

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19 *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)** Melissa Nail, Melissa.Nail@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>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?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>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>
<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. CAEP 1.2, InTASC 1</p>	<p>The Teacher Work Sample ELED 457, Capstone</p>	<p>Using a four-level rubric, students must attain a score of "3" on each criterion to be deemed proficient; at least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p>	<p>Fall 2018: 16/25: 64% candidates earned a score of "3" or higher on this criterion Spring 2019: 64/65: 98% earned a score of "3" or higher on this criterion Overall: 80/90: 88.9% of candidates in the program attained this benchmark.</p>	<p>Moving from a three point scale to a four point scale yielded very different data than in previous years. Whereas over 90% of candidates were scored as proficient in the past, less than 90% of the candidates were scored as proficient with the new scale. The ELED Committee is using this data and backwards design to determine where in the program we can strengthen our candidates' skills.</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. CAEP 1.4, InTASC 5</p>	<p>The Final Evaluation of Student Teaching ELED 400, Theory to Practice ELED 451, Supervised Teaching ELED 453, Supervised Teaching</p>	<p>Using a three-level rubric, students must attain a score of "2" on each criterion to be deemed proficient; at least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p>	<p>Fall 2018: 62/63: 98% candidates in ELED 400 earned a score of "2" or higher and 23/23:100% of candidates in ELED 451</p>	<p>Using a three point scale, nearly every candidate is scored as proficient on the survey/observation assessments completed by their host teachers. With the three point scale, there is very little evidence of growth from ELED 400 to</p>

			<p>earned a score of “2” or higher Spring 2019: 39/40: 97.5% candidates in ELED 400 earned a score of “2” or higher and 62/62:100% candidates in ELED 451 earned a score of “2” or higher Overall: 186/188: 98.9% of candidates in the program attained this benchmark.</p>	<p>ELED 451 with 98% and 97.5% of candidates being evaluated as proficient while 100% of candidates in ELED 451 are scored as proficient. In order to better identify candidates’ strengths and weaknesses, we will be moving to a four point scale. We will also consider the implications of candidates scoring markedly different on surveys/observations than on their written reports in which they document their skills and knowledge through text.</p>
<p>3. Outcome 4:1: Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student. CAEP 1.2 , InTASC 6</p>	<p>The Teacher Work Sample ELED 457, Capstone</p>	<p>Using a four-level rubric, students must attain a score of “3” on each criterion to be deemed proficient; at least 90% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.</p>	<p>Fall 2018: 13/25: 52% candidates earned a score of “3” or higher on this criterion Spring 2019: 64/65: 98% earned a score of “3” or higher on this criterion Overall: 77/90: 85.5% of candidates in the program attained this benchmark.</p>	<p>While the new four point scale yielded very different data than the previous scale, the dramatic difference between the fall and spring data is something that the ELED Committee will be studying. We will look for differences between events leading up to these semesters (identifying when Professional Development Seminars in Assessment were and were not offered) and whether or not any scoring error may have been present.</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):

1) Cohort Sizes	2) Year-to-Year Retention	3) 5-Year Graduation Rate
135	75.56%	35.46%

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. We encourage students to take advantage of resources on campus, prepare for, and take the CASA early. Data indicates that 12 students visited the Center for Mathematics Education for individualize tutoring for the CASA Math test. Students made a total of 30 visits for tutoring and 15 students borrowed books for tutoring purposes.

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

Our most significant opportunities for improvement are in identifying where in the program we can strengthen our candidates’ skills in writing and reporting on their content and pedagogical knowledge (CAEP standard 1 as measured by the TWS) and identifying better ways to support students in accessing and preparing for entry level tests for our teacher education program. The ELED Committee will meet throughout the year and explore ways to improve and strengthen our candidates’ skills. During the first eight weeks of the fall semester, an elective course was provided to twenty students who had not met the testing requirements for admission to our teacher education program. The course introduced students to numerous resources and provided them with support for preparing for the test. We will follow up with data on the retention of these students to measure the success of this initiative.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email.

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. The data also

indicates that our candidates are not as proficient at reflecting on and writing about their professional skills. This raises the questions of: (1) Do university faculty have different expectations for candidates than clinical faculty?; (2) Are candidates proficient in the art of teaching but not the science of teaching OR do our candidates' writing abilities limit them in demonstrating their skills and knowledge with the Teacher Work Sample (TWS)?

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 look at the scheduled Professional Development Sessions planned and provided for candidates leading up fall 2018 and spring 2019 to identify differences in support and training provided to candidates to prepare them for work on the TWS and student teaching. We will also revisit our curriculum map and the learning outcomes in each of our courses to identify any curriculum drift and identify courses in which we could strengthen the curriculum to better align with the outcomes. We will compare the data evidence provided by clinical faculty compared to the data provided by university faculty for the same candidates to attempt to determine what we can learn from these differences. Finally, we will pull a sample of Teacher Work Samples to rescore to help determine if there is any scoring error.

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

Our assessment plan this coming year will focus on determining where can strengthen our program to better prepare our candidates to evidence proficiency on the Teacher Work Sample.

4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

This information will be shared with other stakeholders at the fall Advisory Board Meeting.

***Please prepare this report as a Word document.** Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.*

Dear Melissa,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 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 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: B.A./B.S. Elementary Education	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Learning outcomes are clear, and although complex, assessments are sufficiently complex to measure. Outcomes are aligned with standards.• Rubrics are thoughtfully constructed and described. Expectations and actual results are described in terms of the rubrics.• Good insights into the significant scoring differences at different points in the year and between faculty and site supervisor evaluations. Good action plans to look into these concerns.• Good information provided about the decision to change from a 3-point to 4-point rubric and how that has potentially influenced scoring to reveal more nuanced data and show more areas for improvement.• Fantastic questions being asked as a result of findings in Part 2, 1. Your assessment approach has allowed you to gain helpful insights into differences in student performance, and these questions are thoughtful and follow-up will certainly help you make improvements for your students.• Clear information about sharing of results.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• It seems from the two different sets of scores for the outcomes measured by the TWS that different criteria on the rubrics aligned to each learning outcome are used for evaluation. Stating this clearly would prevent any misinterpretation.• Consider noting why these outcomes were selected for assessment (e.g., part of a normal cycle, or in response to prior year findings/an intervention/a change). Not doing so does not detract from the quality of your report, but it might be helpful when looking back at this report in the future to provide context.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</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>Performance Goals & Measures</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>

Analysis & Results	<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>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<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>
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Department of Teaching and Learning Elementary Committee Meeting

March 18, 2019

University Hall Room 221

4:00-5:00

The Department of Teaching and Learning program faculty for Elementary Education met on March 18, 2019 to discuss the conclusions and results of the evaluative feedback from the Assessment Council and Student Success Council regarding the Student Success report dated October 15, 2018 and submitted to the Assessment Office.

The following elements were discussed

- Assessment activities (included in the original report) were reviewed: Learning outcomes, assignments, expectations for student performance, data/results, and changes or improvements based upon feedback or assessment results.
- Student success activities (included in the original report) were reviewed.
- Feedback from the Assessment and Student Success Councils was studied with particular attention to recommendations and specific elements on the scoring rubric in which we are not yet at the “exemplary” level.
- Using student success data to better identify and support students who would like to enter our program but fail to meet entry level requirements.

The following conclusions were drawn

- While the report is directed to Melissa and the program is identified as Elementary Education on the first page, the rubric identifies CD-MS Speech-Language Pathology, thus we need to confirm that this is our rating and seek to correct the potential error.
- It seems that we are successfully identifying performance goals, measures to ascertain students’ progress toward meeting those goals, and processes for using those measures.
- We can improve our articulation of student success by documenting how our outcomes directly link to CAEP standards.
- We can improve our articulation of student success by discussing our results in relation to CAEP standards
- We need to document how we share results and use data to inform our decision making process.
- We need to follow up with collecting data on our student success activities and use that data to make decisions to better support/ensure student success.

The following actions were recommended

- Melissa will follow up with Kelley regarding the perceived typo in the program name on the rubric.
- Melissa will align outcomes with CAEP standards and bring the draft of the alignments to the committee for approval.

- Follow up with Education Student Services for data on the number of students who have attempted the CASA exams and the number of students who have passed the CASA exams.
- Collect data from the Center for Mathematics Education on the number of students who come for tutoring, the number of tutoring sessions each student attended, the number of times tested, and the pass rate.
- Collect data from Education Student Services on the number of students who come for tutoring at the Education Student Success Center, the number of tutoring sessions each student attended, the number of times tested, and the pass rate.
- Determine if we can collect data from the Math Center and the Writing Center (in the library) regarding the number of students who come for tutoring for the CASA, the number of tutoring sessions each student attended, the number of times tested, and the pass rate.
- Compare the data between the three tutoring options to determine if/how student needs are being met.
- Compare data from attendance/use of the Center for Mathematics Education for 2019 with data from 2018 to determine if limitations on posting flyers in the building may inhibit our ability to inform students of this resource.
- We will examine data from Education Student Services to determine if tutoring services are meeting students' needs or if an elective transition course (perhaps a new course OR a special UC 101 session co-taught with ELED faculty and based in the Growth Mindset) might be an additional source to support student success.