Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2014-2015   **Due: June 1, 2015**

Program: Education Minor   **Date:** May 27, 2015

Completed by: Jeff Piquette

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): The following faculty in Teacher Education participated in eportfolio assessment: Massey, Pettit, Piazza, and Piquette; complete program data were reviewed at the fall and spring department convocation meetings.

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2015. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx.

Please describe the 2014-2015 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2015-2016 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2014-2015 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2013-2014. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the 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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/ improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed in 2014-2015.	2014-2015; because the state and	See table 1 (below); the program has attached	All students admitted to TEP, 2014-2015; all	Expections include all of the following: a) all program completers should	In general, results indicated that a) mean ratings were always above 3.00;	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was	1. Improve the type and quality of classroom experiences for

Teacher Education uses the term "Standards" for program SLOs because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. Standards/SLOs are included in the Assessment Plan and table 1 (below). See comments.	national accrediting bodies for teacher education require the program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2014-2015	**examples** of program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance. (Including all rubrics would take up over 50 pages of space.) Complete performance rubrics are available on the TEP web site at http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx.	students completing TEP, 2014-2015; first year teachers in 2014-2015 (grads in 2013-2014). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2015 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.	receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards and avg. ratings by the group should be >3.00, b) 100% of program completers and >80% of individual students during the year who took the exam receive passing scores and c) >80% of graduates and their supervisors'/principals' ratings of performance are proficient (3.00 or >) and avg. ratings are >3.00 on evaluations of all standards for the group after one year of teaching. All three expectations/benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed	however, mean ratings for program completers as well as ratings of graduates' supervisors were lowest for standards focusing on teaching content, particularly math; 8% of all student teachers were rated below proficient on one or more standards in Goal 2; b) 100% of program completers had passing scores and 83% of students passed the exam the last time they took it in 2014-2015; and c) mean ratings by graduates' and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00. See table 1 for details.	above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). In general, weaknesses in goal 5 (pedagogy) and goal 2 (math integration) are similar to those in previous years and indicate a need to focus on improving 1) clinical experiences and 2) content and instruction in ED 417 and ED 380. Low eportfolio ratings in the pedagogy area at admission to education indicates a continued need to improve instruction and clinical experiences.	methods courses, emphasizing the secondary/K-12 special methods courses. 2. Continue to review and improve clinical and instructional content for ED 417. 3. Conduct reliability training among supervisors of student teachers to strengthen reliability of assessment data (continued goal from 2013-2014).

Comments: 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 http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx) 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. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
Goal 1: Uses democratic principles to create communities of learners that assure positive social interactions, collaboration, and cooperation 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, 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 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 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	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for 88% of students were in the "developing" or higher range, the benchmark for this outcome. At program completion: 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 continued to be among the lowest rated in the program for proficiency (standards 1.2 and 1.3); 6/92 or 7% of 2014-2015 program completers did not meet proficiency on one or more standards. K-12 student teachers overall received the lowest ratings (mean 3.47) and elementary student teachers the highest (mean rating of 3.67); 7-12 teachers received a mean rating of 3.56.
Goal 2: Creates learning experiences that make content knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students. K-12 Literacy: 2.1-2.5 2.1 Plans and organizes reading instruction based on ongoing assessment. CO 1.1 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 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 2.4 Supports reading through oral and written language development including: developing oral English proficiency in students; development of	• *Proficiency Profile (PP)* • Faculty Recommendations • Field Experience Teacher Evaluations • GPA in math, composition, and speech courses • Cumulative GPA at admission • GPA in major at admission to student teaching • Licensure Exam Scores • Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience	At admission to education: When compared to junior students at regional comprehensive institutions nationally, Fall 2014 TEP students scored higher than the national group for each subtest and for overall performance on the *PP* (448.3 compared to the norm of 444.8). Note: Spring 2014 grad PP scores were not available yet for this report. Cum GPA (3.267) was above the GPA required (2.600), but a little lower than last year (which was a high year). Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.6), math (2.7), and speech (3.7) exceeded benchmarks, but math is very close.

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
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 2.5 Utilizes Colorado Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction. CO 1.5 Mathematics: 2.6, 2.7 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 Knowledge of Content: 2.8-2.11 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.	Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after one Year of Teaching *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2014.	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 (e.g. English, Math, and Science) outperforming others on the PP. Average scores of students in PE and Social Studies were below the national averages (444.8).

Within the Major Results cell, the following table appears:

	MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA
El Ed	3.283	445.9	2.7	3.7	3.8
K-12	3.257	449.7	3.2	3.4	3.3
7-12	3.455	456.1	3.8	3.9	3.9

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.

At admission to student teaching: in 2014- 2015, 100% of program completers passed their licensure exams; however, differences existed across programs. The overall pass rate (all takers included – students who take the test numerous times have a big effect on this statistic), first time pass rate, and highest score pass rate (determined by summing the scores for the last test score for individual students) for all students were: 62% (overall), 68% (1st), and 83% (last). Pass rates varied within majors with some areas including small numbers

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
		of test takers. At program completion: 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 3.25 and 3.24). Student teachers in 7-12 classrooms also scored lower on these standards (mean ratings of 3.39 and 3.41). Elementary teachers scored the lowest for all program standards on standard 2.11 (3.50). Performance on 2.11 was also a weakness for K-12 teachers (mean 3.48). However, performance on standard 2.5 was a strength for elementary and secondary teachers.

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
Goal 3: Creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected, appreciated, and celebrated. 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. 3.2 Creates lessons and activities that differentiate instruction, operating at multiple levels to meet individual student needs. 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. 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 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 3.6 Develops and applies individualized education plans as required by law. CO 6.5 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 3.8 Uses specific knowledge of student medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior. CO 6.7	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for 87% of students were in the "developing" range, the benchmark for this outcome. Low ratings were mostly related to students simply not including or having incomplete work and/or artifacts in the portfolio so that faculty had to award lower ratings. At program completion: Overall mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.32 to 3.75 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 4 (4%) students received ratings <3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors and showed no discernable pattern.

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
Goal 4: Ensures, through the use of standards and informal and formal assessment activities, the continuous development of all learners. 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 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 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 4.4 Uses assessment data as a basis for standards-based 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 4.5 Applies technology in a variety of ways to chart, track, and analyze data, including assessment of student learning. 4.6 Collects data on individual learner achievement (e.g., academic, social, cognitive) and is accountable for each student's learning. CO 6.6 4.7 Prepares students for the Colorado Assessment Program (CSAP) and other assessments of educational achievement. CO 3.7 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	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for 93% 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. At program completion: Mean ratings of student teachers exceeded 3.4 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 strength. Performance on standards 4.3, 4.4 and 4.6 were weaknesses. Although 4 students (4%) received ratings <3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors showing no discernable pattern.
Goal 5: Constructs and uses pedagogy to maximize the intellectual, social, physical, and moral development of all students. Pedagogy: 5.1-5.6, 5.10 5.1 Maximizes student learning by incorporating student centered strategies: CO 6.1 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	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for students on this goal were in the "developing" range or above for 78% of students. This is up significantly from last year. It is likely due to the large amount of work done in the revision of our ED 301 course. The reasons for the low ratings that still persisted were consistent with past years and varied: incomplete lesson plans and failure to develop accurate indirect/inquiry and

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results

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
    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
    5.5 Provides effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance relative to content standards. CO 3.6
    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
    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
Technology: 5.7-5.9
    5.7 Applies technology to the delivery of standards-based instruction. CO 7.1
    5.8 Uses technology to increase student achievement. CO 7.2
    5.9 Instructs students in basic technology skills. CO 7.5
	one year of teaching
	• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching
	
	*Tool = Program Rubrics
	
	Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.
		cooperative learning plans. Additionally, for students with low ratings on this goal, some were admitted with reservations, requiring a formal support plan to address the issues.
		
		At program completion: Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.51 (7-12) to 3.68 (K-12) for Goal 5 (Elementary students averaged 3.65). Across all standards for Goal 5, standards 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10 were weaknesses for students in each group. Although 3 students (3%) received ratings <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).

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
Goal 6: Is a reflective decision maker, incorporating understandings of educational history, philosophy, and inquiry, as well as the values of the democratic ideal. 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. 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 consistently with this philosophy. 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. 6.4 Continually examines, reflects, and modifies own educational practices and performances and accesses professional development options necessary to improve performance. 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	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for 74% 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. At program completion: With the exception of ratings for standard 6.2, performance on other standards in this area continued to be strengths for most students. Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.5a (K-12) to 3.62 (Elementary) for Goal 6 (Secondary students averaged 3.60 for standards in Goal 6). Although 1 (1%) received ratings <3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the small number prevented any kind of generalizable analysis.
Goal 7: Creates communities of learning by working collaboratively with colleagues, families, and other members. 7.1 Involves parents and guardians effectively as participants and partners in student learning, establishing respectful and productive relationships. CO 5.4 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 7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate information. CO 7.3 7.4 Makes links with community resources and learners' other environments to foster student learning. 7.5 Is sensitive and responsive to clues of student distress, actively listening and advocating for students, and seeking outside help as needed	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* • Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching	At admission to education: Mean eportfolio ratings for 93% of students were in the "developing" range, the benchmark for this outcome, exceeding the program's goal for performance. At program completion: Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.50 (Secondary) to 3.71 (Elementary) for Goal 7. Mean ratings on standards 7.6 and 7.8 indicate that these continued to be strengths for teachers in all 3 groups (mean ratings all above 3.59). For Secondary students, other standards in Goal 7 showed

Table 1. 2012-2013 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results

and appropriate to remedy problems. CO 8.2
    7.6 Establishes rapport with students, maintaining professional, positive relationships.
    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.
    7.8 Participates successfully as a member of a team, sharing, encouraging, & accepting responsibilities.
	*Tool = Program Rubrics
	
	Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.
		relatively weak performance when compared to other program outcomes. Although 6 (7%) received ratings <3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors, showing no pattern.

Goal 8: Models the professional and ethical responsibilities of the education profession.
    8.1   Follows the ethical standards of the education profession. CO 8.2
    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
    8.3 Demonstrates the behavioral and emotional stability required of professional educators.
    8.4   Acts in a caring manner towards K-12 students, peers, and other members of the learning community.
    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
    8.6   Respects the input of others, including supervisors, and attempts to incorporate feedback to grow professionally.
    8.7   Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence.
    8.8 Is well-groomed and dresses in a professional manner.
    8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level.
	• Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education*
	• Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations
	• Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*
	• Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching
	• Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching
	
	*Tool = Program Rubrics
	
	Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.
		At admission to education: Mean eportfolio rating for students for goal 8 standards was 3.01, the highest overall rating for all goal areas. This is to be expected, as performance on this goal (related to student dispositions for teaching) should be more developed earlier in the program. Among all students, 95% received a rating of 2.00 or higher on goal 8.
		
		At program completion: Mean ratings of student teachers on Goal 8 were the highest for any goal area as well, ranging from 3.72 (Secondary) to 3.85 (Elementary). Average ratings for each group for each standard were all >3.65. Although 2 (2%) students received ratings <3.00 in one or more standards in this area, there was no clear pattern.

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Standards in goal 5 and goal 2 (see above)	2014-2015	1. Improve clinical experiences, including requirements and quality of classroom experiences, for additional methods courses, emphasizing the secondary/K-12 special methods and RDG 435.	Yes, mostly. All field experience guidelines and policies were updated, made uniform across outlets, and further developed to strengthen identified weaknesses. For example, the program formally adopted a policy limiting the number of hours students can complete in the field for a given semester. Additionally, major changes have occurred in ED 301/560 and in ED 380/580. In ED 301/560, students had a much more focused set of tasks that had to be completed as part of the field work. In ED 380/580, students were paired with content experts in art, music, and PE to help host an actual after school program for students in district 70.

One thing that still needs to be done is to work more closely with special methods course instructors to ensure that unit development is happening well. | The number of issues with quality field placements for students dropped drastically as a result of our work to clarify field work guidelines. Having the Associate Dean visit each class was an added benefit. It helped emphasize the importance of getting as much out of the experience as possible. The after school program for District 70 started a little rocky because it was new, but ended up being highly successful. The students and parents were thrilled with the quality and content. This also mirrored an increase in the quality of lessons (and the corresponding ratings) for students in these classes.

Next year, the TEP hopes to further unify the way that all special methods courses handle unit development. |

Standards 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11	2014-2015	2. Continue to review and improve clinical and instructional content for ED 417.	Partially. The field experience component was strengthened as described above, but unfortunately, the instructor for this course, Dr. Jenny Piazza, was on medical leave for much of the fall semester and so little progress was made on revisions. Additionally, in the spring, neither the new Interim Associate Dean nor Dr. Piazza was aware of this as an action item. This will be implemented in 2015-2016.	Because Dr. Piazza will not have a chance to do revisions to her course until Fall 2015, we will monitor the change in proficiency in math as the new requirement are implemented.
All standards	2014-2015	3. Conduct reliability training among supervisors of student teachers to strengthen reliability of assessment data.	Partially. The number of people who supervise student teachers in a given year is actually quite large (~20). Getting them together at the same time for training is difficult. Some sub-groups were convened to start on this, but it needs to be done more comprehensively to have the desired effect.	This goal will continue to be addressed. We have implemented a new fall and spring convocation week meeting that should help facilitate these kinds of trainings.