

Program: ___ Education Minor _____

Date report completed: ___ 5/26/17 ___

Completed by: ___ Jeff Piquette _____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): _____

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

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 that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed in 2016-2017. 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	2016-2017; because the state and national accrediting bodies for teacher education require the program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students’	See table 1 (below); the program has attached 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	All students admitted to TEP, 2016-2017; all students completing TEP, 2016-2017; first year teachers in 2016-2017 (grads in 2015-2016). Please note: admission data for students in	Expectations include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all program standards and avg. ratings	In general, results indicated that a) mean ratings for program completers were almost always above 3.00; however, mean ratings for program completers as well as ratings of graduates’ supervisors	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). Weaknesses in goal 5 (pedagogy) are similar to those in previous years, but	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve communication with adjuncts teaching specific methods courses about unit planning and make sure there is a common vision about what constitutes a quality unit plan. 2. Analyze literacy scores and explore the possibility of course revision. 3. Conduct correlational studies with MAPP test and PRAXIS tests in an attempt to identify early the students who will struggle and put them on a more aggressive support plan for success. Also attempt to connect PRAXIS score weak areas to curriculum issues across the

<p>Plan and table 1 (below). See comments.</p>	<p>eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2016-2017</p>	<p>TEP web site at https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.</p>	<p>Spring 2017 are not complete at the date of this report and are not included (PP scores have not been returned by ETS); first year teacher data for last year's grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions</p>	<p>were lowest for standards focusing on teaching content, particularly reading; 8% of all student teachers were rated below proficient on one or more standards in Goal 2; b) 100% of program completers had passing exam scores and 75% of all students passed the exam the last time they took it in 2015-2016; and c) mean ratings by graduates' and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00.</p> <p>See table 1 for details.</p>	<p>weaknesses in goal 1 (consistent discipline) and goal 2 (literacy) are new this year. These indicate a need to focus on improving 1) unit planning for goal 5, 2) consistent discipline in the classroom, and 3) reading content knowledge.</p> <p>We continue to see a decrease in the pass rates on the required state tests. This is alarming for elementary especially. Part of the problem is that the state has had 3 different versions of the test over 3 years. That has made it difficult to track. Thankfully, it appears that the state has settled on PRAXIS as the sole test provider and that the versions of the test that are in place now will stay that way. We will continue to examine this issue carefully to see if a more aggressive intervention strategy</p>	<p>program.</p>
--	---	---	---	--	---	---	-----------------

				on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed		might help.	

Comments on part I: The program has identified 8 goal areas that summarize the SLOs for all teacher education candidates. Within each of these goal areas are 5-10 more program standards, aligned with the Colorado Performance Standards, as well as the standards of professional and learned societies, and performance on the standards is the crucial level of assessment in terms of student outcomes, not program goals. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>) that outline in considerable detail the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each standard. Also included on the rubrics are benchmarks for performance at three different points in the program – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. Ratings based on this evidence are completed by faculty using a scale of 1-4, with a rating of 3.00 an indication of “proficient” on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at admission to education and program completion based on multiple types and sources of evidence.

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 1: Uses democratic principles to create communities of learners that assure positive social interactions, collaboration, and cooperation</i></p> <p>1.1 Organizes, allocates, and manages resources of time, space, activities, and attention, as well as establishing routines and procedures to create a learning environment characterized by developmentally appropriate student behavior, efficient use of time, and active and equitable acquisition of knowledge, skills, and understanding. CO 5.1</p> <p>1.2 Monitors and analyzes the classroom environment and applies appropriate intervention strategies and practices to enhance social relationships, student motivation and engagement, and productive work, including: CO 5.</p> <p>1.3 Establishes and consistently applies accepted disciplinary practices in the school environment that promote positive student growth. CO 5.2</p> <p>1.4 Nurtures, on the part of students, positive behavior and those moral standards necessary for personal, family, and community well-being. CO 8.2</p> <p>1.5 Models and articulates the democratic ideal to students, including the school's role in developing productive citizens and the school's role in teaching and perpetuating the principles of a democratic republic. CO 8.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 82% of students were in the “developing” or higher range, the benchmark for this outcome.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Although mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of 3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 1 , ratings on 1 standard/outcome was found to be among the lowest rated in the program for proficiency (standard 1.3 on applying consistent discipline); 2/36 or 6% of 2016-2017 program completers did not meet proficiency on one or more standards. Secondary student teachers overall received the lowest ratings (mean 3.42), then elementary student teachers (mean rating of 3.60), finally K-12 teachers received a mean rating of 3.66.</p>
<p><i>Goal 2: Creates learning experiences that make content knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students.</i></p> <p><u>K-12 Literacy: 2.1-2.5</u></p> <p>2.1 Plans and organizes reading instruction based on ongoing assessment. CO 1.1</p> <p>2.2 Develops phonological and linguistic processes related to reading including: phonemic awareness; concepts about print (e.g., print match, directionality); systematic, explicit phonics; other word identification strategies, and spelling instruction. CO 1.2</p> <p>2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategies for a variety of genre, literary response and analysis, content area literacy, and student independent reading. CO 1.3</p> <p>2.4 Supports reading through oral and written language development including: developing oral English proficiency in students; development of sound writing practices in students, including language usage, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and spelling; the relationships among reading, writing, and oral language; vocabulary development, and the structure of standard English. CO 1.4</p> <p>2.5 Utilizes Colorado Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 Teacher Recommendations • Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> When compared to regional comprehensive institutions nationally, Fall 2016 TEP students scored near or just above the national group for each subtest and for overall performance on the PP (overall, 447 compared to the norm of 444.0). Note: Spring 2017 PP scores were not available yet for this report.</p> <p>Cum GPA (3.380) was above the GPA required (2.600), and exactly the same as last year. Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.7), math (2.8), and speech (3.8) exceeded benchmarks, and all are steady from last year.</p> <p>Although small numbers makes it difficult to disaggregate for all teaching areas, the table below demonstrates the variability in results across teaching areas. Average scores of students in PE, Spanish, and English were below the national averages.</p>

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results																													
<p>improvement of instruction. CO 1.5 <u>Mathematics: 2.6, 2.7</u> 2.6 Develops in students an understanding and use of: number systems and number sequences, geometry, measurement, statistics and probability, and functions and use of variables. CO 2.1 2.7 Utilizes Colorado Academic Standards in Mathematics for the improvement of instruction. CO 2.2 <u>Knowledge of Content: 2.8-2.11</u> 2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction. CO 4.4 2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all Colorado academic standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on content standards.CO 4.2 2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning. CO 4.1, 4.3 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching • Ratings by Supervisors after one Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<table border="1" data-bbox="1299 350 1913 583"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>MN GPA</th> <th>MN Overall PP Score</th> <th>MN Math GPA</th> <th>MN Writing GPA</th> <th>MN Speech GPA</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>El Ed</td> <td>3.41</td> <td>447</td> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.8</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-12</td> <td>3.37</td> <td>445</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>3.3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-12</td> <td>3.29</td> <td>450</td> <td>3.2</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>3.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean eportfolio ratings by faculty of outcomes were in the “developing” range for 92% of students, with 8% not meeting this benchmark at admission. Weaknesses in writing were noted for all of those not meeting the benchmark. No clear differences were noted across students from different teaching area.</p> <p><u>At admission to student teaching:</u> in 2016- 2017, 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: 53% (overall), 76% (1st), and 85% (last). Pass rates varied within majors with some areas including small numbers of test takers.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of 3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 2; 96%-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 standard 2.2.</p>							MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA	El Ed	3.41	447	2.8	3.8	3.8	K-12	3.37	445	2.7	3.4	3.3	7-12	3.29	450	3.2	3.9	3.9
	MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA																										
El Ed	3.41	447	2.8	3.8	3.8																										
K-12	3.37	445	2.7	3.4	3.3																										
7-12	3.29	450	3.2	3.9	3.9																										

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 3: Creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected, appreciated, and celebrated.</i></p> <p>3.1 Employs a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social level of each student, and chooses teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes.</p> <p>3.2 Creates lessons and activities that differentiate instruction, operating at multiple levels to meet individual student needs.</p> <p>3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them, assuring all students are treated in an equitable and fair manner.</p> <p>3.4 Designs and/or modifies standards-based instruction in response to diagnosed student needs, including the needs of exceptional learners and English language learners. Appropriate provisions may include time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned, communication, and response modes. CO 6.2</p> <p>3.5 Utilizes his/her understanding of educational disabilities and giftedness and their effects on student learning in order to individualize instruction for these students. CO 6.3</p> <p>3.6 Develops and applies individualized education plans as required by law. CO 6.5</p> <p>3.7 Teaches students within the scope of a teacher’s legal responsibilities and students’ educational rights, and follows procedures as specified in state, federal, and local statutes. CO 6.4</p> <p>3.8 Uses specific knowledge of student medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior. CO 6.7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> 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.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Overall mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.33 to 3.92 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 2 (6%) 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.</p>
<p><i>Goal 4: Ensures, through the use of standards and informal and formal assessment activities, the continuous development of all learners.</i></p> <p>4.1 Utilizes valid and reliable assessment tools that are aligned with standards and benchmarks and that assess meaningful learning in all content areas. CO 3.2</p> <p>4.2 Locates, develops and utilizes a variety of informal and formal assessments, including rubrics. Examples of assessments may include observation, portfolios of student work, teacher-made tests, performance tasks, projects, student self-assessments, peer assessment, and standardized tests. CO 3.3</p> <p>4.3 Accurately documents, in an ongoing manner, and reports the effects of various teaching strategies on individual and group performance relative to content standards through observation of classroom interactions, questioning, and analysis of student work. CO 3.4/5.7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 75% 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 commonly referenced areas for improvement. Overall, this was the second lowest rated goal area for the program, showing a need for intervention at the program level.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers exceeded 3.6 for all standards in Goal 4. Among different student groups, Elementary Education students scored the highest on standards in Goal 4 (3.84). K-12 and secondary</p>

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>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</p> <p>4.5 Applies technology in a variety of ways to chart, track, and analyze data, including assessment of student learning.</p> <p>4.6 Collects data on individual learner achievement (e.g., academic, social, cognitive) and is accountable for each student’s learning. CO 6.6</p> <p>4.7 Prepares students for the Colorado Assessment Program (CSAP) and other assessments of educational achievement. CO 3.7</p> <p>4.8 Ensures that instruction is consistent with school district priorities and goals, the Colorado Academic Standards, and the 1999 Colorado Accreditation Program. CO 3.8</p>	<p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p>students were rated significantly lower overall at about 3.4. For all groups, performance on standard 4.8 was a strength. Performance on standards 4.2 and 4.6 were weaknesses.</p>

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 5: Constructs and uses pedagogy to maximize the intellectual, social, physical, and moral development of all students.</i></p> <p><u>Pedagogy: 5.1-5.6, 5.10</u></p> <p>5.1 Maximizes student learning by incorporating student centered strategies: CO 6.1</p> <p>5.2 Demonstrates a wide variety of instructional strategies that promote learning -- creating and implementing plans which include all essential lesson components: CO 3.1</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, and units based on commercial basal materials. CO 3.1</p> <p>5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and ensures attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards. CO 5.5</p> <p>5.5 Provides effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance relative to content standards. CO 3.6</p> <p>5.6 Uses multiple, alternative teaching strategies and materials matched to different student needs (e.g., developmental stages, learning styles, and interests). CO 6.1</p> <p>5.10 Works in cooperation with library, media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information literacy skills into the curriculum to accomplish standards-based learning activities. CO 5.6</p> <p><u>Technology: 5.7-5.9</u></p> <p>5.7 Applies technology to the delivery of standards-based instruction. CO 7.1</p> <p>5.8 Uses technology to increase student achievement. CO 7.2</p> <p>5.9 Instructs students in basic technology skills. CO 7.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for students on this goal were in the “developing” range or above for 70% of students. This is down a little bit from last year. This goal area is traditionally difficult for students. It is focused on pedagogy and planning. 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 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.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.38 (secondary) to 3.85 (El Ed) for Goal 5 (K-12 students averaged 3.58). Across all standards for Goal 5, standards 5.4 and 5.10 were weaknesses for students in each group. Although 2 students (6%) received ratings <3.00 in one or more standards in this area, the low ratings were across different standards and majors (no pattern). Strength areas included standards 5.5, 5.7, and 5.8.</p>
<p><i>Goal 6: Is a reflective decision maker, incorporating understandings of educational history, philosophy, and inquiry, as well as the values of the democratic ideal.</i></p> <p>6.1 Responds to the following laws, regulations, and policies in a professional manner: federal and state constitutional provisions; federal executive, legislative and legal influences; state roles of the governor, legislature, and State Board of Education; local school districts, boards of education and boards of cooperative educational services; non-traditional and non-public schools, including charter schools, religious schools, and home schooling; and public sector input from business, advocacy groups, and the public.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 76% 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. Becoming reflective practitioners is another traditionally difficult area for beginning teachers. They are more concerned about getting through the lesson without embarrassment than the learning that is happening.</p>

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>6.2 Has developed a personal philosophy of education, incorporating concepts from historical and contemporary educational philosophies and educational research, from the United States and other countries, and acts consistently with this philosophy.</p> <p>6.3 Is able to seek answers to teaching questions and clearly state positions on educational issues and support them with theory, practice, and research.</p> <p>6.4 Continually examines, reflects, and modifies own educational practices and performances and accesses professional development options necessary to improve performance.</p> <p>6.5 Draws upon a variety of sources as supports for development as a learner and a teacher, including colleagues and professional literature. CO 8.5</p>	<p>Year of Teaching</p> <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At program completion:</u> Performance on standards in this area continued to be strengths for most students. Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.53 (7-12) to 3.85 (Elementary) for Goal 6 (K-12 students averaged 3.75 for standards in Goal 6). Although 1 (2%) received ratings <3.00 on one or more standards in this area, the small number prevented any kind of generalizable analysis.</p>

Table 1. 2016-2017 TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 7: Creates communities of learning by working collaboratively with colleagues, families, and other members.</i></p> <p>7.1 Involves parents and guardians effectively as participants and partners in student learning, establishing respectful and productive relationships. CO 5.4</p> <p>7.2 Communicates a variety of assessment results, and their implications to students, parents, guardians, professionals, administrators, and community in order to collaboratively plan the learner's program. CO 5.9</p> <p>7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate information. CO 7.3</p> <p>7.4 Makes links with community resources and learners' other environments to foster student learning.</p> <p>7.5 Is sensitive and responsive to clues of student distress, actively listening and advocating for students, and seeking outside help as needed and appropriate to remedy problems. CO 8.2</p> <p>7.6 Establishes rapport with students, maintaining professional, positive relationships.</p> <p>7.7 Participates in collegial activities such as school functions, interdisciplinary team teaching, and curriculum development designed to make the schools a productive learning environment.</p> <p>7.8 Participates successfully as a member of a team, sharing, encouraging, & accepting responsibilities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 92% of students were in the “developing” range, the benchmark for this outcome, exceeding the program’s goal for performance.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers ranged from 3.45 (7-12) to 3.85 (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 3.7). For Secondary students, other standards in Goal 7 showed relatively weak performance when compared to other program outcomes. Interestingly, no students were rated below a 3, even though the overall average (especially for 7-12 students) was lower than most other goal areas.</p>
<p><i>Goal 8: Models the professional and ethical responsibilities of the education profession.</i></p> <p>8.1 Follows the ethical standards of the education profession. CO 8.2</p> <p>8.2 Consistently exhibits a strong work ethic, assuming responsibility for oneself and others in the learning community; is punctual and on-time for all responsibilities. CO 8.2</p> <p>8.3 Demonstrates the behavioral and emotional stability required of professional educators.</p> <p>8.4 Acts in a caring manner towards K-12 students, peers, and other members of the learning community.</p> <p>8.5 Models an excitement for teaching and learning, advocating teaching as a worthy career and describing various career paths in local, state, national, and education, including international options, higher education, public, and private education. CO 8.4</p> <p>8.6 Respects the input of others, including supervisors, and attempts to incorporate feedback to grow professionally.</p> <p>8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence.</p> <p>8.8 Is well-groomed and dresses in a professional manner.</p> <p>8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2017.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio rating for students for goal 8 standards was 2.90, 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. This average is the same as we saw last year on this goal. Among all students, only 3 received a rating lower than 2.00 on goal 8.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings of student teachers on Goal 8 were the highest for any goal area as well, ranging from 3.72 (Secondary) to 3.85 (elementary). Average ratings for each group for each standard were all >3.60 and no students had ratings less than 3.0.</p>

PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 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? Please indicate the semester and year.	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 from goals 1, 2, and 5	2016-2017	Improve the type and quality of classroom experiences for methods courses, emphasizing the secondary/K-12 special methods courses.	Yes. Our new Field Experience Coordinator was able to make very good connections to schools in the area and start several new quality placements for students in the program.	<p>In each case, field experience placements were more purposeful and better matches for student needs or at least the content area being addressed. Satisfaction with the results and performance were much higher than previous years, and we are as happy as we have been with field experience placements since I have been in the teacher education program (12 years).</p> <p>This progress was also noted by the external review team for our reauthorization visit from CDE/DHE. One of the program strengths that was cited was our field experience partnerships.</p>
2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11	2016-2017	Continue to analyze math scores and explore the possibility of requiring a different course for admission.	Yes. The department completed a thorough analysis of math scores and their correlations to success on PLACE and PRAXIS tests, ratings at the end of the program, etc.	The TEP has been working on math as an area of weakness for some time. For the first time in about 5 years, I am happy to say that it did not show up as an area of concern. It appears that all of the renovations that were implemented have finally resulted in some significant progress. The only issue related to math that came up was how confusing the admission requirement is. The language in the catalog is not clear. For this reason, the admission requirement language will be refined in the next CAPB cycle.
Standards from goal 2	2016-2017	Conduct correlational studies with MAPP test and PLACE/PRAXIS tests in an attempt to identify early the students who will struggle and	Yes. The department completed a thorough analysis of all content areas for MAPP and PLACE/PRAXIS.	The analysis resulted in some significant indicators. The trend was especially clear for elementary education. A cut-off score on the MAPP test was identified and students were notified of the risk if they scored below that mark.

		<p>put them on a more aggressive support plan for success.</p>		<p>These students were encouraged to attend test preparation workshops that were sponsored by the TEP, and were also provided other advice about bolstering their areas of weakness. Although we are not able to require students to participate in remedial measures, most are willing to do it if they know that it will help them pass the required state test. Initial indicators are that the pre-emptive notification is making a difference for some students. Two students who were at risk of failure, but participated in two of the extra sessions, passed the test on their first attempt. It certainly went against the trend we were expecting. Unfortunately, the state just changed the version of the PRAXIS (which is now the only test approved for teacher licensure) for several of the licensure areas, and so we do not know how well our correlations will work with the new versions of the test. We will continue to monitor this issue and adjust as necessary.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

Comments on part II: