

## Student Learning Summary Form AY2017-18 10.10.18

**Degree Program Name:** \_\_\_\_\_ *Physical Education Teacher Education* \_\_\_\_\_ **Contact Person:** Myung-ah Lee Myung-ah.Lee@indstate.edu

### Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <u>Graduate Student Learning Outcome</u> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual results?</p>	<p>e. Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?</p>
<p>1. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate discipline -specific scientific knowledge.</p>	<p>Licensing exam (post graduation)</p>	<p>Licensing exam: 80% of students are expected to pass.</p>	<p>Seven out of nine students passed the Pearson content test for 2017-2018. This is 78%.</p>	<p>The program coordinator collected the data from Education Student Services. Results will be shared at the program meeting in November.</p>
<p>2. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate skill competency in various movement content areas.</p>	<p>FITNESSGRAM test (criterion-referenced test) FITNESSGRAM rubric</p> <p>Administered in PE 217 &amp; PE 442</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn at least "Healthy Fitness Zone" for all 5 fitness tests for FITNESSGRAM.</p> <p>100% of the students will meet this expectation by the end of PE 442.</p>	<p><u>PE 217</u> 24 out of 24 students met the "Healthy Fitness Zone" for all 5 fitness tests. 100% of the students met the benchmark in PE 217.</p> <p><u>PE 442</u> 9 out of 12 students met the "Healthy Fitness Zone" criteria for all 5 fitness tests</p> <p>100% of the students met the benchmark in PE 442(three students were not able to take the test due to their injury).</p>	<p>The course instructor collected the data. Results were shared at the program meeting in November.</p>

<p>3. Physical education teacher candidates are able to design developmentally appropriate curriculum to be implemented to school students.</p>	<p>Lesson plan &amp; implementation rubric  Administered in PE 302</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a 3 point scale for all evaluation rubric components. There are 10 components for planning and 8 components for implementation.  100% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.</p>	<p>All 6 out of 6 students met the minimum expectations for all evaluation components for lesson plan and implementation rubric.  The benchmark was met.</p>	<p>The course instructor collected the data. Results will be shared at the program meeting in November.</p>
<p>4. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate competent teaching performance while using various teaching methods and strategies.</p>	<p>Student Teaching Evaluation  <a href="#">Student Teaching Rubric</a>  Administered in PE 400</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale for all evaluation components. There are 28 evaluation components in this rubric.  100% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark by the end of PE 400.</p>	<p>All 6 out of 6 students met the minimum expectations for all evaluation components for lesson plan and implementation rubric.  The benchmark was met.</p>	<p>Education student service collected the data. Results will be shared at the program meeting in November.</p>
<p>5. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate competent knowledge and skills in assessment plan, implementation, and interpretation about student learning.</p>	<p>An intensive work sample report is completed.  <a href="#">Work Sample Rubric</a>  This occurs in PE 400</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale for all evaluation components. There are 7 evaluation components.  100% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.</p>	<p>Altogether, 6 out of 6 students met the minimum expectations for all evaluation components.  The benchmark was met.</p>	<p>The course instructor collected the data. Results will be shared at the program meeting in November.</p>
<p>6. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate</p>	<p>A disposition assessment</p>			

<p>dispositions that are essential to becoming effective professionals.</p>	<p><u>Disposition Rubric</u> Is administered in PE400.</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 4 point scale. There are 10 evaluation components.  100% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.</p>	<p>Altogether, 6 out of 6 students met the minimum expectations for all evaluation components.  The benchmark was met.</p>	<p>The course instructor collected the data. Results will be shared at the program meeting in November.</p>
<p>7. PETE graduates demonstrate effective teaching performance and meet INTASC beginning teacher standards.</p>	<p><u>Alumni survey</u>  A new program evaluation survey for PETE was developed for CAEP accreditation purpose and it will be implemented from the fall 2018 and spring 2019.  (INDIRECT MEASURE)</p>	<p>This assessment will provide the program effectiveness data.  The survey will be distributed to the alumni and employers and collected in the fall 18 and spring 19. Data will be analyzed to have more insight for the program operation.</p>	<p>We will not have this data by the end of this year. We will report it next year due to the collection date.</p>	<p>The program coordinator will collect the data.</p>

## **Part Two**

### **Question 1**

Outcome 1: The analysis of the content license test data supplied by the Education Student Services showed that 89% of the test takers passed the exam (n=17). However, I found out 8 test takers among them were not PE All Grade program graduates so had to pull their data out. Then the passing rate became 78% (n=9). The result was lower than last year (i.e., 91%). The passing rate was even higher with the data including non-major graduates. I am concerned about that data trend and doubt about the test validity of the Pearson content license exam. I believe the program level of education is not fully reflected by this testing result but this data is an important part of the program learning outcome. On the other hand, the 78% of the passing rate did not meet the benchmark. The flip side of this result is due to two graduates who did fail to pass it but have not retake it because they are currently enrolled in the ISU master program. By the time they graduate the master program, I believe they will retake the test and pass it. The result will be shared with the program area faculty and we will work on improving the passing rate to meet the benchmark.

Outcome 2: This outcome was measured 3 times, twice in PE 217 (Pre & post tests) and in PE 442 during the junior or senior year to be sure that majors are improving or maintaining their fitness competence. In the last academic year PE 217 students met the expectations by the time of their post-test although two students did not meet the minimum expectations in the pre-test (i.e., push up). The students' fitness competence was maintained and 100% of students met the "Healthy Fitness Zone" expectations for all 5 fitness tests (i.e., mile run, push up, curl up, trunk lift, back save sit and reach) and attained the benchmark. Nine out of 12 students in PE 442 met the benchmark and three students did not take the test due to their medical conditions. The need for the remediation plan for the accommodation was identified.

Outcome 3: PE 302 students' lesson plan and implementation competence met the expectations. This is not a surprise because students are introduced how to design and implement developmentally appropriate curriculum in PE 290 and reinforced their design and implementation skills in PE 302. One more course, PE 310 is another course where students are supposed to master this learning outcome. By the time of PE 400 (student teaching), 100% of the students are supposed to meet the expectations for this outcome. The benchmark was reached for this outcome.

Outcome 4: The student teaching evaluation rubric was used to assess student teaching performance during student teaching. This is an extensive rubric with 28 evaluation sub-components. 100% of the students (6/6) have met or exceeded expectations regarding their performance for all 28 sub-components.

Outcome 5: The work sample report (project) was assessed using the rubric. The rubric for assessing this outcome has 8 sub-components. All students (6 out of 6) met or exceeded expectation.

Outcome 6: The disposition assessment allows us to determine whether students demonstrate professional dispositions. This year, we had 6 out of 6 students met the minimum expectations (2 out of 4 point scales). This measurement occurs in PE 290, PE 310, and finally in PE 400 during student teaching. This measurement is a gatekeeper for the PETE students' affective domain of teaching competence. As we repeat the same measure overtime we identify any deficiency or weakness from any teacher candidate and provide a remediation plan. Also students do their self-evaluation using the same evaluation rubric. If there is a big gap between the instructor and the student's evaluation then another remediation or discussion meeting occurs. This program wide effort has been successful and all students met the disposition assessment minimum criteria.

Outcome 7: The survey data for this indirect measure was not collected in time for the analysis. We have relied on this data collection from the ESS office. The major reason was to avoid possible multiple requests to the school principals by multiple ISU programs. But the data collection process did not go well. We will find out other alternative way to do better data collection and the possibility of using the social media with the qualtrics was discussed. We will collect data at the program level next year with the use of qualtrics via social media.

### **Question 2**

First of all, the license test passing rate was not maintained but decreased to 78%. This result needs an immediate attention for the improvement and the program area faculty will discuss about possible solutions. Student fitness competence was well maintained throughout the program as data showed. All learning outcomes reached to the benchmarks except the outcome #1 and demonstrated the program effectiveness.

For the outcome#2 we were able to monitor their performance between two measurement points (PE 217 and PE 442) to convince if they meet the program requirement expectations. Learning outcome # 2 reached to the benchmark too and 100% students met the expectations. For the learning outcome 3, 4, 5, & 6

benchmarks and performance goals were refined in 2016-2017 cycle. We believe it became clear with that changes to demonstrate program effectiveness with student learning outcomes. For the indirect measure we planned to implement “alumni and employer survey” but we were unable to distribute it while trying to make it aligned with the instrument for the entire teacher education program unit. We plan to collect data in spring 2019.

**Question 3**

We will continue monitoring student learning with program assessment process. Next year we will focus on collecting the “employer and alumni survey” to identify our program strength and weakness for the next assessment cycle. As critical concerns, first, we will have to improve the license test passing rate. Second, we lost one tenure line faculty (i.e., Dr. Molly Hare moved to FCTE). We have been doing more rigorous program promotion, major recruitment, and maintaining the high quality of PETE program under the given situation. But two critical concerns seemed to be interrelated. We hope and wish to hire a new faculty for PETE program next year and we believe it is a critical need for maintaining the quality of the program and student success. Regardless, we gained the national recognition for CAEP SPA accreditation in spring 2017 and it was a big success, which we consider “teaching and learning through assessment.”

**Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities**

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Increase number of student/faculty social events	Planned student/faculty social events. Chairperson	None	Increased student and faculty interaction on a social level	Plan to continue with one primary social event each semester.
2. Ensure current course offerings develop applicable skills for employment and not transfer to another department or university	Continuous review of curriculum and course offerings. Program directors	Student retention rates		
3. Formalize career readiness across all KRS programs	Reassess internship evaluation documents	Potential hiring rates of interns.	Challenged with accurate data collection.	Continue with same goal and improve data collection.

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

**Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement**

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?**

KRS will continue to implement faculty and student social events in attempt to improve student retention rates, and possibly attract new students. Program curricula will continue to be reviewed so student graduate with the latest in industry standards increasing likelihood of employment.

Dear Myung,

Thank you so much for sharing your Physical Education – Teaching Education program assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are 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 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)

<b>Program: Physical Education Teacher Education</b>	
<b>Assessment Practice Overall Rating:</b> Exemplary (3.00/3.00)	
<b>Student Success Practice Overall Rating:</b> Developing (1.50/3.00) <i>*see second rubric below</i>	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Clear, measureable outcomes; stated alignment with INTASC standards.</li><li>• Specific, applicable measures of student learning administered across the curriculum for a broader picture of student learning.</li><li>• Clear targets for student performance and reporting of performance relative to targets.</li><li>• Clear information for sharing results and including faculty in discussion and use of findings to improve student learning.</li><li>• <b>Clear goals to support student success.</b></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider listing the aligned INTASC standards alongside your learning outcomes to ease reporting in your next accreditation cycle.</li><li>• <b>Providing more clear expectations and outcomes for student success will help you make more informed decisions regarding each goal.</b></li></ul>

*Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).*

*Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.*

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>

**Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:**

**Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:**

<b>Evaluation Criteria</b>	<b>0 Undeveloped</b>	<b>1 Developing</b>	<b>2 Mature</b>	<b>3 Exemplary</b>
<b>Goals/ Objectives</b>	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion.  Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
<b>Action Steps</b>	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives.  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives  Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
<b>Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective</b>	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
<b>Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement</b>	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.  Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Exemplary</b>