Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16

Degree Program: Elementary Education

Part One

What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	What method(s) did you use to determine how well your attained the outcome? In what course or other experience did the assessment occur?	What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	What were the actual results?	Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?
Candidates will integrate and apply knowledge for instruction; Candidates will foster active engagement in learning on the part of students; Candidates will foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.	Lesson plans from ElEd 400 and ElEd 457

Teacher Work Sample from ElEd 457

Assessment of Lessons and TOTAL Program Self-Evaluation from ElEd 400. | 80% of teacher candidates will receive a rating of Meets or Exceeds expectations on a rubric supplied at the beginning of the semester in each course. | 100% of ElEd 400 teacher candidates (N=16) met the outcome during AY2015 from one ISU supervisor's cohort;

88% of ElEd 457 teacher candidates (N-26) met the outcome during AY 2015 from one ISU supervisor's cohort. | ISU supervisors of ElEd 400 and instructors of ElEd 457 in the ElEd faculty in the Department of Teaching and Learning were responsible. Results are shared at least annually at a meeting of the full faculty. |

Detailed assessment results and departmental meeting minutes are available upon request.

Part Two

In no more than half a page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, the departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinators feedback on last year's summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

1. In ElEd 400, as a result of ISU supervisors' assessments of lesson plans and mentor teachers' assessments of lessons, teacher candidates are confident in instruction and curriculum, and assessment of student learning. Through the TOTAL Program Self-Evaluation survey given at the beginning and end of each semester, the data show that teacher candidates report statistically significant improvement in Ability Development, Development of Professional Attributes, and Belief in Professional Identity.

In ElEd 457, as a result of lesson plans and Teacher Work Sample, teacher candidates show that they can work independently on a variety of disciplinary and pedagogical responsibilities by combining their knowledge and skills in child development, curriculum and instruction, and assessment.

2. In ElEd 400, the changes to the course each semester come from suggestions from mentor teachers and from teacher candidates in regard to topics that need to be added to the weekly seminars, e.g. autism and sociological issues facing young children in inner city schools. In ElEd 457, changes mainly occur to the expectations of each assignment to make them fit the public school needs and challenges of society.

3.In ElEd 400, the faculty is considering creating a tighter connection between this course and the preceding course, ElEd 250. Specifically, faculty plan to add the Program Self-Evaluation survey to ELEd 250 to be used as a comparison with data from ElEd 400. The assessment plan in ElEd 457 will focus on creating a student teacher survey that include Ability Development, Development of Professional Attributes, and Belief in Professional Identity to gather data on growth during student teaching.

Degree Program: BS in Elementary Education   Date: 7.14.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. **Student Learning Outcomes**	☐ No outcomes are identified.	☒ An Outcomes Library was provided. ☒ Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable. ☒ Some of the outcomes are student-centered. ☐ A Curriculum Map was provided.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered. ☒ Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. ☐ At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	☐ Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains. ☐ Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. ☒ Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). ☐ Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) ☒ Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if

				necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. ☐ The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes. ☒ Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. **Measures & Performance Goals**	☐ No measures are provided. ☐ No goals for student performance are identified.	☒ Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. ☐ Measures are primarily indirect. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☒ Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	☒ At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. ☐ Sufficient information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	☐ Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. ☐ Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. ☐ Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. ☐ Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.

			☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. No ☐ Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) ☐ Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. ☐ Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do. ☐ If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.
3. Results	☐ No data are being collected.	☐ Some data are being collected.	☒ Data are being collected and analyzed.	☐ Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and

☐ No information is provided about the data collection process. ☐ No results are provided. ☐ Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	☐ Some data are being analyzed. ☒ Some results are provided. ☒ Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☐ Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	☐ Results are provided. ☐ Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid. ☒ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process. ☐ Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve. ☐ If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark. No
4. Engagement & Improvement	☐ No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. ☐ Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. ☐ No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. ☐ No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. ☐ It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. ☒ Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too vague to implement.	☒ Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☒ Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ☐ The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ☐ These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.	☐ All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. ☐ Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. ☐ Faculty and other

		☒ Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	☐ Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. ☐ Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. ☐ Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. ☐ Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	☐ **Level 0 – Undeveloped**	☒ **Level 1 – Developing** (right on the border between Developing and Mature)	☐ **Level 2 – Mature**	☐ **Level 3 – Exemplary**

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

You have used an old version of this form, which does not include contact information. You'll find the current form at https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components.

1. **Learning Outcomes**
   The outcomes assessed in the past academic year are lumped together in the report and should be separated and each one clearly aligned with its own assessment measures, performance expectations, and results. All but the first outcome are clear and measurable. What exactly does applying knowledge for instruction mean? I reviewed the program's outcomes library too, and see that many use vague verbs such as "understand" and "know." Perhaps it's time to update the library? Ideally you will end up with outcomes that are crystal clear to your students and still will make your accreditor happy. I reviewed your program's curriculum map as well, and it suggests that most outcomes are adequately addressed in the curriculum (the exception are those related to professional standards). Shall I assume that addressing the curriculum standards-related outcome is solely the responsibility of the subject matter departments? Does that work well?

2. **Measures & Performance Goals**
   Not enough information is provided about the assessment methods to demonstrate their connection to the outcomes. Next time, please describe the measures more thoroughly and provide links to rubrics used to assess them. You provide only one performance standard. Is it meant to apply to all three outcomes/measures? If so, is that appropriate? Last, is the TOTAL Program Self-Evaluation an indirect measure? (I don't know what it entails.) Having one is a requirement of the new assessment reporting process.

3. **Results**
   The report identifies two results for three outcomes. Is one missing, or is it combined with one of the others? Also, you note that results are based on one supervisor's cohort. Is it representative of the total population?

4. **Engagement & Improvement**
   You indicate that multiple individuals are responsible for collecting and analyzing results which are shared annually at a faculty meeting. If you would like me to know more about the conversations that occurred, summarize them and include links to minutes. You also identified some changes that have been made/will be made to the ElEd 400 and 457, though it is not clear that these are linked to these outcomes or their assessment. How would you characterize student achievement overall? I ask because I see that

students' pass rates on the licensure exam are below the state average. I look forward to hearing more about the changes you have implemented/will implement to improve their performance.

Thanks!