IU

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
KOKOMO

DIVISION OF EDUCATION

Assessment Report
AY 2005-2006

I.   Summary of the Assessment Plan

The Indiana University Kokomo Teacher Education Program is based upon the
Professional Educator Model that was created and designed using standards from the
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New
Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the Division of Professional
Standards, and other current teacher education documents and best practices in the belief
that the prospective teacher education candidate develops, over time, from a novice to a
skilled educator. The successful teacher must master both a body of content knowledge
and effective teaching skills. The conceptual framework uses Bloom's Taxonomy as a
way of depicting the higher level of thinking required as the candidate moves through the
program, grounded in the standards every step of the way.

Our program offers a bachelors degree in Elementary Education, along with licensure
opportunities for students in 5-12 education. Our program fits into the mission of IU
Kokomo by allowing students the opportunity to receive a degree and simultaneously
attain a professional license allowing them to teach in a variety of settings in Indiana.
Indiana professional licensure standards are embedded within our program and therefore
we ensure that students who graduate from our program are eligible for licensure.

a.   Program Goals and Outcomes

  ▪   The Division of Professional Standards has taken INTASC principles and
      further expanded on them through their developmental and content standards
      for both Elementary and Secondary teachers. Our program summarizes these
      standards into *Metastandards.* These metastandards do not in any way dilute
      the power of the individual standards, but indeed serve as a vehicle for
      ensure compliance with all standards in an effective manner. Included in the
      matrix below are the IPSB Standards and INTASC principles which serve to
      guide all that we do within our program.

  ▪   Integrating the developmental model (conceptual framework) along with the
      meta-standards has allowed the division to create a rubric that looks at
      student learning outcomes across their individual levels. Attached are the
      meta-standards rubrics for the K-6 and 5-12 initial program students. Host
      teachers at the practicum or student teaching site evaluate students. This
      occurs at the end of the semester.

- For students to progress in the program, they must achieve a minimum score across the standards based on their current developmental level within the program. For example, students in the pre-professional level must achieve a *basic* level across the standards, while practicum students within the teacher education program should achieve at least a *mastery* level across the standards. As can be noted, criteria for *basic, proficient, mastery and exemplary* criteria is annotated on the rubric. Each candidate meets a benchmark at the end of a particular period of time. Several groups or cohorts are brought forward to the benchmark meeting even though they are at different points in the program.

- The attached rubric includes the program goals (Metastandard Proficiencies) and Outcomes (Objectives) for each point in the program. This same rubric also includes the courses currently identified as places where these goals will be met (for the curriculum map below).

- For the overall assessment, although each student is evaluated based on this rubric at multiple points in the program (as stated earlier) the *program* itself is not evaluated on every program goal at every benchmark meeting. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the program, we as a Division will assess individual program goals at certain times in the program in order to provide feedback and assesses program standards.

II.   Assessment Methods

- For the overall assessment, although each student is evaluated based on the same rubric, the rubric has now been place online. This affords the division the opportunity to aggregate the data in real time, as the assessments are complete. In the past, there was some delay as rubrics were sent from the host teachers, to Indiana University Kokomo faculty and then to the Unit Assessment System Director, UAS. After data input, the analysis was approximately 1 to 2 semesters behind. Now with the ability to aggregate the data instantaneously, the data presented in this report in indeed from the current semester midterm evaluations.

- All students evaluated in this assessment are currently in student teaching are being assessed by both university supervisors and host teachers. They were assessed in the field, while they were engaging in their clinical, student teaching experience.

- It should be noted that we are no longer looking at the percentage of students meeting benchmark, but the actual score. It is expected that at this point of the program, students should be achieving "3" (mastery level) across all components.

III.   Description of Assessment Results (see attached).

- Outcomes assessed

- **Child Development:** Candidates will be able to create developmentally appropriate curricula and implement with all children sound theory-based instructional strategies.
- **Diversity:** Candidates will integrate diverse instructional opportunities into supportive environment
- **Curriculum:** Candidates will be able to develop and adapt quality, age appropriate curriculum utilizing content area information and specific key strategies for each.
- **Instruction:** Candidates will be able to implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, subject matter, curricular goals, and community
- **Assessment:** Candidates will be able to develop, implement, and utilize curriculum which encompass a variety of assessment methods
- **Professionalism:** Candidates will be able to reflect on practices in accurate ways and discuss continuing efforts in their professional development.
- **Community and Family:** Candidates develop and maintain positive working relationships with school and community connections.

- Students scored well, according to the rubric across the board, but were the highest in the areas of Diversity, Assessment and Community and Family. Overall, students' performance met the expected benchmarks as indicated earlier in the plan.

- After faculty review, there were several issues raised. First, faculty were pleased with the data, and felt that is was indeed a reflection of the performance they had observed of these students. Faculty also indicated, that since these were midterm data, improvements should be reflected by the end of the semester data. In addition, only student teachers are evaluated during the midterm, while all students enrolled in field practica will be assessed at the end of the semester.

IV. Using Assessment for Program Improvement

- Although these results are positive, the faculty still indicate the need to expend the individual standards, adding components, to the current rubric. The revised rubric with components has been developed and will be implemented Spring Semester 07. This rubric will be utilized to more accurately identify strengths and weakness of teacher candidates and afford the faculty an opportunity to more accurately improve and/or revise the program.

V. Dissemination of Results

- Since this was indeed the midterm evaluation, the full range of data will not be collected until the end of the semester. In order to collect those data an online survey of data is in development, which will allow for stakeholders to view data electronically, and comment on individual Metastandards at various benchmarks within the program. As we serve an 11 county region, this electronic form, a Division e-portal so to speak, will be utilized to allow stakeholders to view data, make comments and ask questions, all which will be brought to the faculty. The data will

be presented as a *PowerPoint* presentation in one part, and in another part, an online survey asking questions that pertain to the presentation of results, the clarity of the metastandards rubric, the analysis and utilization of the data, and specific open ended questions directed toward program improvement.