



**Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2019-2020**

(Due: June 1, 2020)

Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Education Minor \_\_\_\_\_

Date report completed: \_\_\_5/29/20\_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean\_\_\_\_\_

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe the 2019-2020 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., B.A.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 Executive Director for Assessment as an email attachment by June 1, 2020. 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? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? <b>(semester and year)</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	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 2019-2020.  Teacher Education uses the term	2019-2020; because the state accrediting bodies for teacher education require the	See table 1 (below); program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance would take up over 50 pages of	All students admitted to TEP, 2019-2020; all students completing TEP, 2019-2020; first	Expectations include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all	In general, results indicated that a.) mean ratings were always above 3.00; however, mean ratings for program	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did	1. Revise the content of RDG 435 and advise students to take additional literacy courses if they are in K-12 or secondary pathways to increase literacy integration. 2. Improve clinical experiences, including

<p>“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>program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students’ eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2019-2020</p>	<p>space so are not included. Complete performance rubrics are available on the TEP web site at <a href="https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teach-education-program/goals-and-standards.html">https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teach-education-program/goals-and-standards.html</a>.</p>	<p>year teachers in 2019-2020(grads in 2018-2019).  Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2020 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>program standards and avg. ratings by the group should be &gt;3.00, b) 100% of program completers and &gt;80% of individual students during the year who took the exam receive passing scores and c) &gt;80% of graduates and their supervisors’/ principals’ ratings of performance are proficient (3.00 or &gt;) and avg. ratings are &gt;3.00 on evaluations of all standards for the group after one year of teaching.  All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed</p>	<p>completers as well as ratings of graduates’ supervisors were lowest for standards focusing on teaching content, particularly literacy; 12% of all student teachers were rated below proficient on one or more standards in Goal 2; b) 100% of program completers had passing scores. However, 80% of students in each teaching area did not pass the exam they took; and c) mean ratings by graduates’ and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00.  See table 1 for details.</p>	<p>indicate strengths and weaknesses within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). In general, weaknesses in goal 5 (pedagogy) and goal 2 (literacy integration) and indicate a need to focus on improving 1) clinical experiences and 2) content and instruction in RDG 435.  Data on student teachers showed much greater variability across ratings than in any year over the last 5 years. This may indicate a need to better train supervisors who are rating these students on our rubrics.  Losing our Director of Student Teaching was a likely reason for these data.</p>	<p>requirements and quality of classroom experiences. This is contingent on hiring a new Director of Student Teaching and Experiential Education. 3. Conduct reliability training among supervisors of student teachers to strengthen reliability of assessment data.</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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</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 2 standards/outcomes were among the lowest rated in the program for proficiency (standard 1.2 and 1.3); 6/93 or 6% of 2019-2020 program completers did not meet proficiency on one or more standards. K-12 student teachers overall received the lowest ratings (mean 3.49) and elementary student teachers the highest (mean rating of 3.65); 7-12 teachers received a mean rating of 3.51.</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"> <li>• Proficiency Profile (PP)</li> <li>• Faculty Recommendations</li> <li>• Field Experience Teacher Evaluations</li> <li>• GPA in math, composition, and speech courses</li> <li>• Cumulative GPA at admission</li> <li>• GPA in major at admission to student teaching</li> <li>• Licensure Exam Scores</li> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> </ul>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> When compared to junior students at regional comprehensive institutions nationally, Fall 2019 TEP students scored higher than the national group for each subtest and for overall performance on the PP (449.5 compared to the norm of 444.3). Note: Spring 2020 grad PP scores were not available yet for this report.</p> <p>Cum GPA (3.368) was above the GPA required (2.6) as well as avgs. for the last two years, and average GPAs in courses in writing (3.7), math (3.0), and speech (3.65) exceeded benchmarks.</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, with students preparing in secondary areas (English, Math, and Science)</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</p> <p><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"> <li>Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>Ratings by Supervisors after one Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</p>	<p>outperforming others on the PP. Average scores of students in PE and Social Studies were below the national averages (444.31).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1304 448 1913 678"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>MN GPA</th> <th>MN Overall PP Score</th> <th>MN Math GPA</th> <th>MN Writing GPA</th> <th>MN Speech GPA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>El Ed</td> <td>3.338</td> <td>446.09</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-12</td> <td>3.297</td> <td>451.70</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>3.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-12</td> <td>3.545</td> <td>456.75</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>4.0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean eportfolio ratings by faculty of outcomes were in the “developing” range for 93% of students, with 7% 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> in 2019-2020, 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 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: 64% (overall), 68% (1<sup>st</sup>), and 78% (last). Pass rates varied within majors: Art (20%, 35%, 25%), El Ed (65%, 70%, 87%), English (50%), Math (100%, 100%, 100%), Music (40%, 40%, 40%), PE (100%, 100%, 100%), Science (0 takers), Social Studies (33%, 50%, 50%), Spanish (100%, 100%, 100%). Note: Some areas included small numbers of participants.</p>		MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA	El Ed	3.338	446.09	2.7	3.8	3.8	K-12	3.297	451.70	3.4	3.4	3.4	7-12	3.545	456.75	4.0	4.0	4.0
	MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA																					
El Ed	3.338	446.09	2.7	3.8	3.8																					
K-12	3.297	451.70	3.4	3.4	3.4																					
7-12	3.545	456.75	4.0	4.0	4.0																					

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
		<p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of 3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 2; 97%-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 standards 2.2, 2.6 and 2.11 (for K-12 teachers 2.2 and 2.6 were the lowest rated standards, with mean ratings of 3.27 and 3.25). Student teachers in 7-12 classrooms also scored lower on these standards (mean ratings of 3.49 and 3.31). Elementary teachers scored the lowest for all program standards on standard 2.11 (3.55). Performance on 2.11 was also a weakness for K-12 teachers (mean 3.43). However, performance on standard 2.5 was a strength for elementary and secondary teachers; secondary teachers also showed strength in standard 2.5.</p>

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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 85% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome. Weaknesses in self-evaluation and incomplete reflections were the most common reasons students failed to meet the benchmark.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Overall mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.34 to 3.72 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 6 (6%) students received ratings &lt;3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no 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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</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. Weaknesses in developing rubrics and incomplete assessment information in lesson plans were the most common reasons students failed to meet the benchmark.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers exceeded 3.43 for all standards in Goal 4. Among different student groups, Elementary Education students scored the highest on standards in Goal 4, although a comparison with Secondary students indicates these differences are not significant. K-12 students were rated significantly lower overall. For all groups, performance on standard 4.8 was a</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 2020.</p>	<p>strength. Performance on standards 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6 were weaknesses. Although 6 students (6%) received ratings &lt;3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern).</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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 58% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome. Reasons for low ratings varied: incomplete lesson plans and failure to develop accurate indirect/inquiry and cooperative learning plans. However, though ratings in this area did not meet the program’s benchmark, only 4 students received recommendations for admission with reservations that required follow up support for lesson planning.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.56 (7-12) to 3.67 (K-12) for Goal 5 (Elementary students averaged 3.61). Across all standards for Goal 5, standards 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 were weaknesses for students in each group. Although 5 students (5%) received ratings &lt;3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern).Both Elementary and Secondary student teachers received stronger scores for their performance on standard 5.3 than for other standards (means of 3.7 and 3.57).</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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 71% 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.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> With the exception of ratings for standard 6.2, performance on other standards in this area were strengths for most students. Mean ratings of student</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 2020.</p>	<p>teachers ranged from 3.55 (K-12) to 3.59 (Elementary) for Goal 6 (Secondary students averaged 3.56 for standards in Goal 6). Although 2 (1%) received ratings &lt;3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern).</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, &amp; accepting responsibilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 93% 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 3.48 (Secondary) to 3.69 (Elementary) for Goal 7. Mean ratings on standards 7.6 and 7.8 indicate that these were strengths for teachers in all 3 groups (mean ratings all above 3.57). For Secondary students, other standards in Goal 7 showed relatively weak performance when compared to other program outcomes. Although 7 (8%) received ratings &lt;3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern).</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"> <li>• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*</li> <li>• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations</li> <li>• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*</li> <li>• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching</li> <li>• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching</li> </ul> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio rating for students for goal 8 standards was 2.96, the highest overall rating for all goal areas. Among all students, 93% received a rating of 2.00 or higher 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, ranging from 3.77 (Secondary) to 3.84 (Elementary). Average ratings for each group for each standard were all &gt;3.68. Although 3 (3%) students received ratings &lt;3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards (no pattern).</p>

**II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2019-2020 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? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	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 relationships, student motivation and engagement,</p>	<p>2018-2019</p>	<p>Maintain changes in ED 301 course that have a focus on classroom management and support this with additional “spiraling” in upper division methods courses.</p>	<p>The department met as a team to discuss changes to the classroom management instruction in ED 301 and instructors of upper division courses aligned supporting content in their courses to revisit and strengthen the management ideas from 301.</p>	<p>Classroom management plans for the ED 301 students during the 2019-2020 year were stronger. Evaluations by cooperating teachers did show an increase in average ratings for these SLOs for <u>admitted</u> students. Additionally, there were increased ratings on these SLOs for program completers! This was significant because it showed that upper division supports made a difference on classroom management ratings for student teachers.</p>

<p>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>Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>2018-2019</p>	<p>Examine the content in courses related to PRAXIS content areas.</p>	<p>Representatives from the Teacher Education Program met with representatives from other IHEs across the state to compare Praxis data and do a “deep dive” into the data in conjunction with representatives from ETS (Praxis) and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). This analysis resulted in a few important revelations about the elementary and social studies Praxis tests. First, CSU-Pueblo is not the only institution struggling with this. It is virtually across the state. It is so universal that CDE is going to pursue additional meetings with ETS to make sure that the test is aligned with state standards.</p> <p>Additionally, the Title V grant that we received allowed us to hire a Praxis Coordinator. She has been in place most of this last academic year and has already made a huge difference. She provides test preparation materials, group and individual tutoring, test anxiety mitigation, and some other services as needed.</p>	<p>Pass rates for elementary and social studies improved this year – especially the final pass rate. Most significant is that many students who had attempted to pass the test multiple times and failed got the support they needed to finally pass the test and student teach. Our pass rates are now above the rest of the state by a significant margin on these tests. Our initial pass rate is still not as strong as we would like, but at least this is no longer holding students back from student teaching like it was over the last few years. We have a robust support structure in place and it is only getting better. I’m sure we will continue to improve even more as our Praxis Coordinator gets even more established and connected to our students.</p>

Comments on part II: