

Assessment: Program Four Column

Program (College of Education and Liberal Arts) - Teacher Education

Mission Statement: To support teacher candidates in the cycle of research, reflection, and response to create powerful knowledge bases, to develop as active members of a democratic society, and to establish and maintain environments conducive to learning.

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Strategies</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Action to be Taken</i>
<p>Claim 1. Content Knowledge (revised) - Candidates demonstrate deep content knowledge through analyzing and synthesizing ideas, information, and data in the disciplines</p> <p>Goal Status: Active</p> <p>Goal Category: Student Learning</p> <p>Start Date: 08/24/2015</p> <p>Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Unit Plan assignment in EDUC411-EDUC422, EDUC420-EDUC421</p> <p>Assessment rubric includes criteria regarding higher order engagement in content</p> <p>All students will complete a unit plan in each of the two methods blocks.</p> <p>Objectives: At least 80% of candidates will score at 4 on each of the criteria.</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Service Learning, Community-based learning</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Not applicable to this outcome</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>Candidates demonstrated depth of content understanding in making connections between standards that are related to the essential questions, for example, including science content standards, a safety standard, an inquiry process standard, and an ELA communication standard within one unit plan.</p> <p>Activities included in the plans provided sufficient opportunities for students to engage the essential questions/big ideas, and to make connections to the enduring learnings.</p> <p>Faculty expressed concern regarding the quantitative, rather than qualitative, nature of the Enduring Learnings criteria and whether this aspect of deep content knowledge is reflected in the Essential Question criteria on the rubric. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Claim 1. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 16-17.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At School of Education Work Session, discuss removal of Enduring Learnings from rubric criteria, and strengthening that aspect of the Essential Question criteria. (08/18/2017)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2015-2016</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>Candidates demonstrated proficiency (at least 80% at level 4) in developing essential questions that are sufficiently meaningful and relevant to deep content knowledge in the discipline and in identifying enduring learnings that are related to those questions.</p> <p>Making connections between the essential questions and</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Maintain the current assignment and rubric for the next academic year to allow time for faculty to fully implement it in their courses. Present rubric early in the semester to provide opportunities for more extensive discussion of connections</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>Direct - Exam/Quiz - Standardized - MTTC Subject Test Analysis of sub-area scores for elementary, and for subject area tests for evidence of mastery (3 or 4 level) Objectives: At least 80% of the sub-areas reports will be at the 3 - 4 level. High Impact Program Practices 2: Not applicable to this outcome High Impact Program Practices 1: Not applicable to this outcome</p>	<p>the larger context of the standards and broader scope of the curriculum that needs to be further developed in working with candidates. This includes the connection between the activities in the unit plan and the essential questions and enduring learnings. The timing of the implementation of the revised assessment and rubric made it difficult for some instructors to have it in place for the fall semester, resulting in skewed results for this year. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 1. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017 Goal met: No Overall candidate performance on the new elementary subject test, test number 103, shows that of 29 unique testers since the implementation of the new test in October, 2013, all but two have passed. One of those who failed has chosen not to continue in the program due to other factors; the other will be retesting during summer 2017.</p> <p>The percent of candidates scoring a 3 or 4 on each of the subareas on the final test experience, during the 2013 - 2017 period, for each of the 29 candidates is as follows: English Language Arts - 86% Social Studies - 72% Visual/Performing Arts - 93% Mathematics - 72% Science - 48% Health and Physical Educ - 66%</p> <p>(06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: MTTC Elementary 103 2013 - 2017 .xlsx</p>	<p>between essential questions/enduring learnings and the standards and lesson/unit activities. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: Following the beginning of the 2017 - 2018 academic year, further research into the alignment of the required coursework in the Elementary Planned Program with the test objectives and elementary standards will be done by teacher education faculty in collaboration with academic departments. (09/11/2017)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: School of Education faculty will review the appropriate alignment of the claim with the MTTC subarea scores, given the limited amount of detailed data provided from the test vendor. Consideration to be given to the overall pass rate on the MTTC as the more appropriate assessment. (08/18/2017)</p>
<p>Claim 1. Content Knowledge (original) - Candidates analyze and synthesize ideas, information, and data to make applications of knowledge in inquiry, problem</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Unit Plan assignment in EDUC411-EDUC422, EDUC420-EDUC421 Assessment rubric includes criteria</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes Candidates are able to make good choices regarding topics of study that are accepted as significant to the discipline, indicating a depth of subject knowledge. They are making</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Revision of claim statement to read: Candidates demonstrate deep content knowledge through</p>

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Strategies</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Action to be Taken</i>
<p>solving, and critical thinking. Goal Status: Inactive Goal Category: Student Learning Inactive Date: 08/24/2015 Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>regarding higher order engagement in content All students will complete a unit plan in each of the two methods blocks. High Impact Program Practices 2: Not applicable to this outcome High Impact Program Practices 1: Service Learning, Community-based learning Related Documents: Claim 1. Unit Plan Key Assessment</p>	<p>connections between the big ideas and learning activities that are problem-based, learner-centered requiring inquiry and critical thinking. There is still room for growth in pushing student engagement in exploring the big ideas and making stronger application of critical thinking and problem-solving. Candidates reported confusion as to 'Big Ideas' versus 'Essential Questions'. Additional feedback from cooperating teachers and student teachers in using the claims for assessment of student teaching performance indicates that the claim is not clearly communicating the deep subject knowledge outcome. Discussion regarding the wording of the claim statement continues, as it is not clear that it adequately captures what is expected for this aspect of the teaching-learning process. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 1. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: Yes Candidates were able to identify appropriate big ideas for their unit plans and to describe ways in which they would engage students with the big idea. They continue to work on enduring learnings, and making connections across the continuum of instruction. Data includes both elementary and secondary candidates The assignment and scoring rubric were not used in the development of all courses. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Sub-program Designation: Combined Finding Related Documents: Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 13-14</p>	<p>analyzing and synthesizing ideas, information, and data in the disciplines. Change in terminology on rubric for first criteria from Big Idea to Essential Question, in keeping with backward design process and for clarity as to what is being asked for. (08/24/2015)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: Faculty will more fully incorporate key assessment into course assignments. Continued review of assessment and results to refine the alignment of the assignment and rubric to the claim. (08/02/2014)</p>
	<p>Direct - Exam/Quiz - Standardized - MTTC Subject Test Analysis of sub-area scores for elementary, and for subject area tests for evidence of mastery (3-4 level) Objectives: At least 80% of the sub-areas reports will be at the 3 or 4 level.</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: No On the new elementary education subject test, which was first administered in October 2013, none of the subareas had more than 80% of the scores at the 3 or 4 level. Specific results were: language arts - 53% social studies - 60%</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Action on related to the findings on the elementary education subject test began in the spring 2015 semester, with meetings with the academic departments for each subarea to discuss the findings, the curriculum alignment with the</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Not applicable to this outcome</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Not applicable to this outcome</p>	<p>arts - 60%</p> <p>mathematics - 47%</p> <p>science - 23%</p> <p>health and physical education - 37%</p> <p>There were a total of 15 unique test takers, some of whom repeated the test during the 2013-2014 test year. By the end of the test year, 13 had passed the test.</p> <p>On the individual subject area tests that were taken during the 2013-2014 test year, the percentage of sub-area scores at the 3 and 4 level were:</p> <p>biology (1 tester) - 60%</p> <p>computer science (1 tester) - 60%</p> <p>earth/space science (1 tester) - 40%</p> <p>English (3 testers) - 50%</p> <p>integrated science (4 testers) - 40%</p> <p>learning disabilities (2 testers) - 63%</p> <p>mathematics (4 testers) - 56%</p> <p>physical science (2 testers) - 47%</p> <p>social studies (1 tester) - 21%</p> <p>(07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>MTTC Elementary Subject Test.xlsx</p>	<p>standards and test objectives, and the general preparation of the candidates for the content required on the test. Additional data was provided as to candidate/test taker's grades in the related, required coursework to explore possible correlation between performance in coursework and performance on the exam. No correlation was found; rather, the indicator seemed to be the quality of test taking ability.</p> <p>These discussions will continue, as will expanded test preparation sessions in the 2015 - 2016 academic year.</p> <p>The results from the individual subject area tests, given the low number of testers, are harder to act upon given the low number for each discipline and the length of time (changing curriculum) that individual candidates had been in the program. School of Education faculty and the related academic department faculty will continue to monitor test results for additional findings which could be used going forward. (08/24/2015)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>There were 18 test results on the elementary education subject test during the 2012-2013 MTTC test year, making a total of 108 sub-area scores. Of these 70% were at the 3 or 4 level. However, among the 15 unique test takers (one passed on her fourth attempt), there was a 93% pass rate on the elementary education subject test.</p> <p>When the data is disaggregated by sub-area, three meet the</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: While the sub-area scores are not rich data in terms of insights into candidates weaknesses in the areas with less than 80% meeting the 3/4 threshold, the curriculum for these areas will be further examined for alignment with the standards. The 2013-2014 test</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>80% threshold: math, science, and health/physical education. The remaining three: language arts, social studies, and the arts, are areas requiring attention. (08/03/2014)</p> <p>Related Documents: 2012-2013 MTTC Elementary Education Subject Test Scores</p>	<p>year data, which will be complete in Sept. 2014, will provide more relevant insight, as it will reflect candidate performance on the new elementary test, although a number of the candidates may not have completed the revised curriculum which is aligned to the new standards.</p> <p>Consideration must also be given to the current criterion, since the pass rate on the test as a whole is much higher than on the individual sub-areas. (08/03/2014)</p>
<p>Claim 2. Pedagogical Content Knowledge - Candidates demonstrate deep subject knowledge through their ability to engage learners in concepts and problem solving from multiple perspectives.</p> <p>Goal Status: Active</p> <p>Goal Category: Student Learning</p> <p>Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Lesson Plan assignment in EDUC411-EDUC422, EDUC420-EDUC421</p> <p>Rubric criteria include demonstration of engaging learners from multiple perspectives</p> <p>Objectives: At least 80% of the candidates score a level 4 on each criteria on the rubric.</p> <p>Schedule/Notes: Criteria/Objective defined 08/2015</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Not applicable to this outcome</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Not applicable to this outcome</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 2. Lesson Plan Key Assessment</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>Candidates successfully met the objective for three of the four criteria: Options, Equity, and Assessment. They were able to develop alternate approaches for engaging students in the content and big ideas, that allowed students to complete each option within the same setting and time frame, with the same assessment criteria, regardless of option chosen.</p> <p>Candidates designed in the expectation that all students complete each of the alternative approaches designed into the lesson plans, continuing to have difficulty with the idea of allowing students choice of how they engage in the content. Faculty noted that this aspect of the assessment sparked discussion among candidates about grouping strategies and about the relative merit of requiring that all students experience all learning experiences/activities. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 2. Lesson Plan Key Assessment Summary 16-17.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At next Work Session, prior to the 2017 - 2018 academic year, review claim and rubric for alignment of Choice criteria with the multiple perspectives focus of the claim. Choice might well be more appropriately aligned with candidates' ability to differentiate instruction, which is reflected in Claim 7. (08/15/2017)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2015-2016</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>The one criteria on which all candidates scored a 4 was Equity, indicating that they were able to design optional</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Discuss claim, assignment and rubric at Work Session to review relevance and alignment. (06/30/2016)</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>learning activities or strategies that were able to be completed within the parameters of the classroom, simultaneously, so that students who choose different options are not disadvantaged by their choice. Candidates had difficulty in developing alternate approaches or structures for engaging students in learning the concept or big idea from different perspectives. Often the options developed were based on supplemental materials that would better be described as accommodations or scaffolding. Faculty identified the need to further discuss the assignment and the rubric to explore ways to engage candidates in developing multiple approaches, or empowering their students to develop their own solutions or strategies for problem-solving or project-based learning. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 2. Lesson Plan Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p>	<p>Update: Confirmed to continue claim, assignment, and rubric for the 2016 - 2017 academic year and then review results. (08/22/2016)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: No Although the total number of students completing this key assessment is small, there are still some interesting findings to consider. Developing options for lessons that engage learners in looking at the material from different perspectives continues to be a challenge, with only 42% scoring at a level 4 on this criteria on the rubric. The consideration of equity in developing lessons that allow learners to explore content in different ways also is more challenging, with 75% scoring at the 4 level. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 2. Lesson Plan Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: As the new academic begins, faculty will further discuss this claim and what it looks like when it is being carried out in the lesson planning process. Also, as students continue in the new program, having had EDUC415 prior to the subject methods courses, it will be important to monitor whether there is an improvement in being able to engage learners in the content from different perspective improves, as candidates have opportunity to broaden their own range of instructional strategies. (08/24/2015)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: Yes Candidates are able to design a variety of activities,</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Discuss key assessment assignment and rubric criteria in Fall 2014 to assure</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>however, they did not consistently provide options to students.</p> <p>There was a split at the two ends of the rubric - candidates either demonstrated the criteria well or were not able to meet it at all.</p> <p>The continued implementation of the key assessment and integration of the expectations into the curriculum will impact the future findings for this key assessment and the claim. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Sub-program Designation: Combined Finding</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 2. Lesson Plan Key Assessment Summary 13-14</p>	<p>shared understanding of expectations and fit with claim.</p> <p>Continue transition to revised program design and development of candidate skills related to the claim. (08/02/2014)</p>
<p>Claim 3. Technology Integration - Candidates intentionally infuse technological tools into curriculum, instruction, and assessment to enhance differentiation, collaboration, and student achievement.</p> <p>Goal Status: Active</p> <p>Goal Category: Student Learning</p> <p>Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Lesson Plan assignment in EDUC350 Developing standards-based lessons utilizing technology tools</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Not applicable to this outcome</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Not applicable to this outcome</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>All candidates met the criteria, completing the plans with alignment of standards, assessments, and activities.</p> <p>The average number of technology tools used per candidate fall 2016 was 1.3. This is a 0.3 increase over last year. Many of the lessons did not use technology tools such as websites or presentation tools, but did use interactive activities and manipulatives. (06/09/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 3. Technology Integration Key Assessment - EDUC 350 Fall2016.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Review of assessment at School of Education Work Session. (08/15/2017)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2015-2016</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>Candidates demonstrated the ability to align standards, assessments, and activities.</p> <p>The number of technology tools included in the plans per candidate averaged 1.0 for fall 2015 is 1.0. Many of the lessons did not use technology tools. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 3. Technology Integration Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Assessment to be implemented again in EDUC350 during the 2016 - 2017 academic year with results to be reviewed in School of Education Work Session specific to the alignment of the claim and assessment. (08/22/2016)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>Standards-based lessons: All students in the course met each of the criteria on the</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: The first year the course is taught (fall 2014) will be used as a baseline</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>standards-based lesson plan rubric (see related document).</p> <p>Technology tools: The average number of technology tools used by elementary candidates was 4.6, and the average number of technology tools used by secondary candidates was 4.6. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 3. Technology Integration Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p>	<p>measurement. The goal will be to improve by increasing the per candidate average for the class each semester until a level is reached where fidelity of tech tool implementation becomes a concern. The educational technology philosophy of the LSSU School of Education program champions includes the idea that technology is a tool for education and should not be used simply for the sake of using technology. Therefore, attention to the fidelity of the use of technology for student learning is critical and if candidates begin to describe technology tool use in ways that are not learner centered, perhaps the optimum number of tech tools a candidate should learn in a semester has been slightly overshot. An alternative explanation of a lack of candidate focus and understanding about learner centeredness should also be considered, but at that point the School of Education faculty and dean should re-evaluate the goals of this assessment. (08/24/2015)</p>
	<p>Direct - Presentation, Performance - Technology Integration in Instruction - assessment of technology integration in student teaching</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Service Learning, Community-based</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: No Course to be taught for first time fall 2014 (08/03/2014)</p> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes The overall average on the OPTIC instrument was 3.5, with a range of 2.82 to 3.9. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Key assessment will be implemented in fall 2014 (08/03/2014)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: 2014 – 2015 was the pilot year for the implementation of this assessment, and training for the university supervisors will continue.</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>learning</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Internships</p> <p>Related Documents: OPTIC Rubric.docx OPTIC.pdf</p>	<p>Claim 3. Technology Integration Student Teaching Summary.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: Yes OPTIC piloted in student teacher observations in 2013 - 2014. (08/03/2014)</p>	<p>(09/09/2015)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: Target to be set and OPTIC implemented in 2014-2015 (08/03/2014)</p>
<p>Claim 4. Reflection and Improvement - Candidates respond to the results of self-evaluation and reflection for continued improvement in their implementation of research-based pedagogical practices that result in student learning.</p> <p>Goal Status: Active Goal Category: Student Learning Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Dispositions Reflection EDUC250 candidates' reflection on candidate-course instructor conference on candidate self-assessment and instructor assessment of demonstration of dispositions</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Diversity/Global Learning High Impact Program Practices 1: Learning Communities</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection EDUC250 Key Assessment Dispositions Assessment.docx</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2015-2016 Goal met: Yes 80% of the candidates (12 of 15) scored at level 4 on the reflection rubric, demonstrating the ability to effectively compare and contrast personal self-assessment and input from the instructor regarding professional dispositions. The remaining three candidates scored at level 2 and generally were not able to incorporate instructor's feedback into their perceptions of their own behavior. This was reflected in less than effective performance in the course overall. (06/30/2016)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes Of the nine candidates who completed the process of self-assessment, instructor assessment, and conferencing regarding the Professional Dispositions inventory, 2/3 scored at a level 4 on the rubric and 1/3 scored at a level 2. Those who scored at a level 2 were able to discuss their strengths and weaknesses but did not acknowledge instructor feedback or input. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Continue implementation as designed. The steps of self-assessment, instructor assessment, and conferencing, followed by the reflection paper, are effective in opening the conversation regarding dispositions in the initial professional education course. In addition, it establishes the expectation and framework for professional dispositions that is carried out during the remainder of the program. (06/30/2016)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: While the goal for the current academic year has been met, there will need to be continued work and focus to develop the orientation to seek out and be able to integrate feedback from others on the part of candidates in the early stages of the program. Faculty will discuss the expanded use of the dispositions inventory, as well as review the inventory itself to assure that the key points are covered without being redundant or confusing. (09/09/2015)</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Dispositions Reflection - EDUC415</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Common Intellectual Experiences</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Learning Communities</p>	<p>Goal met: Yes 83% of the candidates scored 4 on the rubric, indicating that they were able to reflect on the similarities and differences between their self-assessment and that of the course instructor. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Sub-program Designation: Combined Finding Related Documents: Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection EDUC250 Summary 13-14</p> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017 Goal met: Yes Candidates reflected on their professional growth, gaining confidence and feeling more comfortable in the role of the teacher presenting the lessons. Assignment and rubric, as implemented, did not align with the earlier revision. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection EDUC415 2016-17.docx Claim 4. Dispositions Reflection EDUC415 Key Assessment.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Rubric criteria will be reviewed and refined to more clearly focus on the claim. As additional materials are developed for the professional dispositions key assessments in other courses, a clear progression of development will be developed. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: Assignment and rubric revised for future implementations. (06/09/2017)</p> <p>Update: At next School of Education Work Session, review revised assignment and rubric, complete norming exercise for implementation in the 2017-2018 academic year. (08/15/2017)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: No In discussing the relative merits of repeating the same assignment of candidate self-assessment, instructor assessment, and individual conferencing for providing insightful evidence related to this claim, the faculty agreed to use the conference cycle for EDUC250, but then to develop a new key assessment for EDUC415 that would focus on the candidate's self-evaluation and reflection on the lesson development and implementation process used in that course. (12/16/2014)</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Key assessment to be developed for EDUC415 for the 2015-2016 that focuses on candidates self-assessment and reflection as the development and implementation of lessons that engage students and result in learning. (08/24/2015)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: No Key assessment in under development and will be implemented when the course is taught in spring 2015 (08/03/2014)</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Implement key assessment in spring 2015 (08/03/2014)</p>
	<p>Direct - Portfolio Review - Reflective Portfolio</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017 Goal met: Yes Candidates demonstrate their reflective skills and ability to</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At School of Education Work Session, in</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Learning Communities</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Capstone Course(s), Projects</p>	<p>make connections between evidence/artifacts and their philosophy/who they are becoming as educators. When probed in discussion, they are able to discuss the underlying principles and practices that go beyond the educational jargon that they have learned through their coursework. Given the relatively new sequential development of the portfolio, growth over time is not as easy for candidates to document. With the full implementation of the sequence, beginning with the application to the program to student teaching application and culminating with the capstone reflective portfolio in student teaching, assessment of the evolution of reflection on personal growth and development will continue. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 4. Reflective Portfolio - Student Teaching Application Key Assessment 2017.docx Claim 4. Reflective Portfolio - Student Teaching Application Key Assessment.docx</p>	<p>preparation for Student Teaching and Program Application information sessions, faculty will review expectations, processes, and assessment criteria as part of norming session for the portfolio process in its entirety. (09/15/2017)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes Assessment of initial portfolios required as part of student teaching applications, beginning in Spring 2014, and as part of program acceptance applications, beginning in Fall 2014, indicate wide range of candidate understanding of concept of reflective portfolio. The lack of clear, consistent expectations and understanding of criteria for reflective portfolios among faculty is evident from the diversity of feedback captured on the individual comment sheets that each faculty member completes for each portfolio which she reviews. The portfolio process has been introduced at two points in the program, but as of this point, no candidate who completed an initial portfolio as part of the program acceptance process and received feedback on that portfolio has submitted a second iteration of the portfolio as part of an application for student teaching. The first of those who will be in that situation will be applying for student teaching during the 2015-2016 academic year. Candidates who submitted initial reflective portfolios as part of their student teaching application did not complete</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: School work session focused on norming for assessment of reflective portfolios will be held in October 2015, in preparation for review of program application portfolios and student teaching portfolios in December, 2015; February 2016; and April 2016. The norming process will include discussion of criteria, copies of submitted portfolios, and actual feedback recorded by individual faculty members (identifying information redacted).</p> <p>Confirmation of timeline for portfolio process through the program, and the role of this key assessment in aligning to the claim will be part of the work session and/or subsequent work session. (08/24/2015)</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>a second iteration of the portfolio as a culminating assessment during student teaching. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Initial Portfolio Feedback.doc Initial Portfolio - Application to Teacher Education.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: No Initial round of portfolio submissions as part of the student teaching application process occurred in spring 2014. Analysis of results continues (08/03/2014)</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Completion of review of second batch of portfolios in by Sept 1, 2014. Norming of assessment criteria among School of Education faculty in fall 2014. (08/03/2014)</p>
<p>Claim 5. Dispositions - Candidates demonstrate professional dispositions throughout coursework, field experience, and student teaching. Goal Status: Active Goal Category: Student Learning Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Laboratory, Clinical, Skill/Competency Assessments - Dispositions Ratings - EDUC250, EDUC415, EDUC460 High Impact Program Practices 2: Service Learning, Community-based learning High Impact Program Practices 1: Learning Communities Related Documents: Dispositions Assessment.docx</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017 Goal met: Yes Candidate self-assessment data was collected in EDUC250 in fall 2015 and in EDUC415 in spring 2017. The process of tracking self-assessment across the three key courses, EDUC250, EDUC415, and EDUC460, continues to be implemented. More than 80% of the candidates rate themselves as consistently or usually demonstrating each of the dispositions on the two sets of data at this time. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 5. Dispositions Ratings EDUC415 2016-17.docx Claim 5. Dispositions Ratings Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx Dispositions Assessment.docx Claim 5. Dispositions Ratings EDUC415 Key Assessment.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes Candidates rated themselves as consistently or usually demonstrating most of the dispositions identified on the inventory. Most elementary candidates self reported that they set high standards for themselves in their own work, interact positively with peers, maintain a professional appearance, and communicate well with instructors. The</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At next School of Education Work Session, focus will be on the reviewing the alignment of the dispositions-related key assessments and on clarifying expectations and processes. (08/15/2017)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: The dispositions rating form has not been implemented in EDUC460, for the third piece of the evolution of how candidates are viewing themselves in terms of professional dispositions. Given the feedback of those who</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p>outliers for these categories were all from the same candidate. The secondary candidates self reported that they set high standards for themselves in their own work, maintain a professional appearance, and communicate well with instructors.</p> <p>For elementary one of the less frequent items self reported by the candidates was the connections of material to real world happening. For secondary some of the less frequent items self reported by the candidates were demonstrates adaptability and demonstrates a commitment to engaging all learners through the use of diverse instructional strategies.</p> <p>Candidates in EDUC415 noted as they did this assessment that they felt some of their scores decreased from the last time they took the test. The candidates voiced that in EDUC 250, they sort of thought they knew it all (the boldness of ignorance?) and now that they have spent more time in field classrooms and have learned a lot more about education, they realize that they rated themselves as demonstrating behavior much more frequently than they should have. They felt this rating in EDUC 415 was a more accurate portrayal of who they are. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 5. Dispositions Ratings Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p>	<p>completed it in EDUC250 and EDUC415, the addition of a third administration will provide additional insights into the picture of professional dispositions. (08/24/2015)</p>
<p>Claim 6. Equity - Candidates demonstrate commitment to equity and democracy in their active participation in learning communities at the university, school., and community levels.</p> <p>Goal Status: Active</p> <p>Goal Category: Student Learning</p> <p>Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>Direct - Field Placement/Internship Evaluation - Student Teaching Final Evaluation</p> <p>Assessment on effectiveness in participation in learning communities</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Internships</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Learning Communities</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>The student teachers are active in engaging with cooperating teacher in learning communities. They value providing their students with choices, giving them a voice in the classroom.</p> <p>There is less evidence that student teachers understand and/or incorporate a focus on equity for the students and a democratic voice for students. However, in discussion with university supervisors, they see evidence of this in the classroom; it is not documented on the final evaluation. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 6. xCommitment to Equity and Democracy Key</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At School of Education Work Session, faculty, including university supervisors, will review data from past assessments, discuss the claim statement and expectations, and develop strategies for more thorough incorporation into coursework throughout the program. (10/13/2017)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: Additional training for university supervisors and cooperating teachers will be incorporated into the Student</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
		<p data-bbox="951 207 1318 235">Assessment Summary 16-17.docx</p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="951 345 1335 373">Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015</p> <p data-bbox="951 378 1102 406">Goal met: No</p> <p data-bbox="951 410 1602 698">The narrative provided on the student teaching final evaluations for this claim were evaluated as to the level of Blooms taxonomy reflected in the report of student teacher demonstration of the claim. Ratings were made at one of three levels. Of the 27 student teachers who were rated on this claim, 44% had narratives at a high-level (creating/evaluating), 33% had narratives at a mid-level (analyzing/applying), and 22% had narratives at a low-level (understanding/remembering).</p> <p data-bbox="951 735 1602 860">Student teachers are engaged in activities in a number of settings in their student teaching assignments that promote collaboration and working with colleagues in problem-solving and school improvement efforts.</p> <p data-bbox="951 898 1602 958">The focus on equity and democracy is lost in the effort to document engagement with others. (07/15/2015)</p> <p data-bbox="951 979 1182 1006">Related Documents:</p> <p data-bbox="951 1011 1528 1071">Claim 6. xCommitment to Equity and Democracy Key Assessment Summary.docx</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 167 2003 324">Teaching Orientation prior to the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year, to support the shared commitment to this outcome. (08/15/2017)</p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="1612 354 2003 673">Action to be Taken: The need for continued training for university supervisors is clear, as they are the ones who have to maintain the focus on the purpose and key concepts of each claim, and who have to be sure that the quality of assessment data gathered reflects the level at which the student teacher is working.</p> <p data-bbox="1612 711 2003 868">Further discussion is required to determine whether this key assessment is the most appropriate one for this claim. (08/24/2015)</p>
		<p data-bbox="951 1092 1335 1120">Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014</p> <p data-bbox="951 1125 1102 1153">Goal met: No</p> <p data-bbox="951 1157 1581 1185">Key assessment will be piloted in 2014-2015 (08/03/2014)</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 1097 2003 1222">Action to be Taken: Training for university supervisors to be completed in September 2014 (08/03/2014)</p>
<p data-bbox="100 1260 520 1417">Claim 7. Differentiation - Candidates value the uniqueness of each individual through their commitment to learners and learner-centered processes.</p> <p data-bbox="100 1422 321 1450">Goal Status: Active</p> <p data-bbox="100 1455 468 1482">Goal Category: Student Learning</p>	<p data-bbox="531 1260 940 1320">Direct - Case Analysis - Implications of Disability - EDSE301</p> <p data-bbox="531 1325 940 1417">Research and presentation on specific disability and potential impact for student and teacher</p> <p data-bbox="531 1422 940 1482">Rubric criteria include commitment to learners and learner-centered</p>	<p data-bbox="951 1260 1335 1287">Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p data-bbox="951 1292 1102 1320">Goal met: Yes</p> <p data-bbox="951 1325 1602 1417">In both 2015-2016 and 2016-2017, all candidates scored at the level 4 on each of the four criteria on the rubric. (06/05/2017)</p> <p data-bbox="951 1450 1182 1477">Related Documents:</p> <p data-bbox="951 1482 1570 1510">Claim 7. Implications of Disability Key Assessment 16-17.</p>	<p data-bbox="1612 1268 2003 1490">Action to be Taken: At School of Education Work Session, all faculty to review and confirm the alignment of the claim, assignment, and rubric, as well the implications for other coursework. (11/10/2017)</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
<p>Plan Goals Differentiation : High-Level (Creating/Evaluating)</p>	<p>processes Objectives: At least 80% of the candidates score at level 4 on each of the criteria on the rubric for the assignment. High Impact Program Practices 2: Collaborative Assignments, Projects High Impact Program Practices 1: Diversity/Global Learning Related Documents: Claim 7. Implications of Disabilities Key Assessment</p>	<p>docx Claim 7. Implications of Disability Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015 Goal met: Yes All candidates were able to create a plan that reflects a commitment to learners and to learner-centered processes. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 7. Implications of Disability Key Assessment 14-15.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: The case studies used in the course each focus on one student with a particular disability. It may be useful to also consider how to meet the needs of the one learner as well as the rest of the learner in the class or consider how to meet the needs of multiple students with different disabilities in the same classroom.</p> <p>Discussion as to the alignment of the key assessment and criteria on the rubric with the claim statement will be required this academic year. (08/24/2015)</p>
<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Unit Plan assignment - EDUC411-EDUC422, EDUC420-EDUC421 Rubric criteria include learner-centered strategies and awareness of individual learning styles/needs High Impact Program Practices 2: Service Learning, Community-based learning</p>	<p>Direct - Homework, Writing Assignment - Unit Plan assignment - EDUC411-EDUC422, EDUC420-EDUC421 Rubric criteria include learner-centered strategies and awareness of individual learning styles/needs High Impact Program Practices 2: Service Learning, Community-based learning</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014 Goal met: Yes All candidates scored at the highest level on commitment to learners and learner-centered processes on the rubric for this assignment. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Sub-program Designation: Combined Finding Related Documents: Claim 7. Implications of Disability Assessment Summary 13-14</p> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017 Goal met: No Candidates demonstrated less than 80% proficiency on each of the three criteria on the rubric for the unit plan assignment that are specific to this claim. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 7. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 16-17.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Further development of key assessment assignment and rubric will need to be done to assure that it is aligned with the intention of the claim and the place that it has in the development of candidates knowledge and skills related to the claim. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: Review of claim and alignment with the three key assessments to be focus of School of Education Work Session. There is evidence of candidate success with some of the key assessments, so further investigation into the alignment of the claim, the assignments, and the rubric criteria will be</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Writing-Intensive Course(s)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 7. Unit Plan Key Assessment</p>	<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2015-2016</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>80% of the candidates scored at level 4 (proficient) on Individualization, being able to purposefully integrate individual learner needs, and opportunities for differentiated instruction. The criteria specific to assessment, which include selection of assessment tools and differentiated assessments, were met at level 4 by roughly half of the candidates.</p> <p>Candidates often incorporate strategies that are more accommodations than differentiation (07/05/2016)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 7. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 15-16.docx</p>	<p>important. (08/18/2017)</p> <p>Action to be Taken: At School of Education Work Session, review alignment of claim, assignment, and rubric. (08/19/2016)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>All candidates demonstrated an understanding of individualization. Candidates were able to consider different options for assessment, although understanding of differentiation of assessment is still weak. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents: Claim 7. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 14-15.docx</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Work on this key assessment, which cuts across all disciplines and levels, is needed prior to the implementation in the 2015-2016 academic year. In addition, there needs to be further input into to alignment of the assessment with the claim statement. (08/24/2015)</p> <p>Update: School of Education Work Session not held as planned. Faculty will follow up on this in the spring. (08/22/2016)</p>
		<p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>There was evidence of candidates being aware of the need for attention to individual student needs. They were not always able to discuss why alternative assessments were appropriate or how they might be used for individual students.</p> <p>Shared understanding of expectations and definitions on the part of the faculty is not complete. (08/02/2014)</p> <p>Sub-program Designation: Combined Finding</p> <p>Related Documents:</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: Faculty discussion to confirm shared understanding and expectation related to this claim. (08/02/2014)</p>

Goals	Strategies	Findings	Action to be Taken
	<p>Direct - Group project, collaborative learning - Classroom Management Plan - EDUC460</p> <p>Rubric criteria include evidence of focus on individual learners</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 2: Collaborative Assignments, Projects</p> <p>High Impact Program Practices 1: Diversity/Global Learning</p>	<p>Claim 7. Unit Plan Key Assessment Summary 13-14</p> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2016-2017</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>All candidates scored at level 4 (proficient) on the rubric for the assignment. (06/05/2017)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Claim 7. xClassroom Management Plan Key Assessment 16-17.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2014-2015</p> <p>Goal met: Yes</p> <p>Candidates all effectively demonstrated the ability to identify strategies for constructing an effective emotional environment in the classroom, and the knowledge of proactive strategies for managing misbehavior. (07/15/2015)</p> <p>Related Documents:</p> <p>Claim 7. xClassroom Management Plan Key Assessment 14-15.docx</p> <hr/> <p>Finding Reporting Year: 2013-2014</p> <p>Goal met: No</p> <p>Course will be taught spring 2016 (08/03/2014)</p>	<p>Action to be Taken: At upcoming School of Education Work Session, all faculty will review and confirm the alignment of the claim, assignment and rubric, as well as the implications for coursework throughout the program. (11/10/2017)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: EDUC460 was not scheduled to be offered until Spring 2016, however, due to candidates who had transitioned to the new program and who would be student teaching in 2015-2016, the course was offered in Spring 2015. This key assessment was developed and piloted in the Spring 2015 semester. Review of the key assessment assignment and results, with an anticipated revision of the assignment and rubric, will be done in the Fall 2015 semester, in advance of the course being offered again in Spring 2016. (08/24/2015)</p> <hr/> <p>Action to be Taken: Key assessment is under development and will be implemented when the course is taught (08/03/2014)</p>

Program Review - The Program provides evidence in support of Program Review in accordance with the Higher Learning Commission Criteria for Accreditation (4.A. The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs. 1. The

Indirect - Report/Audit - Internal - The Program conducts evidence-supported regular program review. The Program addresses the key components of the , incorporates feedback from assessment activities, and documents the impact of assessment findings and subsequent

<i>Goals</i>	<i>Strategies</i>	<i>Findings</i>	<i>Action to be Taken</i>
<p>institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.) Goal Status: Active Goal Category: Periodic Program Review</p>	<p>actions on student learning. Objectives: The Program Review will address the following criteria: 1. Contribution to LSSU Mission/Vision 2. Metrics of Productivity 3. Internal and External Program Demand 4. Program Quality 5. Program Assessment 6. Opportunity Analysis</p>		
<p>2.1 Program Enrollment - Strategy 2.1 The Program establishes realistic goals for program enrollment that are optimistic, realistic, achievable. Goal Status: Active Goal Category: Enrollment</p>	<p>Regular, recurring - The program sets goals for program enrollment which are time-based, progressive, achievable and quantitative. Objectives: Program Enrollment Growth Goal: _____ by _____</p>		