

Detailed Assessment Report

As of: 5/08/2015 04:02 PM EDT

2012-2013 Education BS

(Includes those Action Plans with Budget Amounts marked One-Time, Recurring, No Request.)

Mission / Purpose

The mission of the School of Education is to prepare candidates to serve as effective members and leaders of the profession, assist candidates in meeting Indiana licensure requirements for public school personnel, and to provide program completers with the requisite knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to become highly qualified professionals.

Goals

G 1:Child Development and Learning Differences

Students understand Child Development and Learning Differences

G 2:Diversity

Students understand Diversity and its relationship to learning

G 3:Curriculum and Content Knowledge

Students understand Curriculum standards and demonstrate Content Knowledge especially in field settings.

G 4:Instruction, Learning Environments and Technology

Students understand Instructional strategies, appropriate Learning Environments and the use of Technology

G 5:Assessment

Students understand Assessment and use assessment to ascertain student learning

G 6:Professionalism and Collaboration

Students understand the importance of Professionalism and Collaboration

Student Learning Outcomes/Components, with Any Associations and Related Artifacts/Objects, Benchmarks, Findings, and Action Plans

S 1:IDOE Standard 1: Student Development and Diversity

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of student development and diversity and demonstrate the ability to provide instruction that is responsive to student differences and that promotes development and learning for all students

S 2:IDOE Standard 2: Learning Processes

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of learning processes and demonstrate the ability to facilitate student achievement

S 3:INTASC Standard #1: Learner Development

Candidates understand how children learn and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences

S 4:INTASC Standard #2: Learning Differences

Candidates use understanding of individual differences to ensure inclusive learning environments that allow each learner to reach his/her full potential

S 5:Knowledge of students' cultural identities

Candidates understand the differences and tensions between these identities and can incorporate their diverse identities into the curriculum.

S 6:Valuing cultural diversity

Candidates utilize best practice to incorporate a variety of curriculum that addresses the values, virtues, and ethical codes shared by various cultural groups and individuals.

S 7:Complex nature of diversity

Candidates use a variety of curricular and instructional techniques to demonstrate the complex characteristics of cultures and groups in an attempt to meet the educational needs of students.

S 8:Culturally sensitive techniques

Candidates utilize a variety of culturally sensitive techniques to address complex cognitive and social skills.

S 9:Multiple perspectives

Candidates provide multiple perspectives for students to help develop strategies and skills to engage with those who are not like themselves.

S 10:INTASC Standard #4: Content Knowledge

Candidates understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners

S 11:IDOE Standard 3: Instructional Planning and Delivery

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of instructional planning and delivery and demonstrates the ability to plan and deliver standards-based, data-driven differentiated instruction that engages students, makes effective use of contemporary tools and technologies, and helps all students achieve learning goals

S 12:INTASC Standard #5: Innovative Applications of Content

Candidates understand how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical/creative thinking and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues

S 13:INTASC Standard #7: Planning for Instruction

Candidates draw upon knowledge of content areas, cross-disciplinary skills, and learners, the community, and pedagogy to plan instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals

S 14:INTASC Standard #8: Instructional Strategies

Candidates understand and use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to access and appropriately apply information

S 15:ISTE Standard #2: Design and Develop Digital-Age Learning Experiences and Assessments

Candidates develop technology-enriched learning environments that enable all students to pursue their individual curiosities

Connected Document

- *SOE Technology Survey Tables*

Related Artifacts/Objects:

A 1:Technology Survey for Principal, Technology Coordinators, and Current Teachers

The School of Education's Unit Assessment System (UAS) is being revised to better measure teacher candidate knowledge, dispositions, and performances as delineated in the INTASC principles (initial licensure), the NBPTS core propositions (advanced preparation), appropriate professional organization standards (NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, NAEYC, etc.), the Indiana teacher education standards, and the SOE Metastandards. The system measures teacher candidate performance, program effectiveness, appropriateness of the School's mission and vision, and effectiveness of the system itself. The UAS is a requirement for NCATE accreditation.

Since program review is moving to a national organization review instead of the

original State review, our assessments and our collection of data systems needed to be revised. We are still in the process of identifying key assessments, and securing a reliable data collection system. We will be piloting all components of the new UAS in the Fall 2012 semester.

During this time of transition, the SOE's Assessment Plan 2011-2012 focused on investigating one concept from the School of Education's 2009 Strategic Analysis Plan. From among Diversity, Technology, Field/Partnerships, Service Learning, Inquiry, 21st Century Skills, Sequencing, Portfolio, this year we are investigating Technology. Dr. Grabner-Hagen and Dr. Glick are co-principal investigators of this project. TK Jeong, Shirley Aamidor, Julie Saam and Christopher Wolfe are also involved in the project. After securing approval from IRB, the investigators have developed a research plan, performed a literature search, written surveys, and obtained subjects. Data collection and some analysis have begun and will continue this academic year. The final analysis will occur Spring and Summer 2013. A final report will be given Fall 2013.

Data collection methods for the investigation of Technology included surveying School of Education fulltime and adjunct faculty, IU Kokomo fulltime and adjunct faculty, SOE current students, SOE graduates, service area classroom teachers, principals, and technology coordinators. We used the online survey tool, Psychdata. For this assessment report, we are reporting the data from the technology usage items of the survey. Respondents were asked if they used from a list of 31 educational technologies for teaching preparation, delivering instruction, and/or student assignments. The data is organized into Technology Survey tables and are located under the Document Management tab. A narrative of the results follows:

Preparation for Instruction

We categorized 22 of the technologies as suitable for instruction preparation. Twelve of the technologies were used with similar frequency by the teachers and the higher education faculty, with less than 10% differences. Word processing and internet functions were most used by both groups.

Larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers. Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more included electronic whiteboards, tablet computers, and desktop publishing. The largest difference was for course management systems. These must be set up and maintained by the schools, so it may be that schools are not providing access.

Delivering Instruction

We categorized 15 of the technologies as suitable for instructional delivery. Nine of the technologies were used with similar frequency by the teachers and the higher education faculty, with less than 10% differences. Presentation software and LCD projectors were most used by both groups. Larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers.

Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more, included tablet computers and electronic whiteboards. Although the difference in wiki use was only 4%, it is interesting that higher education faculty used them three times as much as the teachers. Again, the largest difference was for course management systems.

Student Assignments Requiring Technology

We categorized 29 of the technologies as suitable for student assignments. Twenty-one of the technologies were used with similar frequency by the teachers and the higher education faculty, with less than 10% differences. Word processing, presentation software, and internet functions were most used for student assignments by both groups. Larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers. Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more, included electronic whiteboards and desktop publishing. Although the differences for blogs and wiki use were less than 10%, it is interesting that higher education faculty used them much more than the teachers. Teachers did not report using wikis at all, while 12% of the higher education faculty reported using wikis. The largest difference was in assignments using e-mail, at 42%.

Communication

We categorized 10 of the technologies as suitable for communication. Six of the technologies were used with similar frequency by the teachers and the higher education faculty, with less than 10% differences. E-mail, word processing, and audio software/hardware were most used by both groups. Larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers. Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more, included student response systems and tablet computers. Again, the largest difference was for course management systems.

Summary

In our sample we found that some "teacher use" areas of technology are not being modeled for pre-service teachers (i.e., white boards). However, larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers for all use areas. University faculty are modeling other aspects of technology (i.e., course management systems) which weren't in use in school classrooms. Given that the learning context effects how and where learning will be used, this is most beneficial for education pre-service teachers. They will be prepared to use technology that is currently within schools and to be familiar with new technologies not yet in the schools.

Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more included electronic whiteboards, tablet computers, desktop publishing, and student response systems. Students moving into classrooms would not be prepared to use these technologies which are important in the schools. The largest difference was for course management systems. These must be set up and maintained by the schools, so it may be that schools are not providing access.

Although the difference in wiki use was only 4%, it is interesting that higher education faculty used them three times as much as the teachers. Although the differences for blogs and wiki use were less than 10%, it is interesting that higher education faculty used them much more than teachers. Teachers did not report using wikis at all, while 12% of the higher education faculty reported using wikis. The largest difference was in assignments using e-mail, at 42%, with university faculty requiring email more often.

Source of Evidence: Employer survey, incl. perceptions of the program

Connected Document

- *SOE Technology Survey Tables*

Benchmark:

This assessment was exploratory and does not require a benchmark.

Connected Document

- *SOE Technology Survey Tables*

S 16:IDOE Standard 5: Learning Environment

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of student learning environments and demonstrate the ability to establish positive, productive, well-managed, and safe learning environments for all students

S 17:INTASC Standard #3: Learning Environments

Candidates work with learners to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, encouraging positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation

S 18:IDOE Standard 4: Assessment

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of assessment principles and practices and demonstrate the ability to use assessment to monitor student progress and to use data to guide instructional decision making

S 19:INTASC Standard #6: Assessment

Candidates understand and use multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to document learner progress, and to inform candidates' ongoing planning and instruction

S 20:IDOE Standard 6: The Professional Environment

Candidates have a broad and comprehensive understanding of professional environments and expectations and demonstrate the ability to collaborate with others to improve student learning, to engage in continuous professional growth and self-reflection, and to adhere to legal and ethical requirements of the profession

S 21:INTASC Standard #9: Reflection and Continuous Growth

Candidates are reflective practitioners who use evidence to continually evaluate their practice, particularly the effects of their choices and actions on others (students, families, and other professionals in the learning community)

S 22:INTASC Standard #10: Collaboration

Candidates collaborate with students, families, colleagues, other professionals, and community members to share responsibility for student growth and development, learning, and well-being

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

What did you learn about your students' learning from the assessment process in the most recent year?

We learned from this survey what we expected to learn. Our students need to be fully immersed into the current technologies in the schools. Our students need to obtain professional development regarding new and emerging technologies to help them be more proficient with utilizing those technologies in their future classrooms.

How widely and frequently have these results been discussed with your program faculty?

Results of the survey have been shared with faculty and stakeholders in Department meetings, in Stakeholder meetings.

What do these results mean for your program?

Results from this survey and additional development work from certain targeted faculty members from our school resulted in a proposal for new technology needs for the School. Fortunately, IU Kokomo administration supported the need and found the funds to fully revamp our Curriculum Lab into a High Tech classroom complete with a classroom set of iPads.

What are your next steps going forward?

Additional research is being conducted by certain targeted members of the faculty of the School of Education further informing the technology needs of teacher education preparation. Training on current technology has been and is continuing for School of Education faculty

Annual Report Section Responses

[SAMPLE] Highlights

School of Education's Assessment Plan focused on investigating one concept from the School of Education's 2009 Strategic Analysis Plan. From among Diversity, Technology, Field/Partnerships, Service Learning, Inquiry, 21st Century Skills, Sequencing, Portfolio, this year we are investigating Technology. Dr. Grabner-Hagen and Dr. Glick are co-principal investigators of this project. TK Jeong, Shirley Aamidor, Julie Saam and Christopher Wolfe are also involved in the project.

Data collection methods for the investigation of Technology included surveying School of Education fulltime and adjunct faculty, IU Kokomo fulltime and adjunct faculty, SOE current students, SOE graduates, service area classroom teachers, principals, and technology coordinators. We used the online survey tool, Psychdata. For this assessment report, we are reporting the data from the technology usage items of the survey. Respondents were asked if they used from a list of 31 educational technologies for teaching preparation, delivering instruction, and/or student assignments.

In our sample we found that some "teacher use" areas of technology are not being modeled for pre-service teachers (i.e., white boards). However, larger differences were mainly with the higher education faculty using a technology more often than the teachers for all use areas. University faculty are modeling other aspects of technology (i.e., course management systems) which weren't in use in school classrooms. Given that the learning context effects how and where learning will be used, this is most beneficial for education pre-service teachers. They will be prepared to use technology that is currently within schools and to be familiar with new technologies not yet in the

schools.

Exceptions, where the teachers used the technology more included electronic whiteboards, tablet computers, desktop publishing, and student response systems. Students moving into classrooms would not be prepared to use these technologies which are important in the schools. The largest difference was for course management systems. These must be set up and maintained by the schools, so it may be that schools are not providing access.

We learned from this survey what we expected to learn. Our students need to be fully immersed into the current technologies in the schools. Our students need to obtain professional development regarding new and emerging technologies to help them be more proficient with utilizing those technologies in their future classrooms. Results from this survey and additional development work from certain targeted faculty members from our school resulted in a proposal for new technology needs for the School. Fortunately, IU Kokomo administration supported the need and found the funds to fully revamp our Curriculum Lab into a High Tech classroom complete with a classroom set of iPads. Additional research is being conducted by certain targeted members of the faculty of the School of Education further informing the technology needs of teacher education preparation. Training on current technology has been and is continuing for School of Education faculty