



2021 Academic Program Assessment Report

Education M.Ed.

Program current assessment plan here:

https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/2020/assessment-plans/m.educ-assessment-plan-2020.pdf

Program prior assessment report here:

https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/_doc/2020/report/m.educ-assessment-report-2020.pdf

Report Completed By: Jeff Piquette

Date Report Completed: 5/30/2021

Faculty members involved in this Assessment:

Please describe this year's assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. (Separate sheet for each undergraduate major, stand-alone minor, certificate, and graduate program in your department.) Please also submit any addenda such as rubrics which are not available in your assessment plan. The reports will be available to the Dean of your college/school and to the Executive Director for Assessment as well as faculty peer reviewers.

Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals: It is the mission of the CSU Pueblo teacher education program to prepare teachers and learners of quality and distinction by exposing students to quality communities of teaching and learning.

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 the year based on the assessment process.

A. Your program SLOs are pasted here verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter info in columns B-H only for those assessed during this annual cycle.	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge and in its application to classroom instruction and assessment.	All SLOs are assessed each year.	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook . Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.	All program completers for this academic year	All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5); and c) for completers who need state licensure exams, 80% or > should receive passing scores.	a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.88, which is a bit down from last year, but still above expectation and among the highest average ratings across all SLOs. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.17, which is above the benchmark and slightly above last year's average. c) 71% of completers passed all required licensure exams. Two of seven candidates in SPED did not attempt the licensure exams yet. Our pass rates on the SPED test are nearly 100%, so we expect that once these candidates actually take the test, they will be successful. Not taking the test is a bit different from taking it and not passing.	M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO, and even excel on it. Gaining additional content knowledge within their emphasis area is a strength of the program. It probably should be since 18 credit hours are devoted to it.	None for this SLO.

<p>2. Demonstrate professional growth in the application of scientifically-based practices in teaching and learning, including strategies in literacy education, instructional technology, differentiation of instruction, and apply them to raise student achievement.</p>	<p>All SLOs are assessed each year.</p>	<p>Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook. Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.</p>	<p>All program completers for this academic year</p>	<p>All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).</p>	<p>a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.38, which is also a bit down from last year, but still above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 3.86, which is below the benchmark and well below last year's average.</p>	<p>M.Ed. candidates continue to perform well on this SLO, but it was the only SLO where one dimension of the expectation was not met. The average self-reported rating was below 4.0, which is our benchmark. On the scale of ratings, a 3 is proficient, so candidates are proficient, but we want them to strive for more at the graduate level. That is why we set the benchmark for 4.0. We believe that this dip in performance is more related to our online candidates than our residential candidates because they are able to take the Pedagogy courses (those directly related to this SLO) from university partners. The artifacts they are generating in their portfolios are not as high quality as our residential students. Because we have more online students, they are weighing the average rating down.</p>	<p>We knew this was an issue earlier in the year and have already taken measures to increase the rigor of the courses taken through our partners and the kinds of artifacts student must generate. All providers must resubmit syllabi and get them approved before those courses are allowed to be used for our Pedagogy requirement.</p>
<p>3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change theory and learning.</p>	<p>All SLOs are assessed each year.</p>	<p>Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook. Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.</p>	<p>All program completers for this academic year</p>	<p>All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).</p>	<p>a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.67, which is very close to last year, and above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.25, which is above the benchmark and slightly below last year's average.</p>	<p>M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Understanding assessment is a solid skill for our candidates.</p>	<p>None for this SLO.</p>
<p>4. Research, locate and understand current research in best practices in teaching.</p>	<p>All SLOs are assessed each year.</p>	<p>Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook. Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.</p>	<p>All program completers for this academic year</p>	<p>All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).</p>	<p>a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.36, which is slightly below last year (and the lowest average of all SLOs), but still above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.29, which is above the benchmark but a bit below last year's average.</p>	<p>M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO, however, it continues to be one of the lower-rated SLOs. In terms of knowledge and skills, it is probably one of the more difficult SLOs in the program and so we don't expect it to be too high. We are a bit concerned about it dipping lower, even after if was a focal point last year. However, the changes we started to implement to address this would only affect a few of these completers since they had already taken the courses where these skills are primarily taught. We believe ratings will go up more starting next year.</p>	<p>We are going to continue with the plan that was developed last year to address this and see if our program completers next year will have higher ratings. That group will have been exposed to the changes and should reveal if our plan is successful.</p>
<p>5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.</p>	<p>All SLOs are assessed each year.</p>	<p>Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook. Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.</p>	<p>All program completers for this academic year</p>	<p>All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).</p>	<p>a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.60, which is almost exactly the same as last year, and above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.22, which is above the benchmark and right at last year's average.</p>	<p>M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Understanding teacher-level change is a solid skill for our candidates.</p>	<p>None for this SLO.</p>

6. Demonstrate understanding of reflective practice that results in improved classroom teaching and learning, including teacher reflection, use of technology in self-assessment, collaboration for change, and self-management of change.	All SLOs are assessed each year.	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook . Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.	All program completers for this academic year	All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).	a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.71, which is a bit below last year's average, and above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.42, which is above the benchmark and a bit below last year's average.	M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Reflective practice is a solid skill for our candidates.	None for this SLO.
7. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change.	All SLOs are assessed each year.	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook . Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.	All program completers for this academic year	All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).	a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.37, which is below last year's average (and one of the lowest averages across all SLOs), but still above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.00, which is right at the benchmark and a bit below last year's average.	M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Understanding school-level change is something our candidates can do, but could improve upon as well. We believe that the pandemic did affect the quality of artifacts students produced here because access to schools was quite limited. This made it difficult to show master of this standard.	None for this SLO, considering the limitations of the pandemic.
8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.	All SLOs are assessed each year.	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook . Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.	All program completers for this academic year	All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).	a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.92, which is the highest average across all SLOs, right at last year's average, and above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.13, which is above the benchmark and below last year's average.	M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO, and even excel on it. Taking responsibility for student learning at high levels is a strength of the program. We are quite proud of this performance as it is at the heart of what teaching and learning is all about.	None for this SLO.
9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.	All SLOs are assessed each year.	Rubrics used in assessing SLOs as well as the survey completed by graduates are on p. 46/61 of the M.Ed. Handbook . Students' eportfolio and defense are assessed by 2-3 faculty members, with the faculty advisor summarizing ratings/comments.	All program completers for this academic year	All (100%) program completers should: a) receive ratings of 5.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards (i.e., 5.00 is the benchmark; the scale is 1-8); b) >80% of graduates report ratings of "proficient" (3.0) or > and avg. ratings of >4.00 on self evaluations (scale is 1-5).	a) All program completers (n = 42) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.52, which is below last year's average, but still above the expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.25, which is above the benchmark and below last year's average.	This SLO is kind of the culmination of the entire program, along with the previous SLO. In addition to being responsible for student learning, we also want our graduates to be effective change agents. That's what this SLO is all about. The ratings here are not the highest, but also not the lowest. We are pleased overall with the performance here because it includes so many of the other aspects of the program being applied.	None for this SLO.

Comments on part I:

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

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan, as above.	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?
---	--	---	---	--

4. Research, locate and understand current research in best practices in teaching.	2019-2020	The Associate Dean will meet with graduate faculty and make them aware of the lower ratings on these goals. The group will develop a plan for how to improve student action research projects and their ability to describe system change models. If students have better artifacts to be reviewed for that goal, the ratings should go up.	The Associate Dean and graduate faculty did meet and discuss the lower ratings. Two of the Core courses in the program were slightly adjusted to require enhanced research content and a bit better training on being a critical consumer of research.	We were initially a bit concerned about the average rating dipping even lower this year, even after it was a focal point last year. However, the changes we started to implement to address this would only affect a few of these completers since they had already taken the courses where these skills were primarily taught. We believe ratings will go up more starting next year because that is the cohort that would have the revised course work.			
5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.	2019-2020	The Associate Dean will meet with graduate faculty and make them aware of the lower ratings on these goals. The group will develop a plan for how to improve student action research projects and their ability to describe system change models. If students have better artifacts to be reviewed for that goal, the ratings should go up.	The Associate Dean and graduate faculty did meet and discuss the lower ratings. Two of the Core courses in the program were slightly adjusted to require more focus on change models and teacher-led change initiatives. The faculty supervising defense seminar candidates will also make sure the candidates are showcasing themselves well on this goal.	Ratings stayed about the same on this SLO this year. However, as was true with goal 4, the changes we started to implement to address this would only affect a few of these completers since they had already taken the courses where these skills were primarily taught. We believe ratings will go up more starting next year because that is the cohort that would have the revised course work.			
Comments on part II:							