PRAC Report
School of Education
2012 – 2013

Teaching is a complicated and complex profession. The skills, knowledge and dispositions needed to be a good teacher are many. Therefore, the task of assessing whether interns are acquiring the needed skills, knowledge, and dispositions as they move through the program must go beyond just assessing individual course assignments and achieving satisfactory grades in education courses. We know these things are important but we believe there is more.

Preparing interns to be great teachers is like a puzzle. Each piece is important. Coursework and grades are important pieces of the teacher education puzzle. However, the sum of the pieces addressed in courses does not necessarily equate to the whole. We believe that it is possible for a student to be successfully learning individual skills and pieces of knowledge and yet struggle to put them together to "make the whole." Therefore, the School of Education has designed a Unit Assessment System which not only considers course grades when assessing students" professional growth but utilizes benchmark assessments throughout the program.

Benchmarks are assessments which are external to the education classes but are a vital part of the teacher education program. They attempt to provide a means of assessing if students possess the skills, knowledge, and dispositions at key points in the program and they are used in conjunction with course grades to determine if students are making satisfactory progress in their program. They measure aspects of being a good teacher that may not be captured by individual course assignments. They attempt to assess if students are "putting the pieces together" from all their education courses and experiences and moving forward in their professional growth.

The following is a sample of selected data from candidate, program and unit operations assessments.

Assessment I - Benchmark I – Elementary and Secondary

General Outcomes

This benchmark has been used for several years by the School of Education (SOE). Results have proven to be a good indicator of students' likelihood of encountering problems as they move through the program. That is why the SOE continue to use this valuable assessment. The Block I instructional team meets at the end of the semester to complete the Benchmark I rubric for each student in Block I. They evaluated each student on (1) knowledge and habits of mind, (2) written and oral communication skills, (3) interaction with teachers and students, and (4) disposition and professional behavior. The team determines if each student has displayed the skills, knowledge and dispositions in these areas that they would expect for an student at this stage of the program. All students are sent personalized e-mail with feedback noting areas for improvement.

How would you know it

The Benchmark I rubric is completed by the team of instructors who have taught the courses each student has completed during that semester. The

instructors have the opportunity to not only evaluate the work of each student but to also observe the student during class and working in the schools. Each indicator on the rubric has been discussed over many semesters during Benchmark I assessment meetings which allows for greater reliability among instructors when assessing each indicator. Decisions are also made jointly by the team of instructors at the end of the semester with each instructor being allowed to provide evidence and feedback on the student's knowledge, skills and dispositions throughout the semester. The rubric, which is provided below, also outlines what should be observed for each indicator.

How will you help students learn it

Throughout the semester the instructors provide multiple opportunities for the student to learn and demonstrate each indicator, such as working with children in the schools, preparing written assignments for class, participating in class discussions and on-line chat rooms, and interacting with peers and instructors. Each student is also asked to complete a self-assessment addressing the indicators at mid-term. The students then meet and discuss this self-assessment with their instructors.

Assessment Findings - Fall 2012 and Spring 2013

Knowledge and Habits of Mind PUL 2 PUL 3 PUL 5						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N=84	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N= 51	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N=54	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N=23	Overall Category Results Secondary
Demonstrates understanding of the main ideas taught in the block.	5/6%	4/8%	In the fall, fourteen (17%) of the elementary students received negative indicators in this category. Most students received one or two negative indicators but three students received three negative indicators.

In the spring, eleven (22%) of the elementary students received one or two negative indicators in this | 1/ 2% | 0/0% | In the fall, six (11%) of the secondary students received a negative indicator in this category. No one received more than one negative indicator.

In the spring four (17%) of the secondary students received negative |
Has good foundation of content area knowledge.	0/0%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	
Engages in critical thinking.	3/ 4%	7/14%		0/0%	0/0%	
Attentive during class activities and discussions.	6/7%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	
Is respectful of peers and instructors.	0/0%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	

			category but one student received three.			indicators in this category. No one three or more negative indicators.
Careful about assignments preparation for class	6/7%	2/4%		4/7%	2/9%	
Accurately judges personal strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing.	5/6%	5/10%		0/0%	3/13%	

Written and Oral Communication PUL 1						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N= 84	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N= 51	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N=54	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N=23	Overall Category Results Secondary
Exhibits competent writing skills ➤ Insightful, solid content. ➤ Appropriate language. ➤ Good organization. ➤ Fluent. ➤ Concise. ➤ Few mechanical errors.	23/27%	10/20%	Writing continues to be a major concern for elementary students. In the fall all negative indicators in this category were for writing In the spring all negative indicators were for writing with the exception of one student who received a negative indicator for speech. Students are most often	4/7%	6/26%	In the fall all negative indicators in this category were for writing In the spring all negative indicators were for writing also Students are most often cited for grammar, clarity, and depth.
Models standard English when speaking. Expresses ideas clearly when speaking.	0/0%	1/ 2%		0/0%	0/0%	

			cited for grammar, clarity, sentence structure, and depth.			

<table>
<tr><td colspan="7" style="background-color:#d6e0b6;">Interaction with Teachers and Children
PUL 5</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators
The Student-</td>
<td># of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012
N=84</td>
<td># of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013
N= 51</td>
<td>Overall Category Results Elementary</td>
<td># of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012
N=54</td>
<td># of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013
N=23</td>
<td>Overall Category Results Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishes rapport with classroom teachers and students.</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td rowspan="4">This continues to be a category where most elementary students seem to have few problems and display the skills, knowledge and dispositions assessed.</td>
<td>3/6%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td rowspan="4">This continues to be a category where secondary students sporadically have problems when working in the field with secondary students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comes to field placement prepared</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates willingness to get involved in the classroom.</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>3/13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show patience when working with students.</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>0/0%</td>
<td>1/ 4%</td>
</tr>
</table>

Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N=84	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N= 51	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2012 N=54	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2013 N=23	Overall Category Results Secondary
Focuses on the positive	1/1%	1/ 2%	Sixteen (19%) elementary students received negative indicators during the fall. Each received either one or two in this category with the exception of one student who received three.

Fifteen (29%) of the elementary students during the spring received negative indicators with four students (8%) students receiving three. | 0/0% | 1/ 4% | Three (6%) of the secondary students received negative indicators in the fall with two receiving one and the remaining student receiving two..

During the spring, four students (17%) received negative indicators with two (9%) receiving three or more. |
Makes adjustments as necessary.	2/2%	0/0%		0/0%	1/ 4%	
Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds.	0/0%	1/ 2%		0/0%	1/ 4%	
Appreciates multiple perspectives.	4/5%	7/14%		0/0%	2/9%	
Is willing to give and receive help.	0/0%	1/ 2%		0/0%	0/0%	
Commits to being in class. Takes responsibility for making up work.	3/4 %	1/ 2%		1/ 2%	2/9%	
Commits to being on time.	6/7%	5/10%		0/0%	0/0%	
Meets deadlines.	4/5%	7/14%		3/6%	3/13%	
Has good organization.	3/4%	2/4%		0/0%	0/0%	
Is neatly, appropriately dressed.	1/1%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	

Dispositions and Professional Behavior
PUL 6

0

<u>Summary of Findings</u>

In the fall, thirty-six of the elementary students (43%) received at least one negative indicator in at least one category. Most elementary students received one or two negative indicators but 12% of the students received three or more negative indicators. In the fall, eleven of the secondary students (48%) received one or more negative indicators. Most students received one or two negative indicators with only two students having three negative indicators. Both of these students encountered academic problems during Block I. During the spring semester, twenty-six elementary students (31%) and ten secondary students (43%) received one or more negative indicators. Seven elementary students (13%) and four secondary students (17%) had three or more negative indicators. During 2010-2011, 20-32% of the elementary and 41-89% of the secondary had negative indicators. During 2011-2012, 31-41% of the elementary and 30-44% of the secondary had negative indicators.

In the _Knowledge and Habits of Minds_ category during 2012-2013 (N=212), students had the greatest number of negative indicators for ""Careless about assignments and preparation for class" (7%) followed by "Midjudges personal strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing" (6%), "Demonstrates some gaps or misconceptions about central concepts and content of the block" (5%), and " Avoids or lacks development as a critical thinker" (5%)

In 2012-2013, twenty-one percent (21%) of students had a negative indicator for these general outcomes in the second category, _Written and Oral Communication_. Each of these students had only one negative indictor, with all but one negative indicator being for writing. Professional writing continues to be an issue for students.

For the category _Interaction with Teachers and Students_, only 2% of the students received a negative indicator for these general outcomes all of whom where in the secondary program. There was not a pattern to these areas of concern.

Under _Dispositions and Professional Behavior_, during 2012-2013 18% of students received at least one negative indicator. Eight percent (8%) receiving a negative indicator "Turns in late assignments" while six percent (6%) had a negative indicator for "Prioritizes personal perspective."

<u>What improvements have been made based on assessment findings</u>

The purpose of the Benchmark I Assessment has always been to identify and support our candidates at the end of the first semester of the program so they might complete their program of study and ultimately be successful educators. The Benchmark I Assessment has been a reliable tool that has indeed helped us to identify early struggles in the areas of Knowledge and Habits of Mind, Written and Oral Communication, Interactions with Teachers and Students, and Dispositions and Professional Behavior. However, we came to realize that we needed to more consistently use the results of this assessment to support our candidates. In order to make better use of the Benchmark I data, we recently added a policy to follow up more rigorously with a candidate when he/she is displaying a number of negative indicators. Our new policy requires that a candidates with three or more negative indicators be assigned a mentor faculty member. The mentor then works with the candidate to help the candidate remove these negative indicators during the next one or two semesters. All negative indicators must be resolved prior to the start of student teaching. By providing this early intervention support, we hope to insure that candidates are better prepared to enter and be successful in their student teaching experience and then go on to be successful in the teaching profession.

Assessment II - Student Performance on Principles of Undergraduate Learning – School of Education

General Outcomes

Each semester, faculty assess students based on selected IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PUL). The School of Education has selected critical thinking; integration and application of knowledge; quantitative skills; written, oral and visual communications; intellectual depth, breadth, and adaptiveness; and understanding society and culture as PULS which receive major emphasis in education courses.

How would you know it

Instructors based their assessments of the students on quality of academic work, depth of contributions to class discussions, and observations of students working with children in the field.

How will you help students learn it

Coursework and field experiences are designed to provide all students with the opportunities to display their skills and knowledge, receive feedback, and improve.

Assessment Findings – Spring 2010 – Spring 2012

Faculty Ratings on PULS – Major Emphasis

Faculty Ratings of School of Education Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (100 Level & Lower)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean [2]	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1B. Quantitative Skills	23 3.17	0 0.0%	5 21.7%	9 39.1%	9 39.1%	23 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	85 2.79	7 8.2%	19 22.4%	44 51.8%	15 17.7%	85 100.0%
Total [1]	108 2.87	7 6.5%	24 22.2%	53 49.1%	24 22.2%	108 100.0%

[1] Combined number of student ratings in all 100-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 100 level course.

[2] Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Faculty Ratings of School of Education Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (200 Level)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean [2]	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1B. Quantitative Skills	14 2.86	0 0.0%	4 28.6%	8 57.1%	2 14.3%	14 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	329 3.50	19 5.8%	25 7.6%	56 17.0%	229 69.6%	329 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	112 3.05	7 6.3%	13 11.6%	59 52.7%	33 29.5%	112 100.0%
Total [1]	455 3.37	26 5.7%	42 9.2%	123 27.0%	264 58.0%	455 100.0%

[1] Combined number of student ratings in all 200-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 200 level course.

[2] Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Faculty Ratings of School of Education Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (300 Level)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean [2]	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1B. Quantitative Skills	177 3.15	1 0.6%	27 15.3%	94 53.1%	55 31.1%	177 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	91 3.48	1 1.1%	0 0.0%	44 48.4%	46 50.6%	91 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	586 3.27	3 0.5%	72 12.3%	272 46.4%	239 40.8%	586 100.0%
5. Understanding Society and Culture	286 3.36	11 3.9%	40 14.0%	69 24.1%	166 58.0%	286 100.0%
Total [1]	1140 3.29	16 1.4%	139 12.2%	479 42.0%	506 44.4%	1140 100.0%

[1] Combined number of student ratings in all 300-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 300 level course.

[2] Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Faculty Ratings of School of Education Student Performance on PULs with Major Emphasis (400 Level)

PUL – Major Emphasis	Mean [2]	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
1A. Written, Oral, & Visual Communication Skills	744	22	114	401	207	744
	3.07	3.0%	15.3%	53.9%	27.8%	100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	355	6	53	233	63	355
	2.99	1.7%	14.9%	65.6%	17.8%	100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	577	10	62	437	68	577
	2.98	1.7%	10.8%	75.7%	11.8%	100.0%
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness	77	1	8	44	24	77
	3.18	1.3%	10.4%	57.1%	31.2%	100.0%
5. Understanding Society and Culture	90	0	0	5	85	90
	3.94	0.0%	0.0%	5.6%	94.4%	100.0%
Total [1]	1843	39	237	1120	447	1843
	3.07	2.1%	12.9%	60.8%	24.3%	100.0%

[1] Combined number of student ratings in all 400-level courses sampled in Spring 2010, Fall 2010, Spring 2011, Fall 2011, Spring 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013. A student may be evaluated more than once if he or she is taking more than one 400 level course.

[2] Scale: 1 = "Not Effective", 2 = "Somewhat Effective", 3 = "Effective", 4 = "Very Effective"

Summary of Findings

This assessment addresses many of the same areas as Benchmark I. The data from the two assessments can be easily examined for patterns. In Benchmark I a range of 20-26% of the students received a negative indicator for writing during 2012-2013. Likewise 18.3% of 400-Level students were assessed as "somewhat effective or not effective." This would seem to support that students who experience writing problems early in the program (Benchmark I) continue to have problems throughout the program (PUL – 400-Level).

Data from the two assessments for critical thinking support that faculty members' expectations for this skill increase as students progress through the program as does the development level of the students. In 2012-213 the percentage of students with negative indicators on Benchmark I ranged from 0-14% during the junior and senior years. On the PUL assessment 30.6% of the students were in the lower two categories for Level-100, while 16.6% were in those two categories for the 400-Level assessment.

PUL 5, which addresses "Understanding Society and Culture," is especially important to the School of Education and its mission to prepare educators for urban schools. With means of 3.36 and 3.94 for Level-300 and Level 400 respectively, it appears that students are being given the opportunity to develop the skills and knowledge to support all children learning. This is also supported by Benchmark I data which denotes a range of 0-4% for students receiving a negative indicator for "Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds."

Assessment III – Content Course Grades

General Outcomes

Our accreditation body, CAEP, has adopted new standards which will be in effect during our next visit which establishes a minimum cohort GPA of 3.00 upon entrance into the teacher education program. Therefore, these data have been of great interest to the faculty and have been closely examined during 2012-2013. The SOE has a policy that all candidates must complete 90% of their general education content courses prior to entering a teacher education program. A minimum grade of "C" is required in all content courses with an overall GPA of 2.50 or higher. Grades as based on a 4.0 scale. Each program has mapped the required content courses to specific national content standards.

How would you know it

Elementary students' GPAs are based on all general education courses taken prior to starting the program. All course grades are used since elementary major are prepared to teach multiple subject areas. Secondary students' GPAs are based on grades in the major area which they are being prepared to teach.

How will you help students learn it.

Program design and mappings provide students with a pathway to their preparation in the area(s) they will teach. By analyzing students' academic performance in courses prior to entering their respective teacher education programs, the SOE faculty can determine if the students' academic performance in their content area(s) supports that they have the content knowledge needed to be effective teachers.

Assessment Findings

Elementary Education

Program Completers	Fall 2006 N=79	Spring 2007 N=91	Fall 2007 N=72	Spring 2008 N=96
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.24	3.23	3.12	3.26
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.41	0.35	0.41
	Fall 2008 N= 72	Spring 2009 N= 88	Fall 2009 N= 61	Spring 2010 N= 80
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.14	3.16	3.14	3.20

Standard Deviation	0.43	0.42	0.40	0.37
	Fall 2010 **N= 77**	**Spring 2011** **N= 92**	**Fall 2011** **N= 69**	**Spring 2012** **N= 84**
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.22	3.32	3.21	3.31
Standard Deviation	0.36	0.42	0.38	0.46
	Fall 2012 **N= 67**	**Spring 2013** **N= 86**		
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.23	3.36		
Standard Deviation	0.48	0.44		

Secondary English/Language Arts

Program Completers	Fall 2006 N=8	Spring 2007 N=5	Fall 2007 N=6	Spring 2008 N=8	Fall 2008 N=8	Spring 2009 N=8	Fall 2009 N=8
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.37	3.10	3.22	3.24	3.41	3.55	3.10
Standard Deviation	0.44	0.33	0.54	0.45	0.46	0.48	0.32

Program Completers	Spring 2010 N=8	Fall 2010 N=4	Spring 2011 N=8	Fall 2011 N=13	Spring 2012 N=11	Fall 2012 N=10	Spring 2013 N=10
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.16	3.04	3.16	3.20	3.24	3.12	3.33
Standard Deviation	0.36	0.31	0.51	0.29	0.41	0.49	0.34

Secondary Mathematics Education

Program Completers	Fall 2006 N=2	Spring 2007 N=4	Fall 2007 N=2	Spring 2008 N=8	Fall 2008 N =6	Spring 2009 N = 3	Fall 2009 N = 5	Spring 2010 N = 3
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	2.64	3.20	3.10	3.53	3.30	3.51	2.94	3.11
Standard Deviation	0.61	0.73	0.15	0.23	0.30	0.07	0.29	0.57

Program Completers	Fall 2010 N=7	Spring 2011 N=2	Fall 2011 N=1	Spring 2012 N=6	Fall 2012 N =3	Spring 2013 N = 7		
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.04	3.40	2.62	2.80	3.57	3.35		
Standard Deviation	0.30	0.25	0.00	0.46	0.15	0.25		

Secondary Social Studies Education

Program Completers	Fall 2006 N=14	Spring 2007 N=12	Fall 2007 N=16	Spring 2008 N=14
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.23	3.19	3.20	3.09
Standard Deviation	0.38	0.46	0.45	0.41
Program Completers	Fall 2008 N=8	Spring 2009 N=9	Fall 2009 N=9	Spring 2010 N=10
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.10	3.17	3.10	2.95
Standard Deviation	0.51	0.54	0.29	0.41
Program Completers	Fall 2010 N=9	Spring 2011 N=8	Fall 2011 N=19	Spring 2012 N=11
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	3.12	3.42	3.19	3.05

Standard Deviation	0.34	0.42	0.52	0.28
Program Completers	**Fall 2012** **N=8**	**Spring 2013** **N=13**		
Mean Overall GPA at Start of Block I	2.97	3.19		
Standard Deviation	0.35	0.46		

Summary of Findings

Over the last 14 semesters, all elementary cohorts have enter the teacher education program with an average GPA above 3.00. The range has been between 3.12 and 3.36. This supports that elementary education majors do well in their content courses are should possess the content knowledge to teach the range of subject areas taught in elementary schools.

Cohorts entering the secondary English education program over the last 14 semesters have had an average GPA in their content area between 3.04 and 3.55.   Secondary social studies cohorts have had average GPAs between 2.95 and 3.42 in their content areas for this time period with twelve of the fourteen semesters being over 3.00.   For the secondary mathematics cohorts the range of average GPAs is 2.62 and 3.51 with ten of the fourteen cohort averages above 3.00. Of the four cohorts below 3.00 in mathematics, two were small cohorts of one or two students.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

All data have been shared with the respective faculty during fall 2013 meetings.   Discussions are on-going about how to continue to strive to recruit highly qualified students into the programs with special attend to the secondary undergraduate mathematics program.

Assessment IV - Benchmark IV – Student Teacher Impact on Student Learning Assignment

This benchmark continues to be of great importance to the School of Education. State and national bodies continue to focus on schools providing evidence that their candidates have an impact on student learning. This benchmark is designed to allow student teachers to provide evidence that they have had an impact on student learning during their student teaching experiences. During the first weeks of Block IV, student teachers are asked to collect evidence of student learning resulting from their teaching. Student teachers are able to select any evidence which they feel documents that students have learned as a result of their teaching. The student teachers are encouraged to select evidence which supports that students have learned at the conceptual/higher order level rather than learned just factual information.

At the end of the sixth week, the student teachers bring the evidence to a post-observation conference with the university coach/faculty. During the conversation, the student teachers provide the rationale for selecting the evidence, an analysis of the student learning which is supported by the evidence, and address how they believe that they impacted the student learning. Student teachers do not need to bring a written document to the

meeting but might consider notes to help them talk about the evidence they have selected. After the conference, the coach/faculty complete a rubric which addresses the student teacher's skills, knowledge, and dispositions concerning each student teacher's impact on student learning.

General Outcomes

Benchmark IV is designed to provide data on students' ability to impact children's learning. It addresses students' depth of knowledge of the concepts they are teaching, their abilities to recognize quality evidence of children's learning, their ability to analyze children's learning from the evidence, and their ability to recognize and analyze their own role in the children's learning.

How would you know it

Students meet with their coaches and faculty. They are asked to bring evidence from their student teaching experience that support that the children they were teaching obtained the skills and/or knowledge from the lessons that the student teacher desired. The students bring the evidence to the meeting and then talk about why they selected the evidence, what kind of learning the evidence supports, and what their role was in that learning. The faculty then used the following rubric to evaluate the students.

How will you help students learn it

Throughout the entire teacher education program, class assignments and field experiences prepare the students with the skills and knowledge to successfully complete this assessment.

Student Learning Rubric for Benchmark IV for Elementary Student Teachers

Indicators	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Depth of knowledge of concepts taught (ACEI 2.1-2.4)	Student teacher has an in-depth knowledge of concepts taught.	Student teacher has knowledge of concepts taught but it does not go beyond that addressed in the textbook and/or lower level knowledge.	Student teacher has knowledge of concepts taught but makes some factual errors.	Student teacher has some knowledge of concepts taught but has many misconceptions and factual errors.	Student teacher has little knowledge of concepts/content taught.

Quality of evidence (Does the assessment give valuable information about student learning?) (ACEI 4)	Rich evidence of student learning at conceptual/higher levels of understanding.	Evidence supports some student learning at conceptual/higher levels of understanding.	Evidence supports some student learning but only at lower levels of learning (memorization, factual, procedural, etc.)	Evidence addresses student learning but only at a superficial level.	Evidence does not address student learning.
Analysis of Student Learning (What did the student learn?) (ACEI 4)	Student teacher provides in-depth and accurate analysis of student learning supported by the evidence.	Student teacher speaks to student learning supported by the evidence accurately but the analysis lacks depth.	Student teacher speaks to some student learning supported by the evidence but analysis is sometime superficial and/or inaccurate.	Student teacher speaks to student learning which is not supported by the evidence.	Student teacher has little ability to analyze student learning supported by the evidence.
Analysis of Student teacher Impact (How did the instruction impact student learning?) (ACEI 4 and 5.1)	Student teacher is able to accurately analyze his/her impact on student learning supported by the evidence.	Student teacher speaks to his/her impact on student learning supported by the evidence. Analysis is accurate and but lacks depth.	Student teacher speaks to some impact on student learning supported by the evidence but analysis is sometimes superficial and/or inaccurate.	Student teacher speaks to impact on student learning but it is not supported by the evidence.	Student teacher is unable to speak to his/her impact on student learning. The student teacher seems confused about how his/her lesson/actions impacted the students.

Elementary Benchmark IV Data: 2007 - 2013

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
Depth of Knowledge of Concepts Taught (ACEI 2.1-2.4)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	12/44%	15/56%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.44	.51
Fall 2007 N=66	38/58%	24/36%	4/6%	0/0%	0/0%	4.53	.60
Spring 2008 N=67	31/46%	31/46%	6/8%	0/0%	0/0%	4.40	.61
Fall 2008 N = 44	36/82%	5/11%	2/5%	1/ 2%	0/0%	4.00	.66
Spring 2009 N = 76	60/79%	16/21%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.79	.41
Fall 2009	45/82%	4/8%	4/8%	1/ 2%	0/0%	4.72	.68

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
N = 54							
Spring 2010 N = 73	59/81%	14/19%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.80	.40
Fall 2010 N = 59	46/78%	13/22%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.78	.42
Spring 2011 N=68	53/78%	14/21%	1/1%	0/0%	0/0%	4.76	.46
Fall 2011 N=59	42/71%	15/25%	1 /2%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.66	.60
Spring 2012 N = 69	47/68%	22/32%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.68	.47
Fall 2012 N = 52	13/25%	31/60%	8/15%	0/0%	0/0%	4.10	.63
Spring 2013 N = 36	20/56%	14/39%	2/5%	0/0%	0/0%	4.50	.61
Quality of Evidence (ACEI 4)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	8/30%	18/67%	1 /3%	0/0%	0/0%	4.26	.53
Fall 2007 N=66	32/49%	28/42%	6/9%	0/0%	0/0%	4.40	.66
Spring 2008 N=67	27/40%	26/39%	14/21%	0/0%	0/0%	4.20	.76
Fall 2008 N = 44	24/55%	16/36%	1/ 2%	3/7%	0/0%	4.34	.86
Spring 2009 N = 76	39/51%	31/41%	6/8%	0/0%	0/0%	4.43	.64
Fall 2009 N = 54	43/80%	6/10%	1/ 2%	4/8%	0/0%	4.63	.85
Spring 2010 N = 73	41/56%	29/40%	3/ 4%	0/0%	0/0%	4.52	.58
Fall 2010 N =59	41/69%	18/31%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.69	.46
Spring 2011 N = 68	48/71%	16/24%	4/6%	0/0%	0/0%	4.65	.59
Fall 2011 N=59	37/63%	15/25%	6/10%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.49	.75
Spring 2012 N =69	37/54%	19/28%	12/17%	1/1%	0/0%	4.33	.82
Fall 2012 N = 52	10/19%	32/62%	10/19%	0/0%	0/0%	4.00	.63
Spring 2013 N = 36	5/14%	22/61%	9/25%	0/0%	0/0%	3.89	.62

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
Analysis of Student Learning **(ACEI 4)**							
Spring 2007 **N=27***	7/26%	20/74%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.26	.45
Fall 2007 **N=66**	38/58%	28/42%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.58	.50
Spring 2008 **N=67**	25/38%	37/55%	5/7%	0/0%	0/0%	4.30	.59
Fall 2008 **N = 44**	26/59%	14/31%	2/5%	2/5%	0/0%	4.45	.79
Spring 2009 **N = 76**	52/68%	24/32%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.68	.47
Fall 2009 **N = 54**	43/80%	6/11%	2/4%	3/5%	0/0%	4.65	.80
Spring 2010 **N = 73**	53/73%	20/27%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.73	.45
Fall 2010 **N = 59**	46/78%	13/22%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.78	.42
Spring 2011 **N=68**	51/75%	15/22%	2/3%	0/0%	0/0%	4.72	.51
Fall 2011 **N=59**	39/66%	14/24%	5/8%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.54	.73
Spring 2012 **N= 69**	42/61%	22/32%	4/6%	1/1%	0/0%	4.52	.68
Fall 2012 **N = 52**	17/33%	27/52%	8/15%	0/0%	0/0%	4.17	.68
Spring 2013 **N = 36**	7/19%	23/64%	6/17%	0/0%	0/0%	3.97	.61
Analysis of Student Teacher's Impact **(ACEI 4 and 5.1)**							
Spring 2007 **N=27***	9/33%	18/67%	0/0%	0/0%%	0/0%	4.33	.48
Fall 2007 **N=66**	38/58%	27/40%	1/2 %	0/0%	0/0%	4.56	.54
Spring 2008 **N=67**	22/33%	42/62%	3/5%	0/0%	0/0%	4.30	.56
Fall 2008 **N =44**	23/52%	18/41%	0/0%	3/7%	0/0%	4.39	.81
Spring 2009 **N =76**	50/66%	25/33%	1/1%	0/0%	0/0%	4.64	.51
Fall 2009 **N = 54**	38/70%	12/22%	0/0%	4/8%	0/0%	4.56	.84
Spring 2010	55/75%	18/25%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.75	.43

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
N = 73							
Fall 2010 N = 59	43/73%	16/27%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.73	.45
Spring 2011 N=68	54/79%	12/18%	1/1%	1/1%	0/0%	4.75	.56
Fall 2011 N=59	41/69%	16/27%	1 /2%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.64	.61
Spring 2012 N = 69	43/62%	23/33%	2/3%	1/1%	0/0%	4.57	.63
Fall 2012 N = 52	15/29%	35/67%	2/4%	0/0%	0/0%	4.25	.52
Spring 2013 N = 36	9/25%	20/56%	7/19%	0/0%	0/0%	4.03	.65

*Spring 2007 was the pilot year for this assessment and was used by only two cohorts of students

Secondary Benchmark IV Rubric

BENCHMARK IV EVALUATION RUBRIC
Overarching Question: How do you know that you have had a positive impact on student learning?

	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)
	The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in activities that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.	The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in activities that demonstrate a complete enactment of the standard.	The teacher designs and enacts activities that demonstrate a partial enactment of the standard.	One or more elements of the standard are enacted.	The standard is not observed.
Learning from Assessment Processes: (NCTE 4.10) How have you used an assessment process, using both formative and summative assessments, to inform your instruction and decision making?	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he uses an assessment plan to inform instruction where the methods of assessment are a) coherent with methods of teaching, b) varied (traditional and authentic), c) formative and summative, AND d) used to support individual student development.	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he sets/presents standards for quality student performance, provides students with feedback on their performance, AND demonstrates the quality of student learning by analyzing a) an assessment process, b) varied measures of learning from (traditional and authentic) assessment tasks; OR c) multiple measures (formative and summative) of student learning.	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he a) sets/presents a standard for quality student performance; OR b) provides students feedback on their performance; OR c) uses a single, summative assessment of student learning which audits learning.	Instructional activities do not result in measurable or anecdotal evidence of student growth.

Impact on Student Learning: (NCTE 2.3 and 4.10) What evidence do you have that you have impacted student learning through your efforts to teach?	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	Using description, reflection, and deconstruction to frame evidence of student learning, the teacher candidate demonstrates an ability to reframe *AND* take action for the benefit of future teaching or improved student learning.	Using evidence, the teacher candidate demonstrates impact on student learning by describing, AND reflecting, (using both feelings and thoughts), AND deconstructing the impact on student learning using concepts of learning, teaching, assessment, and student diversity.	The teacher candidate provides evidence/artifacts of student learning *AND* a) describes quality student performance; *OR* b) describes how students received feedback on their performance; *OR* c) describes how data from assessments show evidence of learning outcomes.	No evidence or artifacts of student learning presented.
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: How has your knowledge of your students, subject matter, and pedagogy come together in your learning what it means to teach? (NCTE 4.0)	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	The teacher demonstrates ability to design instruction that a) focuses on significant learning goals; *AND* b) identifies and builds on student strengths and needs; *AND* c) flexibly uses instructional strategies and classroom organizations that are most likely to hook students into new ideas across a lesson or unit; *AND* d) produce quality evidence of student learning.	Using differentiated purposes based on student characteristics, the teacher demonstrates an ability design instruction that flexibly creates a feedback or assistance loop for students *AND* results in students demonstrating comprehension of academic content.	The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of a) <u>purposes</u> for learning; *OR* b) how to check for or anticipates <u>students</u>' understanding or misunderstandings prior to or during instruction; *OR* c) how to <u>pedagogically</u> adapt materials or activities to the characteristics of specific students.	Views teaching from the perspective of being only about content knowledge.

English Education Majors Data: 2009-20013

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes: (NCTE 4.10)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	2	1	2	2	0	3.43	1.27
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	3	1	0	3.57	1.13
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	0	4	2	0	2.67	0.52
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	1.00
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	3	1	1	3.13	1.24
Fall 2011 N = 12	0	4	2	5	1	2.75	1.06
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	2	3	2	0	3.60	1.17
Fall 2012 N = 11	6	1	2	2	0	4.00	1.26
Spring 2013 N = 11	7	1	3	0	0	4.36	0.92

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Impact on Student Learning: (NCTE 2.3 and 4.10)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	1	1	3	2	0	3.14	1.07
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	3	1	0	3.57	1.13
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	2	0	1	0	3.33	1.15
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	3	2	0	3.25	1.04
Fall 2011 N= 12	0	2	1	9	0	2.42	0.79
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	3	3	1	0	3.80	1.03
Fall 2012 N = 11	6	1	2	2	0	4.00	1.26
Spring 2013 N = 11	7	0	3	1	0	4.18	1.17
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: (NCTE 4.0)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	2	2	0	3	0	3.43	1.40
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	2	2	0	3.43	1.27
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	0.89
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	1.00
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	2	3	0	3.13	1.13
Fall 2011 N = 12	0	2	2	7	1	2.42	0.90

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	3	4	0	0	3.90	0.88
Fall 2012 N = 11	6	2	1	2	0	4.09	1.22
Spring 2013 N = 11	7	0	3	1	0	4.18	1.17

Social Studies Education Majors Data: 2008-2012

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 8 Candidates=8	1(1)	3(3)	3(3)	0(0)	1(1)	3.38	1.15
Fall 2009 *** N=10	1	3	3	3	0	3.20	1.03
Spring 2010 N = 9	0	0	4	4	1	2.33	0.71
Fall 2010 N = 9	0	4	5	0	0	3.44	0.53
Spring 2011 N = 6	0	3	2	1	0	3.33	0.82
Fall 2011 N - 18	1	6	4	4	3	2.89	1.23
Spring 2012 N = 12	3	2	3	4	0	3.42	1.08
Fall 2012 N = 8	3	1	2	1	1	3.50	1.51
Spring 2013 N = 13	5	2	2	4	0	3.62	1.33
Impact on Student Learning:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 8 Candidates=8	1(1)	2(2)	5(5)	0(0)	0(0)	3.50	.73
Fall 2009*** N =10	1	3	2	4	0	3.10	1.00

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Spring 2010 **N = 9**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**1**	**1.89**	**0.33**
Fall 2010 **N = 9**	**0**	**7**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3.67**	**0.71**
Spring 2011 **N = 6**	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3.50**	**0.84**
Fall 2011 **N = 18**	**1**	**7**	**3**	**6**	**1**	**3.06**	**1.11**
Spring 2012 **N = 12**	3	1	6	2	0	3.42	1.08
Fall 2012 **N = 8**	3	0	3	2	0	3.50	1.31
Spring 2013 **N = 13**	5	1	3	3	1	3.46	1.45
Pedagogical Content Knowledge:							
Spring 2009 **Completed Rubric = 8** **Candidates=8**	1(1)	3(3)	3(3)	0(0)	1(1)	3.38	1.15
Fall 2009* **N = 10**	1	3	3	3	0	3.20	1.03
Spring 2010 **N = 9**	0	0	0	8	1	1.89	0.33
Fall 2010 **N = 9**	0	6	3	0	0	3.67	0.50
Spring 2011 **N = 6**	0	3	2	0	1	3.17	1.17
Fall 2011 **N = 18**	1	8	4	4	1	3.22	1.06
Spring 2012 **N = 12**	3	3	3	3	0	3.50	1.17
Fall 2012 **N = 8**	3	0	3	1	1	3.38	1.51
Spring 2013 **N = 13**	2	3	5	2	1	3.15	1.34

Mathematics Education Data: 2009-2013

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes: **(NCTM 7)**							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	0.58
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	1	2	0	2.75	0.96
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	0.58
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	3	1	1	0	3.40	0.89
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	1	4	0	0	3.25	0.50
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	1	0	0	0	4.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	3	1	2	0	3.17	0.98
Fall 2012 N = 3	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	0.58
Spring 2013 N = 7	2	0	3	2	0	3.29	1.25
Impact on Student Learning: **(NCTM 8)**							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	0	2	0	2.67	1.15
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	0	3	0	2.50	1.00
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	3	1	1	0	3.40	0.89
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	1	4	0	0	3.25	0.50
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	1	0	0	0	4.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	3	3	0	0	3.50	0.55
Fall 2012 N = 3	0	0	2	1	0	2.67	0.58
Spring 2013 N = 7	2	1	3	1	0	3.57	1.13

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: (NCTM 8)							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	0	1	0	3.33	1.15
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	1	2	0	2.75	0.96
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1.00
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	2	2	1	0	3.20	0.84
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	2	2	1	0	3.20	0.84
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	0.89
Fall 2012 N = 3	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	0.58
Spring 2013 N = 7	1	1	4	1	0	3.29	0.95

Summary of Findings

Over the past four years, elementary majors have done well on this assessment. Averages over the years have fluctuated slightly but always remained above a 4.00 overall. Secondary students average slightly lower on this assessment. However, the use of a more detailed and demanding rubric may results in evaluations which are more critical yet more realistic for the secondary students. Across both programs the vast majority of students are rating as "Developing" or higher.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

The School of Education finds longitudinal data to be very valuable in evaluations of programs and the Unit Assessment System itself.
Faculty members continue to discuss the validity and reliability of this assessment. Because of the consistently high scores for elementary students, there is some concern that the way the assessment is administered does not distinguish between those who have the skills and those who do not have the skills. Discussion continue about possible professional development for elementary coaches who normally complete this assessment..

Graduate Program Assessments

The School of Education surveys graduates of their elementary, secondary, special education and language education master's program one year after students have graduated.   All these programs are designed for practicing teachers who are desiring to further their education and further enhance their skills and knowledge. Graduates are sent an electronic survey to obtain their perceptions of how well their program prepared them to be effective teachers.   In July 2013, 162 e-mail requests were sent out.   Twelve could not be delivered so the final number of request sent was 150. Fifty-five (55) responses were received for a return rate of 37%.   Fifteen (27.27%) were elementary education majors, thirteen (23.84%) were secondary education majors, fifteen (27.27%) were special education majors, and twelve (21.82%) were language education majors.

General Outcomes

Graduates were asked to response on a scale of "Strongly Agree" equals 5 to "Strongly Disagree" equals 1 to items addressing their perceptions of how well their master's program prepared them. Items addressed content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, student learning, critical thinking, working with diverse students, and scholarly inquiry.

How would you know it

Graduate responses were aggregated across all programs and disaggregated by program. Responses of "Strongly Agree" and "Agree" were deemed favorable while "Strongly Disagree" and "Disagree" were seen as indicators of a need to more closely examine that aspect of the master's program. For this report only the aggregated data are presented.

How will you help students learn it

All items on the survey were linked to student outcomes as noted in the School of Education's conceptual framework for graduate programs.   This was to ensure that responses addressed the skills, knowledge, and dispositions deemed important by the faculty and would therefore be addressed in the required courses of the master's programs.

Survey Data   Master's Degree Graduate One-Year Out Survey – 2011-2012 Graduates

	Strongly Agree 5	Agree 4	Undecided 3	Disagree 2	Strongly Disagree 1	Mean	Standard Deviation

My program helped me gain a better knowledge of the subject(s) I am teaching	20 37.74%	27 50.94%	1 1.89%	3 5.66%	2* 3.77%	4.13	0.98
My program helped me improve how I teach my subject to my students	21 39.62%	30 56.60%	1 1.89%	0 0%	1* 1.89%	4.34	0.62
My program helped me improve the way I manage and monitor student learning.	15 28.30%	31 58.49%	2 3.77%	5 9.43%	0* 0%	4.06	0.84
My program helped me think systematically about the practice of teaching.	20 37.74%	26 49.06%	4 7.55%	3 5.66%	0* 0%	4.15	0.89
My program has informed me how to be a better member of a learning community	20 37.04%	29 53.70%	2 3.70%	3 5.56%	0* 0%	4.22	0.77
My program has made me more aware and able to deal with the needs of culturally, linguistically and cognitively diverse learners.	23 42.59%	25 46.30%	3 5.56%	2 3.70%	1* 1.85%	4.24	0.87
My program has taught me how to conduct scholarly inquiry.	17 31.48%	22 40.74%	9 16.67%	6 11.11%	0* 0%	3.93	0.97
I would recommend the master's program I completed to my friends.	20 36.36%	29 52.73%	3 5.45%	3 5.45%	0 0%	4.20	0.78

- Not all respondents answered this question

Summary of Findings

Over 96% of respondents felt their program improved how they teach their subject area to their students while over 88% felt their program helped make them more aware and able to deal with the need of a diverse student population. Responses to the other question were overall positive. When asked if their program taught them to conduct scholarly inquire, 72% agreed or strongly agreed. This question received the lowest overall rating. When asked if they would recommend the master's program they had just completed to their friend, over 89% strongly agreed or agreed.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

These data were obtained during summer 2013 so improvement based on the findings are in the initial stages of discussion.