



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018

Program: Education Minor

(Due: June 1, 2018)

Date report completed: May 31, 2018

Completed by: Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

Please describe the 2017-2018 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

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 <u>last</u> assessed? (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? Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed in 2017-2018. Teacher Education uses the term "Standards" for program SLOs	2017-2018; because the state and national accrediting bodies for teacher education require the	See table 1 (below); program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance would take up over 50 pages of space so are not included.	All students admitted to TEP, 2017-2018; all students completing TEP, 2017-2018; first year teachers in 2017-	Expectations include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on	In general, results indicated that a) mean ratings for program completers were almost always above 3.00;	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise content of ED 301 course that has a focus on classroom management to address the weaknesses identified by the data. 2. Examine the content in courses related to SLOs 2.3, 2.6, and 2.10) and address the weaknesses identified in 2017-2018. 3. Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to

<p>because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. Standards/SLOs are included in the Assessment Plan and table 1 (below). See comments.</p>	<p>program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2017-2018</p>	<p>Complete performance rubrics are available on the TEP web site at https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teach-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.</p>	<p>2018(grads in 2016-2017). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2018 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>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.</p>	<p>however, mean ratings for program completers as well as ratings of graduates' supervisors were lowest for standards focusing on classroom management (1.1, 1.2, 1.3); b) 100% of program completers had passing exam scores however, the pass rates on the new elementary exam have dropped significantly; and c) mean ratings by graduates' and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00. See table 1 for details.</p>	<p>within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). Weaknesses in goal 1 (classroom management) are new this year. These indicate a need to focus on improving instruction related to SLOs 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3. One significant positive finding is that the pass rate on the math section of the elementary state test (PRAXIS 5003) went up dramatically. Math has been a difficult area for us in the past, but appears to be changing as far as the state test can measure. 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</p>	<p>watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.</p>
---	--	---	--	---	--	--	--

				All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed		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 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. 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 2018.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 90% of students were in the “developing” or higher range, the benchmark for this outcome.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Although mean ratings for program completers and graduates were above the benchmark of 3.00 (“proficient”) for all standards in Goal 1 , ratings on 1 standard/outcome was found to be among the lowest rated in the program for proficiency (standard 1.3 on applying consistent discipline); 3/52 or 5.8% of 2017-2018 program completers did not meet proficiency on one or more standards. Secondary student teachers overall received the lowest ratings (mean 3.32), then elementary student teachers (mean rating of 3.42), finally K-12 teachers received a mean rating of 3.60.</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 2017 TEP students scored near or just above the national group for each of the seven subtests and for overall performance on the PP (overall, 438 compared to the norm of 436). Note: Spring 2017 PP scores were close to fall. The average CSU-Pueblo student performance was right at the national average of 443, and was at or above the average on each of the seven subtest.</p> <p>Cum GPA (3.35) was above the GPA required (2.600), and down slightly from last year (3.38). Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.6), math (2.9), and speech (3.6) exceeded benchmarks, and all are steady or just slightly down from last year.</p>

Table 1. 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 2018.</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 border="1" data-bbox="1304 511 1913 743"> <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>3.33</td> <td>444</td> <td>2.9</td> <td>3.7</td> <td>3.7</td> </tr> <tr> <td>K-12</td> <td>3.37</td> <td>435</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>3.4</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>7-12</td> <td>3.44</td> <td>423</td> <td>3.0</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>3.8</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Mean eportfolio ratings by faculty of outcomes were in the “developing” range for 90% of students, with 10% 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> 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: 43% (overall), 72% (1st), and <u>80% (last)</u>. 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</p>		MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA	El Ed	3.33	444	2.9	3.7	3.7	K-12	3.37	435	2.7	3.4	3.5	7-12	3.44	423	3.0	3.9	3.8
	MN GPA	MN Overall PP Score	MN Math GPA	MN Writing GPA	MN Speech GPA																					
El Ed	3.33	444	2.9	3.7	3.7																					
K-12	3.37	435	2.7	3.4	3.5																					
7-12	3.44	423	3.0	3.9	3.8																					

Table 1. TEP assessment details

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

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 3: Creates a learning community in which individual differences are respected, appreciated, and celebrated.</i></p> <p>3.1 Employs a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social level of each student, and chooses teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes.</p> <p>3.2 Creates lessons and activities that differentiate instruction, operating at multiple levels to meet individual student needs.</p> <p>3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them, assuring all students are treated in an equitable and fair manner.</p> <p>3.4 Designs and/or modifies standards-based instruction in response to diagnosed student needs, including the needs of exceptional learners and English language learners. Appropriate provisions may include time and circumstances for work, tasks assigned, communication, and response modes. CO 6.2</p> <p>3.5 Utilizes his/her understanding of educational disabilities and giftedness and their effects on student learning in order to individualize instruction for these students. CO 6.3</p> <p>3.6 Develops and applies individualized education plans as required by law. CO 6.5</p> <p>3.7 Teaches students within the scope of a teacher’s legal responsibilities and students’ educational rights, and follows procedures as specified in state, federal, and local statutes. CO 6.4</p> <p>3.8 Uses specific knowledge of student medical conditions and medications and their possible effects on student learning and behavior. CO 6.7</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2018.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 89% 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 3.1 to 3.9 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 3 (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,</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 78% 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.</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 (3.74). K-12 and secondary students were rated significantly lower overall at about 3.5. For all groups, performance on standard 4.8 was a strength.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>and analysis of student work. CO 3.4/5.7</p> <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 2018.</p>	<p>Performance on standards 4.2 and 4.6 were weaknesses.</p>

Table 1. TEP assessment details

TEP Goal Area Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p><i>Goal 5: Constructs and uses pedagogy to maximize the intellectual, social, physical, and moral development of all students.</i></p> <p><u>Pedagogy: 5.1-5.6, 5.10</u></p> <p>5.1 Maximizes student learning by incorporating student centered strategies: CO 6.1</p> <p>5.2 Demonstrates a wide variety of instructional strategies that promote learning -- creating and implementing plans which include all essential lesson components: CO 3.1</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/integrated units, literature-based units, and units based on commercial basal materials. CO 3.1</p> <p>5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated with various kinds of learning (e.g., critical and creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and ensures attention to these learning processes so that students can master content standards. CO 5.5</p> <p>5.5 Provides effective verbal and written feedback that shape improvement in student performance relative to content standards. CO 3.6</p> <p>5.6 Uses multiple, alternative teaching strategies and materials matched to different student needs (e.g., developmental stages, learning styles, and interests). CO 6.1</p> <p>5.10 Works in cooperation with library, media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information literacy skills into the curriculum to accomplish standards-based learning activities. CO 5.6</p> <p><u>Technology: 5.7-5.9</u></p> <p>5.7 Applies technology to the delivery of standards-based instruction. CO 7.1</p> <p>5.8 Uses technology to increase student achievement. CO 7.2</p> <p>5.9 Instructs students in basic technology skills. CO 7.5</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2018.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for students on this goal were in the “developing” range or above for 68% 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 5.3 and 5.10 were weaknesses for students in some groups. Although 3 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 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 78% 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. 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2018.</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 3.58 (7-12) to 3.90 (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. 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 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 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.</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 90% 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 3.40 (7-12) to 3.88 (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 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.</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 3.2, 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 4 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 3.70 (Secondary) to 3.82 (elementary). Average ratings for each group for each standard were all >3.60 and no students had ratings less than 3.0.</p>

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2017-2018 cycle. These are those 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 to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
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.	2016-2017	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.	The Associate Dean met with adjunct faculty during the convocation orientation sessions for the TEP at the beginning of each term to communicate expectations about unit planning, sharing examples and detailed descriptions of the assignments.	Average ratings on this SLO went from 3.22 in 2016-2017 to 3.40 in 2017-2018. This change is significant and brings the average ratings to levels that are much more in line with other SLOs and it is no longer the lowest-rated area or even the second lowest-rated area.
2.2 Develops phonological and linguistic processes related to reading including: phonemic		Analyze literacy scores and explore the possibility of course revision	The Associate Dean analyzed state test data from students in the program to identify weak areas and match them to specific course outcomes. RDG 410, 411, and 435 were the courses where	Pass rates on tests related to SLOs 2.2 and 2.3 did go up during 2017-2018 compared to 2016-2017. However, it is difficult to know if it had anything to do with course adjustments. Average scores returned to levels that were seen in 2015-2016. This may be the result of a series of changes to the state test being used to measure student

<p>awareness; concepts about print (e.g., print match, directionality); systematic, explicit phonics; other word identification strategies, and spelling instruction.</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.</p>			<p>these topics are primarily addressed. The course content was then discussed with the instructors of those courses to see if changes were needed. Unfortunately, the Colorado Department of Education decided to change the state test that is used to evaluate preservice teacher knowledge of literacy for elementary teachers, so this confounded the process. The alignment to course objectives was still completed, but it was difficult to know if the changes made to the curriculum were effective as the summative test changed during 2017-2018.</p>	<p>content knowledge for this area. In 2015-2016, PRAXIS #5014 was being used. In 2016-2017, PRAXIS #5018 was used and had a lower pass rate. In 2017-2018, PRAXIS #5002 was used and had a pass rate that was similar to that of 2015-2016. We will continue to monitor literacy data in 2018-2019 for stability since PRAXIS #5002 will continue to be used.</p>
<p>2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which he is preparing to teach. For</p>		<p>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</p>	<p>The data from MAPP and PLACE/PRAXIS were analyzed by the Associate Dean with some significant correlations found between MAPP scores and performance on the PLACE</p>	<p>As with the previous improvement area, this item was difficult to address because of the shift from PLACE testing to PRAXIS testing and changes to the specific PRAXIS tests being used for elementary education. New correlations will have to be determined once enough test takers have completed the tests</p>

<p>elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education.</p>		<p>connect PRAXIS score weak areas to curriculum issues across the program.</p>	<p>and PRAXIS tests. A typical “cut score” on the MAPP was identified and students who got that score or below were immediately brought in for advising related to trends on these important tests.</p>	<p>in each licensure area. We believe the interventions that were put into place have helped the students with their content knowledge, but it is difficult to know because of the change in summative assessment.</p>
---	--	---	---	--

Comments on part II: