices used by faculty in this process are included in the appendices.

Ratings automatically are downloaded into the data system that TEP has developed and are recorded in the student’s electronic “file,” becoming accessible as important information on this student and all students admitted to education. This data system (called TEIMS) is described later in this paper.

Web shots of the portfolio as a faculty member views it while evaluating materials at admission to education

Standard	Rating	Not Rated	Comments	Category & Description
1.1		<input type="checkbox"/>		Valid Rating: 1-4 Category: Description: FR-Classroom management procedures & routines; demonstrates growth in both lesson delivery & classroom management across semester; measured by self-eval & teacher eval, based on 2 lessons completed in field exp classroom & peer eval; emphasis: managing time, activities, and attention (ED 301)

Admission Decisions

After reviewing all documents and rating each standard, faculty complete a final recommendation for admission to education. Faculty have three choices: to recommend admission to education, to recommend admission with reservations, and to deny admission to

education. CSU-Pueblo does not admit students conditionally to teacher education – each student is either admitted or denied, and students “recommended with reservations” are fully admitted to TEP. Two types of criteria are considered at admission to education. Some criteria are required for admission, and, if not met, always result in denial. These criteria (such as GPA, completion of writing, speech, and math criteria) are highlighted in boldface in Table 3. No student may enroll in further education classes unless these are met. Staff in the TEP office provide faculty with a review of this key information.

Students may also be denied admission based on the work they included (or didn’t include) in their electronic portfolio. Standards focusing on pedagogy, management, or assessment with ratings below “2” (or “developing”) may result in a student failing to be admitted or may result in a student being admitted with a support plan. Faculty use the following rule in making this decision: if the preponderance of evidence is that a student’s performance is not at a level where she/he can be successful in future methods courses, even with available support, the student would be denied admission. If a faculty member denies admission based on portfolio review, a second review of the portfolio often occurs.

If the faculty member evaluating the portfolio believes that the student has not met a program benchmark for admission but can be successful in future classes with additional support, the student would be admitted with reservations and with the recommendation of a support plan. Support plans, which are generated at a meeting of a faculty member and the student, consist of written goals, action steps, resources to be used, and a date for review. Support plans are stored in the student’s electronic file in the Teacher Education Information Management System (TEIMS). Approximately three to four students are admitted with Support Plans each term. These plans focus on a range of student needs, from oral communication goals, to assertiveness in K-3 field experiences. A majority of plans focus on deficits in writing, in incomplete information in the portfolio (missing information) or in failure in some aspect of lesson planning. At admission to education, these plans are usually developed by the student and the Associate Dean of Education.

Review of Admission to Education Information

The Associate Dean for Teacher Education summarizes data related to admission to education in a standard report with faculty in Teacher Education and with faculty from the arts and sciences on the Teacher Education Board. This review usually occurs once per semester, followed by a discussion of the data and suggestions for program changes or program goals based on faculty discussion.

2. Ongoing Evaluation

Table 2 summarizes information on the timing of formal monitoring of students’ performance on program standards. Performance is monitored each semester following a student’s admission to education. Field experiences are documented, and at the end of the semester, the classroom teacher completes a formal written evaluation of student performance keyed to program standards related to the specific methods course. Some standards (e.g., teaching dispositions) are evaluating across all field experiences. This

information is collected and stored in TEIMS. Student grade points are checked to ensure that the student continues to meet a cumulative GPA of 2.6000. An example of an evaluation is included in the appendices to this paper. These evaluations are available to faculty on their desk tops.

3. Admission to Student Teaching

The application to student teaching is a three-part process in which students first complete a formal application with evidence of 1) subject matter competence (transcripts, recommendation from the major field, passing scores on licensure exams) and 2) successful completion of early field experiences. In a second step, this information is summarized and then reviewed by the entire teacher education faculty, who conditionally approve (or deny) the application and make suggestions for any support they believe needed for the student to be successful during student teaching. In the third step, at the end of the semester, applicants submit their updated portfolio for review. The portfolio includes the students' scores on the state licensure content exam, curriculum exhibits (e.g., unit plans, video teaching episodes), field experience teacher evaluations, content faculty recommendations, and self-assessments that provide evidence for performance on program standards. Also included with evidence for each goal area is an evaluation on program standards completed by the applicant.

A description of the admission to student teaching process is included in the *CSU-Pueblo Teacher Education Handbook* and online on the Teacher Education web site <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/doc/forms-and-documents/teacher-education-handbook.pdf>. Faculty who will supervise the applicant during student teaching review this portfolio prior to the beginning of student teaching, and formally meet with the student teacher and review the portfolio immediately before student teaching begins. The formal rating of 1-3 standards is completed, shared with the student teacher, and submitted to the Teacher Education Program (NOTE: this activity, in addition to its primary purpose of supporting the student teacher, provides “value-added” information to the program, part of its body of evidence for assessing program effectiveness). Table 4 summarizes the measures and tools used to assess students' readiness for student teaching.

Table 4. Summary of body of evidence on outcome measures evaluated at Admission to Student Teaching related to the Early Childhood Education major

Area	Multiple Measures	Source of Information	Level of Performance Required
2.11 Knowledge in Content Area	1. Completion of all program requirements, including courses in the major	Transcript Review; Advising Forms	Grade of “C” or better in all courses

	2. Grades in Content Area	Transcript Review	2.50 or higher
	3. <i>PLACE or PRAXIS Exam</i>	<i>PLACE/PRAXIS</i>	Passing Score
2.11 General Education Knowledge	1. Completion of <u>all</u> program requirements, including courses in the major	Transcript Review	Grade of “C” or better in all courses
	1. Cumulative GPA	<i>Transcript Review</i>	Cumulative GPA of 2.60 or better
	2. Recommendation of faculty in major program	Advising Form	Signature on Advising Form
Performance Standards	Submission of the portfolio demonstrating that the student meets benchmarks for performance on program standards	Portfolio Work samples: Management assignment, evaluations by peer and teacher of lessons, evaluation of peer’s teaching, videotape of teaching, field experience teacher evaluations, lesson plans, transcripts, recommendations, <i>MAPP</i> , writing samples, reflections, rubric, technology applications, etc.	Ratings of “2” or better; “3” or better on CSU-P standards in Goal 8

4. Program Completion/Student Teaching

The cooperating teacher and university supervisor continually evaluate student teacher performance throughout the student teaching experience. The cooperating teacher completes four formal written evaluations focusing on standards related to lesson planning, delivery, and assessment, which are used primarily for formative feedback to the student teacher and are not officially recorded by the program. Two are completed before midterm and two after midterm. However, these do become part of the body of evidence that supervisors use these in evaluating performance on the performance standards. The university supervisor completes four written evaluations, and, together with the student and cooperating teacher, complete a midterm and a final evaluation that address each standard. The midterm evaluation is submitted with other evaluations to the Director of Student Teaching and Experiential Programming, with a copy shared with the student. The purpose of the midterm evaluation is to provide feedback on strengths and (especially) on identified challenges that need to be addressed before completion of student teaching. At that point in the student teaching semester, any standards on which the student is not making adequate progress are discussed, and support plans developed to ensure the student teacher meets proficiency before program completion.

On the final summative evaluation (the *Final Inventory*), the supervisor (again, with collaboration) records a rating (1-4) for each standard and writes a brief description of the

nature of the student's performance that resulted in the rating. In developing the final evaluation, Supervisors consider their own direct observation of teaching skills, as well as written and video materials in the student's teaching portfolio. In the portfolio are a variety of exhibits, including the Teacher Work Sample.

At the completion of student teaching, student teachers also complete their own self-evaluation of their performance across program standards, as well as an evaluation of the quality of the teacher education program at CSU – Pueblo, an assessment of the quality of student teaching process, and an assessment of the quality of supervision by the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

The rubrics that assist faculty in evaluating the student teacher's ability to apply content knowledge are included on the program web site; two are included as examples in the Appendices to the report. In addition, at the completion of student teaching, each student teacher completes a self-evaluation rating their performance on the program standards; this tool also asks questions about the student teacher's evaluation of key aspects of the teaching program (advising, quality of classes, etc.).

5. Follow-up Assessments

At the end of the graduate's first year of teaching, the teacher education program conducts a survey, requesting feedback from each graduate about his/her performance during their first year of teaching and about the quality of his/her preparation at CSU – Pueblo. A similar survey is sent to each graduate's supervisor (building principal), requesting information about teaching performance.

Component III: Major Evaluation Tools Used in Assessment and Evaluation

Table 5 summarizes the data concerning the measures and tools used in assessment and evaluation of students in the Early Childhood Education major and the timing and strategies used to analyze data gathered by the program. In order to reliably assess students' performance and monitor program quality, the Teacher Education Program (TEP) has developed a number of evaluation tools to evaluate the outcomes of the Early Childhood Education/Elementary Education Program. These include:

- Course-based rubrics, checklists, and assessments used to assess student progress in meeting benchmarks in courses. Some tools, such as a lesson plan components/checklist, are used with minor modifications by faculty across all methods courses.
- Field experience evaluation forms, completed electronically by field teachers in early field experiences. Feedback from these forms, linked to program standards, provide ongoing information on students' ability to apply key knowledge in classroom settings.

- Electronic portfolio evaluation tools, used by students and university faculty at admission to education. An example of a completed portfolio evaluation is included in Appendix E to this report.
- *The Colorado State University - Pueblo Student Performance Inventory*, which was developed after a review of the literature related to teacher performance on program standards. The *Performance Inventory* is a tool to assist faculty in evaluating student proficiency on program standards at the three transition points in the program (admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion) and serves as a more general guide in program development and assessment.
- An electronic inventory of student performance completed by the university supervisor in collaboration with the student and cooperating teacher during student teaching that documents the student teacher's performance on all standards at the completion of student teaching (the *Final Inventory*).
- A survey evaluating performance on program standards and satisfaction with the teaching program and their student teaching experience that is completed by program completers at the end of student teaching.
- Surveys evaluating performance on program standards and satisfaction with the teaching program, to be completed by both program graduates as well as their supervisors/principals at the end of the first year of teaching.

The *Performance Inventory* is a set of rubrics for each program standard. These include the dimensions and criteria for student performance at four different levels: basic, developing, proficient, and advanced. In developing these descriptions, faculty used the following criteria, developed by the Colorado Department of Education:

1. = *Basic/Needs Improvement*: has only basic understanding and/or minimal or poor application. This level is not acceptable for students in any methods classes in teacher education.
2. = *Developing*: is developing knowledge and skills; is able to begin to demonstrate the skill with assistance. This is an acceptable level of performance for well-prepared students in methods courses.
3. = *Proficient*: has achieved the same level of proficiency as well-prepared first year teachers, i.e., independent application of the skill.
4. = *Advanced/Highly Proficient*: knowledge and skills are comprehensive and performance exceeds expectations for well-prepared beginning teachers.

Included with a rubric for each standard is information to assist in observing, reviewing, and evaluating student performance at the three important program transition points: admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. These procedures describe the types of materials, exhibits, and activities to be reviewed and evaluated in assessing student performance, as well as the knowledge base that informed development of dimensions and criteria. Examples of the *Inventory* for several standards recently revised by

the program are included in Appendices to the *Self Study*. The complete *Inventory* is accessible on the program’s website (<https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>). These tools also are included in the Reference Library of students’ eportfolios.

Table 5. Summary of Information available on CSU-Pueblo Early Childhood Education preservice students and timing of assessment

Measures & Tools	Data Analysis	Timing of Assessment
MAPP <i>scores</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comparisons with national groups • Comparisons with non-teaching students at CSU-Pueblo • Profiles of cohort groups at admission, disaggregated by demographic characteristics (level, gender, ethnicity) • Comparisons with students in other majors • Comparisons of strengths/weaknesses in various subareas (Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Humanities, Writing, Math, Reading, Critical Thinking) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to Education
GPA Data <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumulative GPA • GPAs in major • GPAs in methods/ pedagogy classes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profiles of cohort groups at admission, disaggregated by demographic characteristics (level, gender, ethnicity) • Comparisons with students in other majors • Comparisons with non-teaching majors (done once every 5 years) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to Education • Admission to Student Teaching • Admission to Student Teaching
Faculty recommendations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profiles of cohort groups disaggregated by demographic characteristics • Comparisons with students in other majors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to Education
Performance rating data by field experience teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Component of summative portfolio evaluation at admission to education and program completion • Reviewed by faculty/instructors at end of each semester (individual student review) • Reviewed at admission to student teaching (individual student review) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to Education • End of Each Semester • Admission to Student

Measures & Tools	Data Analysis	Timing of Assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed by student teacher supervisor at beginning to student teaching (individual student review) 	Teaching <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program completion
Licensure test scores <i>(PLACE/Praxis II)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First time and overall pass rates by year in which test was taken and by cohort groups Trends in performance over time by cohort (student teaching) groups Comparisons of strengths/weaknesses in various subareas of tests Data disaggregated for ethnicity, gender Results of test preparation activities on pass rates (% passing who participated in workshop, study groups, and no participation) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admission to Student Teaching
Eportfolio exhibits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Teaching exhibits (lesson plans, video clips of teaching, student data, unit plans, etc.) are reviewed by faculty using department rubrics, with performance rated on a 1-4 scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admission to Education Admission to Student Teaching Program completion
Teacher work samples	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Component in final evaluation and rating of standards/outcomes (is placed in the eportfolio, with contents aligned with specific standards) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program completion
Faculty ratings of Portfolio and TEIMS data (writing samples, recommendations, field experience teacher evaluations, eportfolio exhibits)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final Inventory assessments by university supervisors/cooperating teachers of student teacher performance Average ratings for individual standards/outcomes and goal areas of cohort groups disaggregated by demographic characteristics Analysis of strengths and weaknesses of ratings on individual standards/outcomes (highest, lowest rated, variance) Comparisons with students in other majors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Admission to Education Admission to Student Teaching Program completion
Ratings by graduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Profiles of cohort groups disaggregated by demographic characteristics Comparisons with students in other majors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program completion One Year after teaching

Measures & Tools	Data Analysis	Timing of Assessment
Ratings by supervisors of graduates after one year of teaching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Profiles of cohort groups disaggregated by demographic characteristics • Comparisons with students in other majors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Year after teaching
Student Demographic Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of students admitted to education, last five years • Number of students admitted, disaggregated by teaching area • Number of students admitted, disaggregated by teaching area, ethnicity, gender, and level at admission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to Education
Student Retention Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retention of students disaggregated by teaching area • Retention of students disaggregated by ethnicity, gender, and level • Data on reasons for non-retention • Data on students removed from the program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly
Placement Data on Graduates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement data on graduates, disaggregated by teaching area and completion date • Data on program completers becoming licensed in Colorado • Retention data on graduates employed in teaching 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yearly
Student Satisfaction & Program Quality Data	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Average ratings of satisfaction and program quality of major, advising, and teacher education program by program completers at end of student teaching • Average ratings of satisfaction and program quality of major, advising, and teacher education program by first year teachers • Course satisfaction/end of term evaluations by students for each course 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • End of Student Teaching • End of first year of teaching • Each semester

Standard Reports

The program uses a variety of reports to monitor its own success and to identify and implement program changes. This information is shared annually with teacher education

faculty, with faculty serving on CSU – Pueblo’s Teacher Education Board, and with the CSU – Pueblo administration. These data also serve as a basis for developing yearly program goals and monitoring progress. The following are examples of reports generated with program assessment information. Samples of these reports are included in the appendices to this report:

- Profile reports on students admitted to teacher education, including cumulative GPA, basic skills assessments (scores on the *MAPP*), writing assessments (grades in English composition classes, faculty recommendations, and assessment of writing in the portfolio), performance on benchmarks for specific program performance standards (portfolio evaluation and ratings of field experience teacher), and teaching dispositions (faculty recommendations, ratings of field experience teacher).
- State licensure score results by program and by cohort group admitting to teacher education.
- Overall status of groups of students admitted to student teaching, including profiles of overall GPA’s and GPA’s in the major field, performance on benchmarks for specific program performance standards (portfolio evaluation, ratings of field experience teachers, ratings of faculty), and teaching dispositions (faculty recommendations, ratings of field experience teacher).
- Performance on specific program standards/benchmarks for student teachers at program completion (portfolio evaluation, ratings of cooperating teacher and university supervisor, self-evaluation), as well as ratings of teaching dispositions (ratings of cooperating teacher and university supervisor, self-evaluation).
- Profile of an individual student’s progress for each standard throughout the program, culminating with the electronic inventory ratings and description of performance leading to the rating for each standard. Faculty and/or students can request this profile of an individual’s progress at any time.
- Specific questions of interest to the faculty, e.g., stability of performance across the program for students with specific profiles; the effectiveness of program interventions, referral patterns, and comparisons of program success for specific groups of students.

Additional reports generated by TEIMS include an annual CCHE/SURDS report of individual student progress, in which information (e.g., GPA, test scores, cumulative hours, status in program) is summarized for each semester the student is enrolled in the program. Other examples include the federal Title II report card data, information on licensure test scores reported to CCHE as part of the university’s Performance Contract, and data required as part of federal reporting requirements for federal teacher education grants.

Component IV: Documenting and Monitoring Student Performance

CSU-Pueblo's assessment system is a comprehensive, integrated system that could not be possible without the program's electronic student data management system (called TEIMS – Teacher Education Information Management System). TEIMS has been developed over the last six years to assist teacher education with documenting and storing student data and interacts closely with the university AIS system, importing term data on a regular basis, and sharing data that supports university needs. The system, unique in teacher education, consists of a database comprised of three major components:

- Student demographic and progress monitoring – demographic information, student grades, test scores, and standards monitoring data (portfolio assessment data, field experience teacher evaluations);
- Field experience component – placement information and documentation of field experience hours; and
- Student advisement file – documents counseling, support, and intervention activities.

These components are also linked to the student's electronic portfolio, which includes much of the documentation reviewed by faculty at transition evaluation points. In addition, program reporting and research activities are other important TEIMS functions. The system is programmed to prepare key reports frequently used by faculty and administration. In addition, TEIMS allows users to query the databases, providing information organized to answer diverse assessment questions.

Table 6 outlines the various student data collected in TEIMS, timing for data collection, and some of the major reports generated with these data. Data from field experience evaluations are routinely collected at the end of each grading period or semester, as well as at the three in-depth assessment periods (admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion).

Four grants have aided in the development of the system. A Title II Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant from the U.S. Department of Education (DOE) funded the initial design of the system, providing resources during Year 1 of the program. Another DOE program, the Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology (PT³) grant provided additional monies to plan an electronic data management system and student portfolio system. Finally, two DOE Transition to Teaching grants have funded further development of the new electronic database, web-based evaluations, and revisions in the portfolio that allow the program to monitor and continuously improve student performance and program quality.

Table 6. Overview of the CSU-Pueblo Teacher Education Information Management System (TEIMS)

<u>Fields/Data Required</u>	<u>TEIMS Data Source</u>	<i>Timing of Data Collection</i>							<i>Reports Generated</i>							
		Initial TEP Course	Admission to TEP	@Term/Ongoing	Admit to St. Teach.	Program Completion	Spring Semester Only	Fall Only	Admission to TEP	CCHE Teacher Education File	Admit to St. Teach.	CO Quality Indicator System	Program Completion	Title I R. Card	Grant Reporting	Program Evaluation
<i>Demographic Data</i>	CSU-Pueblo Administrative Information System (AIS) ¹						Grads	Grads								
Student Name	AIS															
Student ID	AIS															
Address	AIS						Grads	Grads								
Phone	AIS															
Date of Birth	AIS															
Gender	AIS															
Race/Ethnicity	AIS															
E-mail Address	Student															
Student Teaching Placement	School															
Job Placement	Student															
<i>Demographic Admission Data</i>	CCHE Teacher Education File (SURDS)															
Licensure Area (e.g., Elementary Ed.)	CCHE SURDS															
Program (Major, e.g., History)	CCHE SURDS															
Program Status (e.g., Admitted, denied)	CCHE SURDS															
Program Type Indicator	CCHE Enrollment File (EF)/AIS															

<u>Fields/Data Required</u>	<u>TEIMS</u> <u>Data Source</u>	<i>Timing of Data Collection</i>							<i>Reports Generated</i>							
		Initial TEP Course	Admission to TEP	@Term/Ongoing	Admit to St. Teach.	Program Completion	Spring Semester Only	Fall Only	Admission to TEP	CCHE Teacher Education File	Admit to St. Teach.	CO Quality Indicator System	Program Completion	Title II R. Card	Grant Reporting	Program Evaluation
Program Type (e.g., UG, Post-Baccal.)	CCHE EF/AIS															
Student Level (based on # of credits completed)	CCHE EF/AIS															
Registration Status (e.g., Transfer, continuing)	CCHE EF/AIS															
Degree Prior to Enrollment	CCHE SURDS /AIS															
Cumulative Hrs. at Admission to CSU-Pueblo	CCHE Student Applicant File (SAF)/AIS/Student ²															
Cumulative GPA at Admission	CCHE SAF/AIS/Student ²															
Cumulative GPA (Term)	CCHE EF/AIS															
Cumulative GPA in Major	AIS/Transcript															
Tuition Classification (resident, non-resident)	CCHE EF / AIS															
Formal Tests PLACE Scores (Exam Date, # Pass, total scores, area scores)	National Evaluation Services (NES)															
MAPP (Total, sub-scores) (Educational Testing Service [ETS])	ETS, Faculty															
PRAXIS Scores (Exam Date, # Pass, total scores, area scores)	ETS															

<u>Fields/Data Required</u>	<u>TEIMS</u> <u>Data Source</u>	<i>Timing of Data Collection</i>							<i>Reports Generated</i>							
		Initial TEP Course	Admission to TEP	@Term/Ongoing	Admit to St. Teach.	Program Completion	Spring Semester Only	Fall Only	Admission to TEP	CCCHE Teacher Education File	Admit to St. Teach.	CO Quality Indicator System	Program Completion	Title II R. Card	Grant Reporting	Program Evaluation
Standards Monitoring Faculty Recommendations	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Field Experience Teacher Evaluation at Admission to Program	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Faculty Evaluation of Portfolio at Admission to Program	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Field Experience Teacher Evaluations	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Ratings of Standards Met In Courses	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Student Teacher Inventory	Faculty Evaluations ³															
Student Surveys Course Evaluations (end of course)	University Form															
Program Completion Evaluation	Student Form															
Field Experiences Placement (School, Grade, Teacher)	Program Forms															
<i>Beginning/Completion Dates</i>	School Form															
Permission Slip/Principal Signature	School Form															
Hours Completed	School Form															

Fields/Data Required

TEIMS
Data Source

Timing of Data Collection

Reports Generated

		Initial TEP Course	Admission to TEP	@Term/Ongoing	Admit to St. Teach.	Program Completion	Spring Semester Only	Fall Only	Admission to TEP	CCHE Teacher Education File	Admit to St. Teach.	CO Quality Indicator System	Program Completion	Title II R. Card	Grant Reporting	Program Evaluation
<i>Advising/Student Support</i>																
No. of contacts per semester; nature of contact (e.g., course scheduling)	Faculty input directly into TEIMS															
Advising Sheet Update	Input directly into TEIMS															
Long Term Plan Update	Input directly into TEIMS															
Number of advisees per faculty member	Input directly into TEIMS															
Support Plans / Update	Input directly into TEIMS															
<i>Recruitment/Retention</i>																
Students in TEA (Total Number, TEP Status)	Sponsors' Form															
Students in Summer Academies (Total Number, TEP Status)	Staff Form; Survey or AIS															
Scholarship Students (TEP status)	AIS, survey															
<i>Graduates' Data</i>																
First Year Survey of Graduates	Graduation Form															
First Year Survey of Supervisor	Supervisor Form															
Placement & Update for 3 yrs.	Survey of HR Offices															
Number Participating in Induction Activities	Attendance Rosters															
Survey Satisfaction with Activities	Survey of Participants															

<u>Fields/Data Required</u>	<u>TEIMS</u> <u>Data Source</u>	<i>Timing of Data Collection</i>							<i>Reports Generated</i>							
		Initial TEP Course	Admission to TEP	@Term/Ongoing	Admit to St. Teach.	Program Completion	Spring Semester Only	Fall Only	Admission to TEP	CCHE Teacher Education File	Admit to St. Teach.	CO Quality Indicator System	Program Completion	Title II R. Card	Grant Reporting	Program Evaluation
Survey of Needs of First Year Teachers	Teachers' Forms															

¹The University's AIS/Administrative Information System is a database of demographic information, including the student's transcript. ²Information collected in the CCHE file from documents provided by the student (e.g., transcripts from another institution). ³Ratings and narrative comments are recorded on the web and downloaded into TEIMS.

Teacher Education's Quality Control System

The Teacher Education Program also maintains a Quality Control System as part of its ongoing requirements for its accreditation. The system requires screening of specific program measures by faculty once a year to determine whether major aspects related to program quality are being maintained. These include

- Random identification of a number of students who were program completers (2 per faculty).
- Thorough audit trail or check of the student's file and all other records to determine whether procedures were adhered to, including
 - Admission to education evaluation, admission criteria, accurate recording of all information.
 - Retention in education criteria.
 - Admission to student teaching evaluation, admission criteria, and accurate recording of all information.
 - Program completion criteria, including accurate recording of all information
- Check of the portfolio evaluation by faculty at admission to education. (Were all standards evaluated?) Faculty also make comments on the quality of the evaluation.
- Check of advising information (advising sheets updates, accuracy in any course substitutions/documentation of auditing or completion of requirements, presence of a long term plan).
- Check of the *Final Inventory* to be completed at the end of student teaching (when all standards are evaluated). Faculty also make comments on the quality of the evaluation.
- Check of records of employment in TEIMS.
- Check of advising records. (Is there one each semester? Is there a long term plan? Is there a grade or appropriate and approved course substitution for each required course?)
- A check of the quality of courses (i.e., course evaluations by students of courses completed by the student in teacher education at CSU-Pueblo) and adequacy of faculty credentials. These two checks are completed by the Associate Dean and office personnel.
- A check of any support plans. (If so, were goals met?)

Results of the audits are reviewed by faculty as a group, with suggestions made for improvement. In all three reviews conducted by faculty, they found consistent adherence to policies for admission and program completion, including recording of documentation. Checks of "course quality" and faculty competence have also been consistently positive. Inconsistencies identified, which have resulted in improvements in program quality have included:

- Inconsistencies among some faculty in education in recording advising and counseling.
- Failure to submit *Final Inventories* at program completion. Though rare, they did occur. The program now has a double check policy, with the Director of Student Teaching and Experiential Programming checking at the end of the semester and the Associate Dean checking after the semester at the beginning of the next semester.
- Quality of the *Final Inventory* has been inconsistent among some Supervisors. Improvements in the rubrics and tools for assessing performance now provide examples

of narratives, and the Associate Dean is reviewing these as part of the Annual Performance Review process for faculty.

- Support Plans have not always been updated in a timely manner. The Associate Dean is now running a standard report updating all information at the end of each semester.