![CSU Pueblo logo]

Academic Program Assessment
AY 2024-2025 [Due 6/1/25]

Program Name	Date Completed
Education, MEd	**5/29/2025**
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jeff Piquette	
Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals	
To engage and empower our community of learners and develop professional educators who respect diversity, advance social justice, and promote academic excellence through immersion in equitable exploration.	

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2024-2025 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessments or other data.

A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2024-2025 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.
9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.
B. In which academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s)?
2023-2024
C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle? (See Column H in the previous cycle's report.)
The Associate Dean will meet with the graduate faculty, share these results, and make sure Core course assignments are developing the skills and confidence that would result in higher ratings on this goal.
D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?
The Associate Dean and graduate faculty met regularly during the Fall 2024 semester to adjust course assignments/expectations related to this SLO. Revisions were implemented in both the Fall 2024 and Spring 2025 terms.
E. How did the change(s) impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?
Average ratings on this SLO were already above proficient, but did increase to levels that we were more used to seeing before the new faculty took over one of the Core courses.

Enter Table I Closing the Loop Comments Below
Our MEd continues to be transformative for educators across the United States and even internationally!

Program Name	Date Completed
Education, MEd	**5/29/2025**
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jeff Piquette	

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2024-25

1. Include information to share assessment processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Copy this table for each assessed outcome.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.	
1. Demonstrate growth in content knowledge and in its application to classroom instruction and assessment.	
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.	
2023-2024	
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.	
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)	
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.	
All program completers for this academic year	
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.	
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).	
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.	
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 7.19, which is about the same as last year 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 4.25, which is above the benchmark and slightly above last year's average.	

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
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.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
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.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.71, which is about 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 4.26, which is above the benchmark and slightly above last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO, which is great because it was the lowest-rated area for a couple of years prior to last year. That means the changes we made to improve it have been sustained for 2 years!

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
3. Demonstrate multiple means of assessing and evaluating student learning and use them to change theory and learning.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. However, the average rating was 6.48, which is lower than last year and the lowest average rating across all SLOs. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.05, which is above the benchmark but below last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Unfortunately, ratings on this one have dropped during the last year. Initial reactions by program faculty are that this may be a result of an over-reaction to our "closing the loop" topic last year and maybe not keeping enough emphasis on this. Another possible reason could be that concentration area courses are electives for many of the concentrations and those electives may not address assessment like the ones chosen by previous program completers.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.

Graduate faculty who teach courses in the Core and Pedagogy components of the MEd will look for ways to infuse more content about assessment so that we are sure it is covered. However, ratings are still proficient, so we are not too worried about performance here.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.

4. Research, locate and understand current research in best practices in teaching.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.

2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.

MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.

All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.

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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.

a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.74, which is about 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 4.55, which is above the benchmark and slightly lower than last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.

As with Goal 2, this is traditionally one of our lower-rated SLOs, but it has been up and steady for 2 years now.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.

None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
5. Understand models for professional change, including teacher collaboration, professional learning communities, strategies for mentoring and coaching to facilitate change, and effective professional development.
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.85, which is above last year and among the higher average ratings across all SLOs. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.20, which is right at last year's average.
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Understanding teacher-level change is a solid skill for our candidates.
H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
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.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 7.15, which is slightly above last year 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 4.75, which is above the benchmark and slightly above last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
M.Ed. candidates continue to meet program expectations on this SLO. Reflective practice is a solid skill for our candidates.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
7. Demonstrate understanding of system and organizational change in education, including models for school change and current research and trends in school change.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.68, which is about 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 4.30, which is above the benchmark and about the same as last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
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.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.79, which is below last year but still well above expectation. b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.45, which is above the benchmark and about the same as last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
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.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
9. Demonstrate responsibility for school reform and leadership in school change.

B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2023-2024

C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
MEd Defense Seminar Rubric (included at the end of this report)

D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All program completers for this academic year

E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
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).

F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
a) All program completers (n = 82) received ratings of at least 5 on this SLO. The average rating was 6.64, which is above last year and back to what we were used to seeing on this SLO after a short dip over the last year or so.   b) All program completers self-reported ratings of 3 or above on this SLO and the average rating was 4.05, which is above the benchmark and slightly above last year's average.

G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
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. We are happy to see that ratings are back up and that our MEd completers are considered effective change agents.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.
None for this SLO.

Enter Table II AY 2025 Assessment Comments Below
The evaluation rubric for the MEd program is shown in the following pages.

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

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

OVERALL RATING ☐

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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.

NOT PASSING		PASSING		OVERALL RATING
Basic (1-2)	**Developing (3-4)**	**Proficient (5-6)**	**Advanced (7-8)**	
• Performance is similar to expectations for students who have not completed a teacher education program • No evidence is included and/or evidence included does nor provide support for the goal • Rationale for artifact is superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused	• Performance is similar to expectations for student teachers or beginning teachers with limited teaching experience: • Reflections/rationale may be superficial and/or incoherent or conceptually confused or may not be supported by theory or research • Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research	1. Candidate's reflection meets expectations for well-prepared teachers completing a master's program and • Describes value of experience on thinking and practice • Utilizes reflection to change own practice of teaching • Illustrates relationship among research/theory, own practice and student achievement • Refers to changes in patterns in thought and action with regard to own practice • Identifies patterns of program impact on practice • Identifies directions for future inquiry and development • Candidate must demonstrate at least 4/6 expectations. 2. Artifact(s) or proposition addresses use of technology in self-assessment or collaboration for change. Evidence may be limited to course generated products/research Quality of writing may affect proficiency level.	Performance is beyond expectations for well prepared teachers completing a master's program; exceptional performance on more than one bulleted items at the left. A rating of the highest level must demonstrate exceptional performance on both #1 and #1.	
List qualities that are not passing:		**List qualities that demonstrate proficiency:**	**List qualities that are advanced:**	

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

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

8. Demonstrate responsibility for student learning at high levels.

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

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

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