

Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16 3.28.16

Due to your dean by May 15

Due from dean to assessment office by June 15

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? 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>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale.</p> <p>100% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.</p> <p>Licensing exam: 70% of students minimum are expected to pass.</p>	<p>Nine out of eleven students passed the Pearson content test for 2014-2015. This is 81%.</p>	<p>Dr. Lee will collect the data from Education Student Services. Results were shared at the program meeting in May.</p>
<p>2. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate skill competency in various movement content areas.</p>	<p>Skills test rubric PE 211 scoring rubric Administered in PE 211</p>	<p>Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale.</p> <p>70% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.</p>	<p>100% of students met the benchmark.</p> <p>Spring 16: Tennis/Pickleball: 9 were at "Exceeds (EE) Expectations" & 7 were at the "Meets Expectations" Badminton: 7 were at "Exceeds expectations" & 2 were at the "Meets Expectations (ME)."</p> <p>Fall 15</p>	<p>Dr. Lee will collect the data from Nancy Cummins. Results were shared at the program meeting in May.</p>

			Tennis/Pickleball: 5 were EE & 14 at ME Badminton: 12 were at EE & 7 at ME.	
3. Physical education teacher candidates are able to design developmentally appropriate curriculum to be implemented to school students.	Lesson plan evaluation Lesson Plan Rubric Administered in PE 302	Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale. 70% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.	All 12 out of 12 students met the minimum meets expectation or better in PE 302 sections. Lesson plan data graph	Dr. Lee will collect the data from Dr. Hare. Results were shared at the program meeting in May.
4. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate competent teaching performance while using various teaching methods and strategies.	Student Teaching Evaluation Student Teaching Rubric Administered in PE 400	Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale. 70% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.	The benchmark was met. 8 out 9 students met the minimum of 2 on a 3 point scale. *The student who did not meet the expectation will receive a remediation plan for 4 weeks during May 2016.	Dr. Lee will collect the data. Results were shared at the program meeting in May.
5. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate competent knowledge and skills in assessment plan, implementation, and interpretation about student learning.	An intensive work sample report is completed. Work Sample Rubric This occurs in PE 310	Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale. 70% of the students will be required to meet this benchmark.	Altogether, 11 out of 11 students met the expectations (2 points) or exceeded expectations (3 points).	Dr. Lee will collect the data from Dr. Hare. Results were shared at the program meeting in May.
6. Physical education teacher candidates demonstrate dispositions that are essential to becoming effective professionals.	A disposition assessment Disposition Rubric Is administered in PE 310	Students are expected to earn a minimum of 2 on a minimum of 3 point scale. 70% of the students will be	All 11 out of 11 students met the expectation or exceeded expectations. Disposition data	Dr. Lee will collect the data from Dr. Hare. Results were shared at the program meeting in May. program meeting minutes

		required to meet this benchmark.		
7. Physical education teacher candidates articulate their a program evaluation of teacher education program	A Program evaluation exit survey Exit interview Is completed during the culminating student teaching meeting the day before commencement. (INDIRECT MEASURE)	80% of the students will meet this benchmark of completing this survey. Will analyze for themes that emerge.	We will not have this data for this year. We will report it next year due to the collection date.	Dr. Lee will collect the data from Kristin Blair.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, 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 coordinator's feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Part Two

Question 1

The assessment plan process has enabled the physical education teacher education program to obtain a snapshot of where are students are in performance terms of programmatic outcomes and benchmarks. We collected seven assessments in which six were direct measures. We added the seventh measure of an exit survey to include an indirect measure. This measure is not included in the graded coursework of our teacher candidates, as we want to obtain candid feedback based on the teacher candidates' overall perspective of the program they are completing. We have discovered that our physical education candidates are generally on track to meet expectations. This is not a surprise to us based on previous analysis of data for past accreditation cycles.

Outcome 1: Analysis of the data supplied by the Education Student Services licensing exam identifies that 81% of test takers passed the exam. Since accreditation requirements identify a 70% passing rate, we feel we met this outcome.

Outcome 2: Using the scoring rubric approved by our accreditation body, students met or exceeded expectations for the motor skill competencies outcome. This is conducted while observing students performing specific skills in the content area. The rubric is based on specific criteria and the same 3, 2, 1 scoring system.

Outcome 3: Two sections of scores for PE 302 were combined for this data set in assessing 10 subcomponents for the students' ability to lesson plan. Two separate evaluators used the same rubric to assess. All students met or exceeded expectations for lesson planning. The data graph was attached. Based on this

information, we will address learning cues as we feel the students should perform better here (58% exceeds expectation, 42% meets expectation). The instructor for PE 290 will address learning cues in greater depth.

Outcome 4: The student teaching rubric was used to assess student teaching performance during student teaching. This is an extensive rubric assessing many components. 89% of the students (8/9) have met or exceeded expectations regarding their performance. One student is currently completing a remediation plan and we do not have the results of success.

Outcome 5: The intensive work sample report was assessed using the rubric. The rubric for assessing this outcome has multiple subcomponents. All students met or exceeded expectation.

Outcome 6: The disposition assessment allows us to determine whether students demonstrate professional dispositions. This year, we had 11 out of 11 students meet or exceed expectations. As with the other rubrics, there are multiple subcomponents incorporated in this assessment. The majority of students fell in the meets category. Over time, we have seen the professionalism drop from exceeds expectation to meets expectation. We will continue to watch this data closely.

Outcome 7: The survey data for this indirect measure was not collected in time for analysis. We will include this data for next year's cycle.

Question 2

The changes we have made as a result of these discoveries are to address more intensely the instruction around learning cues in the lesson planning process. The use of the learning cues subcomponent does improve over time as seen in the data for the subsequent early field experience course. However, we would like this to be better. In addition, we will closely monitor students' disposition overall. Over time we have seen changes. While all students still meet expectation, we want them to be strong teaching candidates.

Question 3

We will continue to use the assessment plan as above and focus on all seven of these stated student learning outcomes.

[Program meeting minutes May 2016](#)

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Physical Education Teaching Date: 8.7.16

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

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure

				<p>provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not clear</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	established timelines. <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

1. Learning Outcomes

The program assessed six outcomes this year (and plans to address a seventh using an indirect measure). While a majority are clear and measurable, 1 and 2 are rather broad, and 7 is not clear.

2. Measures & Performance Goals

Six discrete measures were used to assess student performance. Little detail is provided about these measures (unfortunately, the links included do not work), but they generally appear to be appropriate. I do suspect that your performance expectations are too low: Why not select a higher, more aspirational goal, especially for the exam pass rate—perhaps a rate at least equal to the state average?

3. Results

Students are meeting the standards set for each outcome. In addition to the numeric results, a very general summary of their success is provided.

4. Engagement & Improvement

Multiple faculty are responsible for collecting and analyzing assessment data, which are shared annually. Part Two notes that students generally are on track, and it identifies one area for improvement (learning cues), but I would appreciate knowing more about students' specific strengths and weaknesses. How has the program addressed these over the years? Do you see evidence that learning continuously improves?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!