

Indiana University Kokomo

Detailed Assessment Report 2013-2014 Education BS

As of: 9/25/2014 02:56 PM EDT

(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

Connected Documents

[SoE Field data for Elementary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Secondary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Special Education program](#)

Related Artifacts/Objects**A 1: Field and Clinical Evaluations**

Current teachers in our region host our IU Kokomo School of Education students in field experiences and student teaching. These host teachers evaluate each student's performance in the field. University supervisors are assigned to each student teacher and also evaluates each student teacher performance in the field.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Benchmark:

Student Level: On a rating of 1-4 (Ineffective, Improvement Necessary, Effective, Highly Effective), students are expected to score at or above an average of 3 and at least 80% of the statements need to be rated 3 or 4.

Unit Level: Aggregate scores need to be 3 or above.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmark: Met

See attached Aggregate scores

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

Connected Documents

[SoE Field data for Elementary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Secondary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Special Education program](#)

Related Artifacts/Objects**A 1: Field and Clinical Evaluations**

Current teachers in our region host our IU Kokomo School of Education students in field experiences and student teaching. These host teachers evaluate each student's performance in the field. University supervisors are assigned to each student teacher and also evaluates each student teacher performance in the field.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Benchmark:

Student Level: On a rating of 1-4 (Ineffective, Improvement Necessary, Effective, Highly Effective), students are expected to score at or above an average of 3 and at least 80% of the statements need to be rated 3 or 4.

Unit Level: Aggregate scores need to be 3 or above.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmark: Met

See attached Aggregate scores

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

Connected Documents

[SoE Field data for Elementary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Secondary program](#)

[SoE Field data for Special Education program](#)

Related Artifacts/Objects**A 1: Field and Clinical Evaluations**

Current teachers in our region host our IU Kokomo School of Education students in field experiences and student teaching. These host teachers evaluate each student's performance in the field. University supervisors are assigned to each student teacher and also evaluates each student teacher performance in the field.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Benchmark:

Student Level: On a rating of 1-4 (Ineffective, Improvement Necessary, Effective, Highly Effective), students are expected to score at or above an average of 3 and at least 80% of the statements need to be rated 3 or 4.

Unit Level: Aggregate scores need to be 3 or above.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmark: Met

See attached Aggregate scores

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

Connected Documents

Related Artifacts/Objects

A 1: Field and Clinical Evaluations

Current teachers in our region host our IU Kokomo School of Education students in field experiences and student teaching. These host teachers evaluate each student's performance in the field. University supervisors are assigned to each student teacher and also evaluates each student teacher performance in the field.

Source of Evidence: Performance (recital, exhibit, science project)

Benchmark:

Student Level: On a rating of 1-4 (Ineffective, Improvement Necessary, Effective, Highly Effective), students are expected to score at or above an average of 3 and at least 80% of the statements need to be rated 3 or 4.

Unit Level: Aggregate scores need to be 3 or above.

Finding (2013-2014) - Benchmark: Met

See attached Aggregate scores

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](#)

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?

Aggregate performance assessment data is consistently meeting the benchmark for students in both elementary, secondary, and special education. Field work is on target for successful program completion.

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

Field scores are discussed on the student level every semester at Decision Point meetings. Aggregate scores are discussed at least once per year in either a Program Improvement meeting or a Re-conceptualization meeting. All full-time faculty in the School of Education participate in Decision point, Program Improvement, and Re-conceptualization meetings.

What do these results mean for your program?

These results are showing that field work is in line with what we expect from our students in different parts of the program. These data show that our students are performing well in early field experiences through student teaching.

What are your next steps going forward?

The data reported here is gathered from new evaluations for field and clinical experiences. The SoE is currently engaged in a study to investigate the usability of the evaluation for host teachers and university supervisors. We are also investigating whether the feedback is appropriate for our students and if the statements are appropriately aligned with our expectations at varying stages of performance in the program.

Annual Report Section Responses

Click the Expand arrow to the left and add your concise summary of one to three paragraphs that highlight this year's assessed outcomes, artifacts and benchmarks, findings, and action plan for your program.

This summary will be copied onto the campus Campus Assessment Feedback web page for your program, found

at the CTLA website, to share publicly. On this page you can view a [list of programs](#) and links to their assessment summaries for prior years.

After you have run your WEAVE assessment report, saved it to a pdf, and uploaded it to your program's website, add a link to that report in this section so that the CTLA summary page will be able to link to your full report from your summary.

School of Education recently completely revised the evaluation system for field and clinical experiences. We piloted this new evaluation in Fall 2012. The 2013-2014 academic year was the first complete year that used the new evaluation for all programs at all performance levels. We have nine evaluations (3 elementary, 3 secondary, 3 special education) that are completed electronically by our host teachers for field experiences and our cooperating teachers and university supervisors for student teaching. Each evaluation has a varying number of statements aligned with the performance expectations at that particular level of each program. Evaluators use a rating of 1 for Ineffective, 2 for Improvement Necessary, 3 for Effective, and 4 for Ineffective. At the Unit level, we expect our aggregate scores per statement to be at least an average of 3. In the 2013-2014 academic year, all aggregate scores were 3 or above for all statements for all levels for all programs. These data show that our students are meeting the instructional planning and delivery standards and outcomes in our programs.