

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20 Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

Unit/Program Name: Teaching & Learning / Elementary Education B.A., B.S. Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Debra Knaebel, debra.knaebel@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.

| a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? | b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur? | c. What were your expectations for student performance? | d. What were the actual data/results? | e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2. |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>1. Outcome 1:1: Candidates know, understand and use the major concepts, principals, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation. InTASC 1</p> | <p>The Teacher Work Sample m(TWS) ELED 457, Capstone;</p> <p>The Student Teacher Evaluation (STE) ELED 451;</p> | <p>Using four-level rubrics, students must attain a score of "3" on each criterion to be deemed proficient.</p> <p>At least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p> | <p>Fall 2019: 36/36 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the TWS criterion.</p> <p>Fall 2019: 37/37 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the STE criterion.</p> <p>Spring 2020: 65/67 (97%) earned a score of "3" or higher on this criterion.</p> <p>Spring 2020: 27/27 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the STE criterion.*</p> <p>Overall: 99.25% of candidates in the program attained this benchmark.</p> | <p>Last year the overall attainment was 88.9%. There was an increase of 10.35% this school year. The ELED Committee is using this data to continue determining where in the program we can strengthen our candidates' skills.</p> <p>*Due to COVID-19 school closures (Spring 2020), not every candidate in the student teaching semester was assessed by his or her cooperating teacher.</p> |
| <p>2. Outcome 3.1: Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community. InTASC 5</p> | <p>The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) ELED 457, Capstone;</p> <p>The Student Teacher Evaluation (STE) ELED 451;</p> | <p>Using four-level rubrics, students must attain a score of "3" on each criterion to be deemed proficient;</p> <p>At least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p> | <p>Fall 2019: 36/36 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the TWS criterion.</p> <p>Fall 2019: 37/37 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the STE criterion.</p> <p>Spring 2020: 67/67 (100%) candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on the TWS criterion.</p> | <p>Last year the overall attainment for Outcome 3.1 was 98.9%. There was an increase of 1.1% this school year. The ELED Committee will continue the good work here and move focused attention to other areas.</p> <p>*Due to COVID-19 school closures (Spring 2020), not every candidate in the student teaching semester was assessed</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>Spring 2020: 27/27 (100%) candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on the STE criterion.*</p> <p>Overall: 100% of candidates in the program attained this benchmark.</p> | by his or her cooperating teacher. |
| <p>3. Outcome 5.2: Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children. InTASC 10</p> | <p>The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) ELED 457, Capstone;</p> <p>The Student Teacher Evaluation (STE) ELED 451;</p> <p>Parent Playbook (PPB) ELED 324;</p> | <p>Using four-level rubrics, students must attain a score of “3” on each criterion to be deemed proficient.</p> <p>Using a three-point rubric (PPB), students must attain a score of “2” on each criterion to be deemed proficient.</p> <p>At least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p> | <p>Fall 2019: 35/36 (97%) candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on the TWS criterion.</p> <p>Fall 2019: 37/37 (100%) candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on the STE criterion.</p> <p>Fall 2019: 49/52 (94%) candidates earned a score of “2” or higher on the PPB criterion.</p> <p>Spring 2020: 57/67 (85%) candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on the TWS criterion.*</p> <p>Spring 2020: 26.5/27 (98%) of candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on the STE criterion.</p> <p>Spring 2020: 27.5/28 (98%) candidates earned a score of “2” or higher on the PPB criterion.</p> <p>Overall: 95% of senior candidates in the program attained this benchmark.*</p> <p>Overall: 76.5/80 (97%) candidates in the program attained the PPB benchmark.</p> | <p>There were several “NA” on the TWS criterion during Spring 2020. *Due to school’s either going completely virtual or just sending home paper packets, several student teachers were unable to complete the TWS and were therefore assessed as “NA”.</p> <p>The PPB is completed when students are early in the program for the Emergent Literacy course and is reading specific and geared toward Kindergartners. In Fall 2019, there was a 3% gain in this benchmark. Looking at the those who were able to complete the TWS before schools closed for COVID-19, the scores indicate that the senior candidates were well on their way to matching or exceeding the lower classmen’s percentage as they did Fall 2019.</p> |

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.

- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

| | | |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|
| 1) Cohort Sizes | 2) Year-to-Year Retention | 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); |
| 103 | 70.75% | 50% (4-year = 40.48%) |

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

The data indicates that our greatest loss in retention is from the freshmen to sophomore year. We feel that this is due to students not taking or not passing the CASA for acceptance into our teacher education program. The state of Indiana has changed the state requirements and no longer requires candidates to pass a standardized test to enter into teacher education programs. This will change our retention rate from the freshman to sophomore year considerably going into the 2020-21 school year.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

The ELED Committee will meet throughout the year and explore ways to improve and strengthen our candidates’ skills. It is theorized that the attainment for Outcome 5.2 is directly related to the COVID-19 Pandemic in that a small handful of students were unable to finish the Teacher Work Sample and therefore were assessed “NA” in certain areas. The COVID-19 Pandemic also influenced scoring in other areas as well considering not all cooperating teachers completed their final evaluations of their student teacher candidates.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs

If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)**

The data indicates that our candidates perform very well in clinical settings. Ratings by clinical faculty during field placements indicate that our candidates have learned how to model excellence in professional settings. This indicates that our candidates are career ready when they complete our program. During candidates last year in the program, they take the TOTAL Internship semester right before Student Teaching. During the Internship and Student Teaching they are assessed by their cooperating teachers using the same Student Teacher Evaluation form. For ELED 400 (TOTAL Internship) this is completed twice, once at midterm and once at the end of the semester. Comparing the ELED 400 midterm scores to the final evaluation scores collected during Student Teaching, there

are significant gains. The combined percentage for all three reported outcomes for both semesters in ELED 400 at midterm is 71.35% and end of student teaching combined scores is 99.65%. This is an average increase of 28.3%. While the committee is pleased with the average candidate growth during their senior year, it is theorized that having a more substantive clinical placement earlier in the program may be beneficial to overall candidate growth and allow for more practice of concepts being learned as candidates are learning them.

2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)

The ELED Committee will discuss the data to determine where in the program we can strengthen our candidates' skills. Fall assessment data will be analyzed at the beginning of the Spring semester to help determine if the "NA"s for Outcome 5.2 were as result of schools either closing or going virtual due to the pandemic.

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

Our assessment plan this coming year will focus on determining where we can strengthen our program to better prepare our candidates to evidence proficiency across the outcomes using multiple assessments.

4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

This information will be shared with other stakeholders at the fall Advisory Board Meeting. It will be shared with colleagues at department meetings.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President’s Office and the Provost’s team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

| Program: MS Educational Technology | Overall Rating: Mature (2.94/3.00) |
|--|---|
| Strengths | Recommendations |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All assessment activities are aligned to standards and GSLOs. • Assessment measures are direct measures that incorporate high-level cognitive skills appropriately matched to the outcomes. Some outcomes are measured at multiple points in the curriculum. • Means for evaluating (rubrics, etc.) performance are made clear, and expected and actual results are shared in reference to these. Multiple cohort performances are described. • Decisions to assess learning outcomes over the course of two years allows for meaningful analysis of student performance over time and assuredness regarding the results. • With high student performance, action plans focus on using additional sources of data on the program to continue strong foundational traditions while updating the program to continue to meet diversifying needs of students and industry. A clear plan is established for gathering information and involving others in this process. • Clear information is provided about how others are involved/will be involved in sharing and using assessment results. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be sure to include the program-specific learning outcomes as the primary listed outcomes in the table. Definitely retain the ISTE/AECT and GSLO aligned standards to show that connection as well. • One thing I noticed is that the expected performance level of 80% corresponds to “developing” on the rubric, which is below “meeting expectations” at 90%. Your data shows most students are achieving beyond the “developing” level. It may just be a language thing with the levels on the rubric, but I think at the graduate level in the types of courses you are using for assessment you likely want to see students “meeting expectations” at minimum (and in fact, most and sometimes all are meeting or exceeding). |

| Evaluation Criteria | 3 Exemplary | 2 Mature | 1 Developing | 0 Undeveloped |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| <p>Student Learning Outcomes</p> | <p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p> | <p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p> | <p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p> | <p>No (program) learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p> |
| <p>Performance Goals & Measures</p> | <p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p> | <p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.</p> | <p>Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p> | <p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|
| Analysis & Results | <p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p> | <p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p> | <p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p> | <p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p> |
| Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement | <p>A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p> | <p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p> | <p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p> | <p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p> |
| Overall Rating | <input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature | <input type="checkbox"/> Developing | <input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped |

Please see reviewer notes for more details.