

Organizational Area	Summary Results	Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan Summary Results																																																																														
Indiana University System AMS » Indiana University: Kokomo » Academic Affairs » School of Education Education	<p>Overall Statistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100% (14/14) outcomes were included • 100% (14/14) of outcomes included have at least one measure specified • 100% (14/14) of outcomes included have measures with findings specified <table border="1" data-bbox="472 467 1470 885"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">14 Total Measures (Includes measures that do not have findings)</th> <th colspan="2">14 Total Measures with Findings</th> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2">Measure Type/Method</th> <th colspan="2">Measure Level</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Student</td> <td>11 (79%)</td> <td>Course</td> <td>1 (7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Artifact</td> <td></td> <td>Program</td> <td>13 (93%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exam</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td>Institution</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Portfolio</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td>Other</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>3 (21%)</td> <td>Unspecified</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Direct</td> <td>14 (100%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Survey</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Focus Group</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Interview</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Indirect</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unspecified</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1" data-bbox="976 544 1470 657"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Acceptable Target Achievement</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Not Met</td> <td>2 (14%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Met</td> <td>12 (86%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Exceeded</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Unspecified</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	14 Total Measures (Includes measures that do not have findings)		14 Total Measures with Findings		Measure Type/Method		Measure Level		Student	11 (79%)	Course	1 (7%)	Artifact		Program	13 (93%)	Exam	0 (0%)	Institution	0 (0%)	Portfolio	0 (0%)	Other	0 (0%)	Other	3 (21%)	Unspecified	0 (0%)	Total Direct	14 (100%)			Survey	0 (0%)			Focus Group	0 (0%)			Interview	0 (0%)			Other	0 (0%)			Total Indirect	0 (0%)			Unspecified	0 (0%)			Acceptable Target Achievement		Not Met	2 (14%)	Met	12 (86%)	Exceeded	0 (0%)	Unspecified	0 (0%)	<table border="1" data-bbox="1501 467 2037 641"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">14 Total Actions with Status Report</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="2">Current Status</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not started</td> <td>1 (7%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>In Progress</td> <td>13 (93%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Completed</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Not Implemented</td> <td>0 (0%)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	14 Total Actions with Status Report		Current Status		Not started	1 (7%)	In Progress	13 (93%)	Completed	0 (0%)	Not Implemented	0 (0%)
14 Total Measures (Includes measures that do not have findings)		14 Total Measures with Findings																																																																														
Measure Type/Method		Measure Level																																																																														
Student	11 (79%)	Course	1 (7%)																																																																													
Artifact		Program	13 (93%)																																																																													
Exam	0 (0%)	Institution	0 (0%)																																																																													
Portfolio	0 (0%)	Other	0 (0%)																																																																													
Other	3 (21%)	Unspecified	0 (0%)																																																																													
Total Direct	14 (100%)																																																																															
Survey	0 (0%)																																																																															
Focus Group	0 (0%)																																																																															
Interview	0 (0%)																																																																															
Other	0 (0%)																																																																															
Total Indirect	0 (0%)																																																																															
Unspecified	0 (0%)																																																																															
Acceptable Target Achievement																																																																																
Not Met	2 (14%)																																																																															
Met	12 (86%)																																																																															
Exceeded	0 (0%)																																																																															
Unspecified	0 (0%)																																																																															
14 Total Actions with Status Report																																																																																
Current Status																																																																																
Not started	1 (7%)																																																																															
In Progress	13 (93%)																																																																															
Completed	0 (0%)																																																																															
Not Implemented	0 (0%)																																																																															

Report : Assessment Cycle Details for : Education

Report Generated by Taskstream

Workspace : Academic Program Assessment and Planning Workspace

Assessment Plan: 2020-2021 Assessment Cycle: Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings

Assessment Plan Template : IU Kokomo Academic Assessment Template

Report Generated : Tuesday, July 20, 2021

Measures and Findings

2020-2025 Assessment Plan

❖ Instructional Strategies

Teacher candidates will develop and implement effective instructional strategies in order to engage all learners in a classroom.

Outcome 1

Candidates will develop appropriate strategies which push learners to think critically and creatively.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

 Lesson Plan Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings

for Lesson Plan Rubric

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Student Activities competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=61)

Highly Effective (4): 20

Effective (3): 15

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.80

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=60)

Highly Effective (4): 25

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 3

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 3.10

Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)

Highly Effective (4): 85

Effective (3): 30

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 1

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.54

Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=230)

Highly Effective (4): 66

Effective (3): 79

Proficient (2): 68

Needs Improvement (1): 7

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 2.93

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Improved inter-rater reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started .

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 2

Candidates will sequence learning experiences which build on learners' existing knowledge.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

 Lesson Plan Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings *for Lesson Plan Rubric*

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Student Activities competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=61)

Highly Effective (4): 20

Effective (3): 15

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.80

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=60)

Highly Effective (4): 25

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 3

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 3.10

Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)

Highly Effective (4): 85

Effective (3): 30

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 1

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.54

Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=230)

Highly Effective (4): 66

Effective (3): 79

Proficient (2): 68

Needs Improvement (1): 7

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 2.93

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Improved inter-rater reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started.

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 3

Candidates will utilize multiple instructional strategies to ensure

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

accessibility for all learners.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

[Lesson Plan Rubric \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

Findings

for Lesson Plan Rubric

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Instruction competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=59)

Highly Effective (4): 12

Effective (3): 27

Proficient (2): 10

Needs Improvement (1): 10

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.69

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=59)

Highly Effective (4): 26

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 5

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.03

Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)

Highly Effective (4): 87

Effective (3): 28

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 1

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.55

Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=220)

Highly Effective (4): 62

Effective (3): 105

Proficient (2): 44

Needs Improvement (1): 9

Unsatisfactory (0): 0
Mean: 3.00

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Improved inter-rater

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started.

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

Outcome 4

Candidates will utilize technology as a tool to enhance their instruction.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

[Lesson Plan Rubric \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

Findings

for Lesson Plan Rubric

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Instruction competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=59)

Highly Effective (4): 12

Effective (3): 27

Proficient (2): 10

Needs Improvement (1): 10

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.69

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=59)

Highly Effective (4): 26

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 5

Unsatisfactory (0): 1
Mean 3.03
Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)
Highly Effective (4): 87
Effective (3): 28
Proficient (2): 11
Needs Improvement (1): 1
Unsatisfactory (0): 1
Mean 3.55
Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=220)
Highly Effective (4): 62
Effective (3): 105
Proficient (2): 44
Needs Improvement (1): 9
Unsatisfactory (0): 0
Mean: 3.00

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started.

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Improved inter-rater reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

✦ **Assessment**

Teacher candidates will utilize all types of assessment to inform instruction and ensure learners have met the goals and objectives of each lesson.

Outcome 1

Candidates modify their instruction based on informal assessments.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The student teaching capstone assessment component is used to measure a student teacher's ability to analyze formative assessment data in order to inform instruction and measure student growth over the course of a lesson. The rubric measures five aspects of the of the assessment component (Objectives, Formative Assessment Instrument, Formative Assessment Description, Summative Assessment, Assessment Data Collection) and has five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable performance is currently placed at the Effective performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

All student teachers are currently required to complete the student teaching capstone.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

The School of Education assessment committee is responsible for assessing student teacher submissions.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from the Formative Assessment Instrument competency in the Assessment Component of the Student Teaching Capstone.

Fall 2019 (n=27):

Highly Effective (4): 8

Effective (3): 2

Proficient (2): 9

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 2.37

Spring 2020 (n=18):

Highly Effective (4): 14

Effective (3): 4

Proficient (2): 0

Needs Improvement (1): 0

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 3.78

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Significant differences were seen in the scores between the fall and spring semesters. This was likely due to clarifications made to the instructions of the assessment component between the two semesters. There was confusion regarding the expectations of the component during the Fall 2019 semester. Additional data from the 2020-2021 academic year is needed in order to see if further clarifications to the directions are needed for this component.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Additional Data Review

Action details:

Additional cycles of data are needed due to the inconsistencies seen between the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semester. If inconsistencies in student teacher scores persist,

Status

for Additional Data Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

then additional changes to the directions or rubric will be made for clarity.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Review of the 2020-2021 academic year data will occur at the August School of Education assessment meeting. Necessary changes will be discussed during that meeting and implemented for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Increased consistency of scores across semesters and academic years

Supporting Attachments:

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 2

Candidates develop and/or select assessments appropriate for a given lesson's learning objectives.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The student teaching capstone assessment component is used to measure a student teacher's ability to analyze formative assessment data in order to inform instruction and measure student growth over the course of a lesson. The rubric measures five aspects of the of the assessment component (Objectives, Formative Assessment Instrument, Formative Assessment Description, Summative Assessment, Assessment Data Collection) and has five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable performance is currently placed at the Effective performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

All student teachers are currently required to complete the student teaching capstone.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

The School of Education assessment committee is responsible for assessing student teacher submissions.

Supporting Attachments:

 Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component Rubric (Word Document (Open XML))

Findings

for Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from the Summative Assessment competency in the Assessment Component of the Student Teaching Capstone.

Fall 2019 (n=31):

Highly Effective (4): 4

Effective (3): 4

Proficient (2): 13

Needs Improvement (1): 6

Unsatisfactory (0): 4

Mean: 1.93

Spring 2020 (n=19):

Highly Effective (4): 9

Effective (3): 6

Proficient (2): 4

Needs Improvement (1): 0

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 3.26

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Significant differences were seen in the scores between the fall and spring semesters. This was likely due to clarifications made to the instructions of the assessment component between the two semesters. There was confusion regarding the expectations of the component during the Fall 2019 semester. Additional data from the 2020-2021 academic year is needed in order to see if further clarifications to the directions are needed for this component.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Additional Data Review

Action details:

Additional cycles of data are needed due to the inconsistencies seen between the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semester. If inconsistencies in student teacher scores persist,

Status

for Additional Data Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

then additional changes to the directions or rubric will be made for clarity.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Review of the 2020-2021 academic year data will occur at the August School of Education assessment meeting. Necessary changes will be discussed during that meeting and implemented for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Increased consistency of scores across semesters and academic years

Supporting Attachments:

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 3

Candidates utilize technology appropriately as part of both informal and formal assessments.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The student teaching capstone assessment component is used to measure a student teacher's ability to analyze formative assessment data in order to inform instruction and measure student growth over the course of a lesson. The rubric measures five aspects of the of the assessment component (Objectives, Formative Assessment Instrument, Formative Assessment Description, Summative Assessment, Assessment Data Collection) and has five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable performance is currently placed at the Effective performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

All student teachers are currently required to complete the student teaching capstone.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

The School of Education assessment committee is responsible for assessing student teacher submissions.

Supporting Attachments:

 Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component Rubric (Word Document (Open XML))

Findings

for Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from both the Formative Assessment Instrument and Summative Assessment competencies in the Assessment Component of the Student Teaching Capstone.

Formative Assessment Instrument

Fall 2019 (n=27):

Highly Effective (4): 8

Effective (3): 2

Proficient (2): 9

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 2.37

Spring 2020 (n=18):

Highly Effective (4): 14

Effective (3): 4

Proficient (2): 0

Needs Improvement (1): 0

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 3.78

Summative Assessment

Fall 2019 (n=31):

Highly Effective (4): 4

Effective (3): 4

Proficient (2): 13

Needs Improvement (1): 6

Unsatisfactory (0): 4

Mean: 1.93

Spring 2020 (n=19):

Highly Effective (4): 9

Effective (3): 6

Proficient (2): 4

Needs Improvement (1): 0

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 3.26

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Significant differences were seen in the scores between the fall and spring semesters. This was likely due to clarifications made to the instructions of the assessment component between the two semesters. There was confusion regarding the expectations of the component during the Fall 2019 semester. Additional data from the 2020-2021 academic year is needed in order to see if further clarifications to the directions are needed for this component.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Additional Data Review

Action details:

Additional cycles of data are needed due to the inconsistencies seen between the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semester. If inconsistencies in student teacher scores persist, then additional changes to the directions or rubric will be made for clarity.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Review of the 2020-2021 academic year data will occur at the August School of Education assessment meeting. Necessary changes will be discussed during that meeting and implemented for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Increased consistency of scores across semesters and academic years

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Additional Data Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 4

Candidates provide meaningful feedback to all learners based on the analysis of formative and summative assessment data.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The student teaching capstone assessment component is used to measure a student teacher's ability to analyze formative assessment data in order to inform instruction and measure student growth over the course of a lesson. The rubric measures five aspects of the of the assessment component (Objectives, Formative Assessment Instrument,

Formative Assessment Description, Summative Assessment, Assessment Data Collection) and has five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable performance is currently placed at the Effective performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

All student teachers are currently required to complete the student teaching capstone.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

The School of Education assessment committee is responsible for assessing student teacher submissions.

Supporting Attachments:

 Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component Rubric (Word Document (Open XML))

Findings

for Student Teaching Capstone Assessment Component

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from the Assessment Data Collection competency in the Assessment Component of the Student Teaching Capstone.

Fall 2019 (n=29):

Highly Effective (4): 8

Effective (3): 0

Proficient (2): 3

Needs Improvement (1): 16

Unsatisfactory (0): 2

Mean: 1.86

Spring 2020 (n=18):

Highly Effective (4): 9

Effective (3): 1

Proficient (2): 6

Needs Improvement (1): 0

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean: 2.83

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Not Met

Reflections/Notes:

Significant differences were seen in the scores between the fall and spring semesters. This was likely due to clarifications made to the instructions of the assessment component between the two semesters. There was confusion regarding the expectations of the component during the Fall 2019 semester. Additional data from the 2020-2021 academic year is needed in order to see if further clarifications to the directions are needed for this component.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Additional Data Review

Action details:

Additional cycles of data are needed due to the inconsistencies seen between the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semester. If inconsistencies in student teacher scores persist, then additional changes to the directions or rubric will be made for clarity.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

Review of the 2020-2021 academic year data will occur at the August School of Education assessment meeting. Necessary changes will be discussed during that meeting and implemented for the 2021-2022 academic year.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Increased consistency of scores across semesters and academic years

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Additional Data Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

❖ **Learning Environment**

Teacher candidates will manage the learning environment with strategies promoting respect and which support all learners in a classroom.

Outcome 1

Candidates create a learning environment which actively engages all learners.

Measure

Field Evaluation

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Details/Description:

The field evaluation rubric measures a candidate's ability to apply their knowledge and understanding of instructional, assessment, and classroom management strategies while in a field placement. The field evaluation measures a teacher candidate's performance during the entirety of their field placement. The field experience rubric consists of twenty-six competencies from seven metastandards and has six performance levels (Initial Knowledge, Emerging Knowledge, Transitional Knowledge, Initial Practice, Emerging Practice, Advanced Practice).

Acceptable Target:

Teacher candidates which are in Movement A, B, and I are expected to perform at the Initial Practice performance level. Teacher candidates which are in Movement C, II, and student teaching are expected to perform at the Emerging Practice performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

All candidates in a field placement are currently assessed with the field evaluation.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

For teacher candidates not yet in student teaching, cooperating teachers are responsible for completing the field evaluation. For student teachers, the field evaluation rubric is completed by both their cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Supporting Attachments:

 Field Evaluation Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings for Field Evaluation

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from competency 2.3 of the Field Evaluation Rubric. The rubric has a six point scale. Data will be presented as the mean score by teacher education program movement on that six point scale.

Fall 2019:

Movement A (n=18): 4.22

Movement B (n=8): 4.50

Movement C (n=16): 4.75

Movement I: No data

Movement II (n=12): 4.33

Student Teaching (n=81): 4.85

Overall: 4.60

Spring 2020:

Movement A (n=6): 4.00

Movement B (n=14): 4.71

Movement C (n=11): 4.73

Movement I (n=4): 4.25

Movement II: No data

Student Teaching (n=110): 5.07

Overall: 4.95

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

The data follows the expected trend over time. Movement A candidates are in their first

year of the Elementary Education program, and they are expected to perform lower than Movement B, C, and student teachers. Movement I and II candidates are in the Secondary Education program. No data is recorded during the semesters in which those candidates do not have a field placement. Discussions with faculty regarding why Spring 2020 scores were generally higher than Fall 2019 scores did not identify any specific reason.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Continuous Review

Action details:

With the data generally matching expected candidate performance, continuous data monitoring is needed to ensure there are no anomalies in future cycles of data.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The data will be reviewed by School of Education faculty and staff at the August assessment meeting.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Continuous Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 2

Candidates respond appropriately to desired and undesired student behavior with strategies which minimally disrupts the learning environment.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Field Evaluation

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:

The field evaluation rubric measures a candidate's ability to apply their knowledge and understanding of instructional, assessment, and classroom management strategies while in a field placement. The field evaluation measures a teacher candidate's performance during the entirety of their field placement. The field experience rubric consists of twenty-six

competencies from seven metastandards and has six performance levels (Initial Knowledge, Emerging Knowledge, Transitional Knowledge, Initial Practice, Emerging Practice, Advanced Practice).

Acceptable Target:

Teacher candidates which are in Movement A, B, and I are expected to perform at the Initial Practice performance level. Teacher candidates which are in Movement C, II, and student teaching are expected to perform at the Emerging Practice performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

All candidates in a field placement are currently assessed with the field evaluation.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

For teacher candidates not yet in student teaching, cooperating teachers are responsible for completing the field evaluation. For student teachers, the field evaluation rubric is completed by both their cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Supporting Attachments:

 Field Evaluation Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings *for Field Evaluation*

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from competency 2.2 of the Field Evaluation Rubric. The rubric has a six point scale. Data will be presented as the mean score by teacher education program movement on that six point scale.

Fall 2019:

Movement A (n=18): 4.22
Movement B (n=8): 4.38
Movement C (n=16): 4.94
Movement I: No data
Movement II (n=12): 4.00
Student Teaching (n=81): 4.81
Overall: 4.56

Spring 2020:

Movement A (n=6): 3.83
Movement B (n=14): 4.71
Movement C (n=11): 4.45
Movement I (n=4): 4.25
Movement II: No data
Student Teaching (n=110): 5.05
Overall: 4.89

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

The data for Fall 2019 follows the expected trend over time. Movement A candidates are in their first year of the Elementary Education program, and they are expected to perform lower than Movement B, C, and student teachers. Movement I and II candidates are in the Secondary Education program. No data is recorded during the semesters in which those candidates do not have a field placement. Movement B and C candidates do not follow our expected trend, with Movement B scoring higher than

Movement C. Discussions with faculty regarding why that discrepancy occurred did not identify any specific reason.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Continuous Review

Action details:

With the data generally matching expected candidate performance, continuous data monitoring is needed to ensure there are no anomalies in future cycles of data.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The data will be reviewed by School of Education faculty and staff at the August assessment meeting.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Continuous Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 3

Candidates manage the learning environment through the use of mutual respect and by promoting learners to be responsible for their own behavior.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Field Evaluation

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - OTHER

Details/Description:

The field evaluation rubric measures a candidate's ability to apply their knowledge and understanding of instructional, assessment, and classroom management strategies while in a field placement. The field evaluation measures a teacher candidate's performance during the entirety of their field placement. The field experience rubric consists of twenty-six competencies from seven metastandards and has six performance levels (Initial Knowledge, Emerging Knowledge, Transitional Knowledge, Initial Practice, Emerging Practice, Advanced Practice).

Acceptable Target:

Teacher candidates which are in Movement A, B, and I are expected to perform at the Initial Practice performance level. Teacher candidates which are in Movement C, II, and student teaching are expected to perform at the Emerging Practice performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

All candidates in a field placement are currently assessed with the field evaluation.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

For teacher candidates not yet in student teaching, cooperating teachers are responsible for completing the field evaluation. For student teachers, the field evaluation rubric is completed by both their cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Supporting Attachments:

 Field Evaluation Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings for Field Evaluation

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will come from competency 2.3 of the Field Evaluation Rubric. The rubric has a six point scale. Data will be presented as the mean score by teacher education program movement on that six point scale.

Fall 2019:

Movement A (n=18): 4.22
Movement B (n=8): 4.50
Movement C (n=16): 4.75
Movement I: No data
Movement II (n=12): 4.33
Student Teaching (n=81): 4.85
Overall: 4.60

Spring 2020:

Movement A (n=6): 4.00
Movement B (n=14): 4.71
Movement C (n=11): 4.73
Movement I (n=4): 4.25
Movement II: No data
Student Teaching (n=110): 5.07
Overall: 4.95

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

The data follows the expected trend over time. Movement A candidates are in their first year of the Elementary Education program, and they are expected to perform lower than Movement B, C, and student teachers. Movement I and II candidates are in the Secondary Education program. No data is recorded during the semesters in which those candidates do not have a field placement. Discussions with faculty regarding why Spring 2020 scores were generally higher than Fall 2019 scores did not identify any specific reason.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Continuous Review

Action details:

With the data generally matching expected candidate performance, continuous data monitoring is needed to ensure there are no anomalies in future cycles of data.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The data will be reviewed by School of Education faculty and staff at the August assessment meeting.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Continuous Review

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year is currently being collected.

Next Steps:

Data from the 2020-2021 academic year will be reviewed by faculty and staff in August 2021.

Substantiating Evidence:

❖ Diversity and Inclusion

Teacher candidates will develop a deeper understanding of student diversity and inclusive practices in order to provide all learners with an opportunity to grow and excel.

Outcome 1

Candidates develop appropriate learning experiences based on an understanding of how learners grow and develop cognitively, linguistically, socially, emotionally, and physically.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.


Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

 Lesson Plan Rubric (Adobe Acrobat Document)

Findings

for Lesson Plan Rubric

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Student Activities competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=61)

Highly Effective (4): 20

Effective (3): 15

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.80

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=60)

Highly Effective (4): 25

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 3

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 3.10

Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)

Highly Effective (4): 85

Effective (3): 30

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 1

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.54

Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=230)

Highly Effective (4): 66

Effective (3): 79

Proficient (2): 68

Needs Improvement (1): 7

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean: 2.93

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the

Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Measures:

Improved inter-rater reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started.

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

Outcome 2

Candidates develop relevant and accessible instruction for all learners based on an understanding of how language and culture influence learning.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Lesson Plan Rubric

PROGRAM LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

The lesson plan rubric measures a teacher candidates ability to plan an implement effective instructional and assessment strategies. The lesson plan rubric measures six aspects of a candidate's lesson plan (Goals, Objectives, Essential Questions, Instruction, Student Activities, and Assessment) across five performance levels (Unsatisfactory, Needs Improvement, Proficient, Effective, Highly Effective).

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable candidate performance is at the Effective performance level.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

The lesson plan rubric is introduced to candidates in M311/313 and is assessed in all methods courses.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Course instructors will assess a candidate lesson plans during all methods courses.

Supporting Attachments:

[Lesson Plan Rubric \(Adobe Acrobat Document\)](#)

Findings

for Lesson Plan Rubric

Summary of Findings:

The data for this outcome will be pulled from the Student Activities competency in the lesson plan rubric.

Fall 2019 Student Teachers (n=61)

Highly Effective (4): 20

Effective (3): 15

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 8

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 2.80

Spring 2020 Student Teachers (n=60)

Highly Effective (4): 25

Effective (3): 16

Proficient (2): 16

Needs Improvement (1): 3

Unsatisfactory (0): 0

Mean 3.10

Fall 2019 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=128)

Highly Effective (4): 85

Effective (3): 30

Proficient (2): 11

Needs Improvement (1): 1

Unsatisfactory (0): 1

Mean 3.54

Spring 2020 Teacher Education Program Candidates (n=230)

Highly Effective (4): 66

Effective (3): 79
Proficient (2): 68
Needs Improvement (1): 7
Unsatisfactory (0): 0
Mean: 2.93

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Met

Reflections/Notes:

Student teachers should be performing at a higher level than teacher candidates. The difference in mean scores between student teachers and teacher candidates indicates a further need for training for faculty on how to score the lesson plan rubric. Expected performance for both student teachers and teacher candidates is at the Effective performance level. While a number of student teachers and teacher candidates performed below that level, a greater number performed above that level.

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Evaluator Calibration

Action details:

Additional training is needed to ensure all faculty evaluating candidates on this rubric are calibrated in order to limit the discrepancy of scores seen between student teachers and teacher education program candidates. The rubric will be reviewed to ensure clarity, and training sets will be developed for calibration purposes.

Implementation Plan

(timeline):

The rubrics are reviewed during School of Education assessment meetings held in August. Training sets will be developed throughout the 2021 calendar year as time is available.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

School of Education faculty and staff

Status

for Evaluator Calibration

Current Status:

In Progress

Additional information:

The rubrics were reviewed in August 2020 by School of Education faculty and staff. The development of training sets for calibration purposes has not yet started.

Next Steps:

A training set of viable teacher candidate artifacts will first need to be selected. The training set will need to have a high degree of agreement on their associated rubric scores. Once a viable training set has been identified, faculty and staff that assess the lesson plan rubric will need to be calibrated with that training set.

Substantiating Evidence:

Measures:

Improved inter-rater reliability scores and a decreased gap in student teacher and teacher education program candidate performance

Supporting Attachments:

Outcome 3

Candidates reflect on his or her personal biases to deepen their understanding of cultural, ethnic, gender, and learning differences in order to create more relevant learning experiences.

Mapped to:

No Mapping

Measure

Learning Outcomes Reflection

COURSE LEVEL; DIRECT - STUDENT ARTIFACT

Details/Description:

Teacher candidates analyze the sociological and multicultural concepts which they will encounter in schools.

Acceptable Target:

Acceptable performance is based on a candidate's ability to develop a rich reflection supported by concrete examples which can be tied back to the course's essential questions and learning outcomes.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

All teacher candidates will complete this assessment during the EDUC-M300 course.

Key/Responsible Personnel:

The course instructor is responsible for grading this assessment.

Supporting Attachments:

Findings

for Learning Outcomes Reflection

Summary of Findings:

Rubrics for this assessment were not developed or implemented during the 2019-20 academic year. Data will be reported during the next assessment cycle.

Acceptable Target Achievement:

Not Met

Reflections/Notes:

Substantiating Evidence:

Action

in Include data collected in 2019-2020 - Action Plan

Rubric Development

Action details:

A valid and well-articulated rubric will be developed to measure candidate performance for this outcome.

Implementation Plan (timeline):

The rubric will be developed during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Key/Responsible

Personnel:

Course instructor

Measures:

Supporting Attachments:

Status

for Rubric Development

Current Status:

Not started

Additional information:

Next Steps:

Assessment coordinator will work with course instructor to establish a desired rubric which will fit the course-embedded assessment.

Substantiating Evidence: