

B. S. in Elementary Education
Student Learning Outcome Progress Report
Kansas State University

Academic Year: 2007 - 2008
Department: Department of Elementary Education
Degree Program: B.S. in Elementary Education (CIP Code 13.1202)
Person preparing the report: Dr. Paul Burden, Chair of the Dept. of Elementary Education
Date submitted: March 1, 2009

The link to the department website where degree program student learning outcomes are posted:
www.coe.ksu.edu/departments/eled.htm

Is the Alignment Matrix for the degree program attached? YES

1. Student Learning Outcomes – *List the student learning outcomes that were assessed during the academic year, including those for which data were gathered as well as those for which developmental work was done, such as the creation or piloting of assessment measures.*

[Note: The student learning outcomes contained in this document are but a subset of a broad, comprehensive evaluation of the elementary education program outcomes which were documented for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Please refer to the NCATE Institutional Report and its accompanying electronic exhibit room at the following website to examine all of the outcomes: <https://www.coe.ksu.edu/ncate/login.php?urlreq=/ncate/index.php> (the password is available upon request).]

The department identified a number of student learning outcomes for the B.S. in Elementary Education that are tied directly to Kansas State Board of Education (KSDE) teaching licensure requirements and the unit's conceptual framework.

The student learning outcomes are organized into three categories: (1) general education (KSDE standards), (2) professional education standards (tied to the unit's conceptual framework and based on state standards), and (3) content standards (KSDE standards) for individual subject areas (e.g., biology, mathematics, etc.). For the purpose of the three-year assessment plan, the following student learning outcomes were selected from the professional education standards:

- *Students and Learning: Diversity.* The educator demonstrates the ability to provide different approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable, that are based on developmental levels, and are adapted to diverse learners, including those with exceptionalities.
- *Instruction: Critical Thinking.* The educator understands and uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage and develop various kinds of students' learning including critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.

- *Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity.* The educator is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community), actively seeks opportunities to grow professionally, and participates in the school improvement process (Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation [QPA]).

2. How will the learning outcomes be assessed? What groups will be included in the assessment?

Learning Outcomes	Measures			Who will be assessed?
	Direct	Indirect	Not sure	
1. <i>Students and Learning: Diversity</i> The educator demonstrates the ability to provide different approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable, that are based on developmental levels, and are adapted to diverse learners, including those with exceptionalities	<i>Student Teaching Portfolio</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
	<i>Student Teaching Final Evaluation</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
		<i>Undergraduate Program Exit Survey</i>		All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
	<i>The Principles of Learning and Teaching Test: Praxis II</i>			All students who have completed student teaching and are applying for licensure.
2. <i>Instruction: Critical Thinking.</i> The educator understands and uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage and develop various kinds of students' learning including critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.	<i>Student Teaching Portfolio</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
	<i>Student Teaching Final Evaluation</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
		<i>Undergraduate Program Exit Survey</i>		All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).

	<i>The Principles of Learning and Teaching Test: Praxis II</i>			All students who have completed student teaching and are applying for licensure.
--	--	--	--	--

<i>3. Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity.</i> The educator is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community), actively seeks opportunities to grow professionally, and participates in the school improvement process (Kansas Quality Performance Accreditation [QPA]).	<i>Student Teaching Portfolio</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
	<i>Student Teaching Final Evaluation</i>			All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
		<i>Undergraduate Program Exit Survey</i>		All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).
	<i>The Principles of Learning and Teaching Test: Praxis II</i>			All students who have completed student teaching and are applying for licensure.

3. Results of the Assessment – What did you learn? What is working well? Where are improvements needed?

Students and Learning: Diversity.

- Measure 1 (Direct): Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 2 – Contextual Information). (See Table 1). We want students to attain a score on Entry 2 that meets or exceeds 80% (operationally defined as “proficient”) of the points comprising this measure (max. score = 14). Students are considered proficient if they score 11 points or greater on the 14-point scale. Table 1 illustrates that 94.7% of the students meet the “proficient” standard for Entry 2 of the student teaching portfolio related to the diversity learning outcome for the 2007-2008 academic year. This result is consistent with student performance in the previous years (see the cumulative data in Table 1).

Table 1. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 2 – Contextual Information) (Diversity)

Semester	# of Students	Unsatisfactory (0-64%)	Basic (65-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
F '07 & S '08	113	0 (0 %)	6 (5.3%)	107 (94.7%)
Cumulative S '05 – S '08	557	1 (0.2%)	23 (4.3%)	533 (95.5%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. (See Table 2). Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. Components from the final evaluation of student teaching that represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to “diversity” issues are displayed in Table 2.

Table 2 illustrates that for each of the components representing a measure of diversity issues, students scored at a “proficient” level for each component with the exception of Category 1 (item 2) on “Demonstrating Knowledge of the Students.” Our target is at least 80% of the students performing at the proficient level. For each item, student performance in 2007-2008 was consistent with the cumulative performance over the last three years.

Table 2. Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Components Representing “Diversity”

Academic Year	Category / Item	Topic	Percent Proficient
F '07 & S '08	1 – item 2	Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	77.5%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	1 – item 2	Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	77.2%
F '07 & S '08	2 – item 7	Creating an Environment of Respect	87.8%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	2 – item 7	Creating an Environment of Respect	88.7%
F '07 & S '08	3 – item 16	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	82.3%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	3 – item 16	Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	83.1%
F '07 & S '08	4 – item 22	Demonstrating Professionalism	86.7%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 – item 22	Demonstrating Professionalism	86.7%

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. (See Table 3). At the end of the student teaching semester, each student is asked to complete an Undergraduate Program Completion Survey, which includes questions about curriculum features of the program, academic advising, services, field experiences, and the mission statement. Some of the questions about curriculum features relate to diversity, and those questions are noted in Table 3. Scoring goes from 1 to 6 (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree). It is our expectation that the mean for each statement correspond with an “Agree” response (i.e., 5.00 or greater).

For 2007-2008, a very high level of proficiency is shown for each diversity question in Table 3. For each item, student performance in 2007-2008 was consistent with the cumulative data.

Specific statements from the exit survey related to the diversity student learning outcome include the following:

- *I can adapt instruction to accommodate the developmental stages of my students (Item 12)*
- *I can provide equitable instructional opportunities for diverse learners (Item 13)*
- *I can apply multiple learning strategies that provide equitable opportunities for diverse learners. (Item 14)*

- *I can adapt my teaching to address diverse student needs (Item 15).*

Table 3. Undergraduate Program Exit Survey: Questions Relating to Diversity

Sem.	Item	Section	Topic	N	Mean (1-6)
F '07 & S '08	12	Student & Learning	adapt/developmental stages	154	5.38
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	12	Student & Learning	adapt/developmental stages	301	5.38
F '07 & S '08	13	Student & Learning	instr. opportunit./diverse learners	152	5.42
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	13	Student & Learning	instr. opportunities/diverse learners	301	5.41
F '07 & S '08	14	Student & Learning	learning strategies/diverse learners	154	5.42
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	14	Student & Learning	learning strategies/diverse learners	301	5.45
F '07 & S '08	15	Student & Learning	adapt teaching/diverse learners	153	5.33
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	15	Student & Learning	adapt teaching/diverse learners	301	5.35

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). (See Table 4). Students are expected to attain a score that meets or exceeds a nationally norm-referenced “cut-off” score that serves as a general predictor of success as a professional teacher. In the most recent three semesters of record, elementary Education majors passed this test at a 98.8% rate (See Table 4). This result is consistent with student performance in the previous years (see the cumulative data in Table 4).

Table 4. Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II)

Semesters	Number of Students	Number Passing	Percent Passing
Fall 07, Spring 08, Summer '08	162	160	98.8%
Cumulative U '04 – U '08	702	696	99.1%

Instruction: Critical Thinking.

- Measure 1 (Direct): Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Parts 1-3). (See Table 5). We want students to attain a score on Entry 3 (Parts 1-3) that meets or exceeds 80% (operationally defined as “proficient”) of the points comprising this measure (max. score part 1 = 9; max. score part 2 = 14; max. score part 3 = 9). Table 5 illustrates that 90-99% of the students meet the “proficient” standard for the 2007-2008 academic year for the following components of Entry 3 of the student teaching portfolio related to the critical thinking learning outcome.
 - Entry 3, Part 1 – Learning Goals and Objectives (score 7 or higher for proficient)
 - Entry 3, Part 2 – Instructional Design (score 10 or higher for proficient)
 - Entry 3, Part 3 – Demonstration of Integration (score 5 or higher for proficient)
 This result is consistent with student performance in the previous years (see the cumulative data in Table 5).

Table 5. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Parts 1-3). (Related to Critical Thinking)

Semester	Part	# of Students	Unsatisfactory (0-64%)	Basic (65-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
F '07 & S '08	1	113	0 (0%)	1 (0.9%)	112 (99.1%)
Cumulative S '05 – S '08	1	557	0 (0%)	17 (3.1%)	540 (96.9%)
F '07 & S '08	2	113	1 (0.8%)	5 (4.5%)	107 (94.7%)
Cumulative S '05 – S '08	2	557	3 (0.5%)	49 (8.8%)	505 (90.7%)
F '07 & S '08	3	113	4 (3.5%)	7 (6.2%)	102 (90.3%)
Cumulative S '05 – S '08	3	557	7 (1.3%)	42 (7.5%)	508 (91.2%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. (See Table 6). Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. Components from the final evaluation of student teaching that represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to “critical thinking” issues related to instructional decision making are displayed in Table 6. Our target is at least 80% of the students performing at the proficient level. Table 6 illustrates that for each of the components representing a measure of critical thinking on instructional issues, students scored at a “proficient” level on four components. The target proficiency in 2007-2008 was missed on items 12, 13, and 15 by small amounts. However, only item 13 concerning questioning and discussion techniques had cumulative data less than the 80% target proficient level.

Table 6. Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Components Related to “Critical Thinking”

Academic Year	Category / Item	Topic	Percent Proficient
F '07 & S '08	1 – item 3	Establishing Instructional Outcomes	82.0%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	1 – item 3	Establishing Instructional Outcomes	83.7%
F '07 & S '08	1 – item 5	Designing Coherent Instruction	82.2%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	1 – item 5	Designing Coherent Instruction	88.7%
F '07 & S '08	2 – item 8	Establishing a Culture for Learning	85.7%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	2 – item 8	Establishing a Culture for Learning	87.3%
F '07 & S '08	3 – item 12	Communicating with Students	79.4%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	3 – item 12	Communicating with Students	81.5%
F '07 & S '08	3 – item 13	Questioning and Discussion Techniques	79.9%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	3 – item 13	Questioning and Discussion Techniques	75.2%
F '07 & S '08	3 – item 14	Engaging Students in Learning	83.8%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	3 – item 14	Engaging Students in Learning	83.4%
F '07 & S '08	3 – item 15	Using assessment in instruction	75.7%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	3 – item 15	Using assessment in instruction	81.5%

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. (See Table 7). At the end of the student teaching semester, each student is asked to complete an Undergraduate Program Completion Survey, which includes questions about curriculum features of the program, academic advising, services, field experiences, and the mission statement. Some of the questions about curriculum features relate to critical thinking, and those questions are noted in Table 7. Scoring goes from 1 to 6 (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree). It is our expectation that the mean for each statement correspond with an “Agree” response (i.e., 5.00 or greater).

Specific statements from the exit survey related to the critical thinking learning outcome include the following:

- *I feel confident in the preparation I received in regard to problem-solving skills* (Item 1d)
- *I understand how individuals develop intellectually* (Item 9)
- *I can use the tools of inquiry of all my content field(s) in teaching.* (Item 17)
- *I can develop classroom activities that encourage students to connect multiple concepts through reading and thinking skills* (Item 19).
- *I can help students understand relationships between subjects.* (Item 20).
- *I can use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage critical thinking skills.* (Item 30).
- *I can use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage problem solving.* (Item 31)
- *I can use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage reading.* (Item 32).

For 2007-2008, a very high level of proficiency is shown for each diversity question in Table 7. For each item, student performance in 2007-2008 was consistent with the cumulative data. Only item 1d on problem solving had performance below the target proficiency level in 2007-2008 and in the cumulative data.

Table 7 Undergraduate Program Exit Survey: Questions Relating to Critical Thinking

Semester	Item #	Section	Topic	N	Mean (1-6)
F '07 & S '08	1d	General Education	Problem Solving	153	4.76
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	1d	General Education	Problem Solving	299	4.79
F '07 & S '08	9	Student Learning	Individuals develop intellectually	154	5.28
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	9	Student Learning	Individuals develop intellectually	300	5.22
F '07 & S '08	17	Content & Pedagogy	Tools of inquiry	152	5.20
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	17	Content & Pedagogy	Tools of inquiry	299	5.24
F '07 & S '08	19	Content & Pedagogy	Activities to connect concepts	154	5.37
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	19	Content & Pedagogy	Activities to connect concepts	301	5.48

F '07 & S '08	20	Content & Pedagogy	Relationships between subjects	151	5.45
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	20	Content & Pedagogy	Relationships between subjects	301	5.50
F '07 & S '08	30	Instruction	Strategies to encourage critical thinking	154	5.27
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	30	Instruction	Strategies to encourage critical thinking	301	5.30
F '07 & S '08	31	Instruction	Strategies to encourage problem solving	154	5.22
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	31	Instruction	Strategies to encourage problem solving	301	5.27
F '07 & S '08	32	Instruction	Strategies to encourage reading	154	5.23
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	32	Instruction	Strategies to encourage reading	301	5.32

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). (See Table 4). Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). We want students to attain a score that meets or exceeds a nationally norm-referenced “cut-off” score that serves as a general predictor of success as a professional teacher. Elementary Education majors passed this test at a 98.8% rate (See Table 4).

Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity.

- Measure 1 (Direct): Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Part 5 – Self-Evaluation of Instructional Unit). (See Table 8). We want students to attain a score on Entry 3, Part 5 that meets or exceeds 80% (operationally defined as “proficient”) of the points comprising this measure (max. score = 12 {score 9 or higher for proficient}). Table 8 illustrates that 88.5% of the students meet the “proficient” standard for Entry 3, Part 5 related to the professionalism learning outcome for the total 2007-2008 academic year. This performance is consistent with the cumulative data.

Table 8. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3, Part 5) (Concerning Reflection and Personal Integrity)

Semester	# of Students	Unsatisfactory (0-64%)	Basic (65-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
F '07 & S '08	113	2 (1.7%)	11 (9.7%)	100 (88.5%)
Cumulative S '05 – S '08	556	12 (2.2%)	75 (13.4%)	469 (84.4%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. (See Table 9). Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. Components from the final evaluation of student teaching that represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to specific “professionalism” issues are displayed in Table 9.

Our target is at least 80% of the students performing at the proficient level. Table 9 illustrates that for each of the components representing a measure of diversity issues, students scored at

a “proficient” level for each component with the exception of Item 17 on “Reflecting on Teaching” and Item 19 on “Community with Families.” Only item 19 on “Communicating with Families” had performance less than the target proficiency level for 2007-2008 and in the cumulative data.

Table 9. Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Components Representing “Professionalism”

Academic Year	Category / item	Topic	Percent Proficient
F '07 & S '08	4 a – item 17	Reflecting on Teaching	79.7%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 a – item 17	Reflecting on Teaching	82.7%
F '07 & S '08	4 b – item 18	Maintaining Accurate Records	80.9%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 b – item 18	Maintaining Accurate Records	83.9%
F '07 & S '08	4 c – item 19	Communicating with Families	72.8%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 c – item 19	Communicating with Families	73.3%
F '07 & S '08	4 d – item 20	Participating in a Learning Comm.	80.3%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 d – item 20	Participating in a Learning Comm.	81.2%
F '07 & S '08	4 e – item 21	Growing and Develop. Professionally	85.6%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 e – item 21	Growing and Developing Professionally	84.9%
F '07 & S '08	4 f – item 22	Demonstrating Professionalism	86.8%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 f – item 22	Demonstrating Professionalism	86.7%
F '07 & S '08	4 g – item 23	Personal Habits	92.6%
Cumulative F '05 – S '08	4 g – item 23	Personal Habits	93.8%

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. (See Table 10). At the end of the student teaching semester, each student is asked to complete an Undergraduate Program Completion Survey, which includes questions about curriculum features of the program, academic advising, services, field experiences, and the mission statement. Some of the questions about curriculum features relate to reflection and personal integrity, and those questions are noted in Table 10. Scoring goes from 1 to 6 (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree). Specific statements from the exit survey related to the professionalism learning outcome include the following:
 - *I am a reflective practitioner who evaluates the effects of my choices/actions on others* (Item 36)
 - *I participate in opportunities to grow professionally* (Item 37)
 - *I have the skills necessary to develop professional relationships with school personnel.* (Item 38a)
 - *I have the skills necessary to develop professional relationships with parents* (Item 38b).
 - *I have the skills necessary to develop professional relationships with community agencies.* (Item 38c).

- *I have the skills necessary to participate in the school improvement process.* (Item 39).

It is our expectation that the mean for each statement correspond with an “Agree” response (i.e., 5.00 or greater). The results summarized for the professionalism learning outcome (See Table 10) illustrate that students meet our expectations for each item being assessed. The performance in 2007-2008 is consistent with the cumulative data.

Table 10 from Undergraduate Program Exit Survey: Questions Relating to Reflection and Personal Integrity

Semester	Item #	Section	Topic	N	Mean (1-6)
F '07 & S '08	36	Professionalism	Evaluates choices/actions	154	5.64
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	36	Professionalism	Evaluates choices/actions	301	5.66
F '07 & S '08	37	Professionalism	Seeks growth opportunities	153	5.54
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	37	Professionalism	Seeks growth opportunities	300	5.58
F '07 & S '08	38a	Professionalism	Prof/School personnel	153	5.62
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	38a	Professionalism	Prof/School personnel	299	5.63
F '07 & S '08	38b	Professionalism	Prof/Parents	151	5.49
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	38b	Professionalism	Prof/Parents	295	5.50
F '07 & S '08	38c	Professionalism	Prof/community agencies	151	5.27
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	38c	Professionalism	Prof/community agencies	295	5.26
F '07 & S '08	39	Professionalism	School improvement	139	5.26
Cumulative F '06 – S '08	39	Professionalism	School improvement	265	5.28

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). (See Table 4). Students are expected to attain a score that meets or exceeds a nationally norm-referenced “cut-off” score that serves as a general predictor of success as a professional teacher. Elementary Education majors passed this test at a 98.8% rate (See Table 4).

4. Describe the process by which faculty reviewed the results and decided on actions and/or revisions that were indicated by them.

A number of the elementary faculty reviewed the assessment data reports for 2007-2008, and their comments served as the basis for the answers to questions #4-7 in this report. The assessment reports were available to all faculty members in the department, and the department chair particularly solicited the comments from the following program coordinators: the Block A coordinator, the Block B coordinator, the coordinator of the Professional Development Schools, the Director of Field Experiences, and the department chair.

Some concerns that were identified by the reviewers included:

- **Diversity**
(Table 2 from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation). One item in this table had less than 80% of the students at the proficient level:
 - Item 2 on “*Demonstrating Knowledge of Students*” had only 77.5% of the student teachers at the proficient level in 2007-2008 academic year, and 77.2% for the cumulative data.
- **Critical Thinking**
(Table 6 from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation). Three items in this table had less than 80% of the students at the proficient level:
 - Item 12 on “*Communicating with Students*” in the 2007-2008 academic year at 79.4%
 - Item 13 on “*Questioning and Discussion Techniques*” in the 2007-2008 academic year at 79.9%, and 75.2% for the cumulative data.
 - Item 15 on “*Using Assessment in Instruction*” in the 2007-2008 academic year at 75.7%

(Table 7 from the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey). One item in this table had less than the target proficiency level of 5.0:

 - Item 1d in General Education concerning “Problem Solving” had a mean of 4.76 for 2007-2008, and the cumulative score was 4.79.
- **Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity**
(Table 9 from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation). Four items in this table had less than 80% of the students at the proficient level:
 - Item 17 on “*Reflecting on Teaching*” in 2007-2008 academic year at 79.7%
 - Item 19 on “*Communicating with Families*” in the 2007-2008 academic year at 72.8%, and 73.3% for the cumulative data.

5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that have been implemented in response to the assessment results.

The actions taken last year appear to have stabilized student performance in many different areas. The direct measures include the Student Teaching Portfolio, the Student Teaching Final Evaluation, and the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) test. The Indirect measure was the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. In each of these measures, the student performance was equal to or better than the performance from the previous year.

The three areas of concern identified last year again showed up in this year’s review, and continued attention will be given to each of those areas. A few additional items showed up as areas of concern, and these are discussed in the questions below.

6. Describe the effects of last year’s actions on student learning.

Here is a discussion of actions that took place since last year’s progress report about areas of concern or weakness identified in the assessment data.

The Revised Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. During 2007-2008, this was the second year that we used a completely revised version of the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey (see Tables 3, 7, and 10 for data from the survey). The redesigned survey more directly aligns the survey questions with expected outcomes of the program, which are based on our *Conceptual Framework*. We want the mean for each statement to correspond with an “Agree” response (i.e., 5.00 or greater). Survey results indicate that students perform well above the 5.00 level on all but one item (Table 7, item 1d concerning Problem Solving in the General Education category).

We speculate that students are not certain what “problem solving” means in the exit survey since they don’t take any particular general education course on that topic. Thus, many students may simply check that they “somewhat agree” (a score of 4). The very strong student performance on the Principles of Learning and Teaching test (see table 4) and on the critical thinking indicators in the student teaching portfolio (see Table 5) suggest that students, in fact, are capable of problem solving and critical thinking and that the lower scoring on the exit survey question concerning problem solving may be due to their uncertainty about what course the question is directed for.

Diversity. Data from Tables 1, 3, and 4 do not indicate any problems with students showing proficiency about diversity. In Table 2, however, students showed less strength about “Demonstrating Knowledge of Students” in the Student Teaching Final Evaluation in 2007-2008 and in the cumulative data.

Due to concerns about the diversity scores in previous years, the College of Education enacted a professional development seminar series from February 2006 to March 2008 dealing with issues of student diversity issues (e.g., poverty, special needs, race/ethnicity, ESL, etc.) to more comprehensively accommodate students’ needs and reinforce efforts in courses where diversity is the primary emphasis. Faculty teaching courses in Block A and Block B have given increased attention to demonstrating knowledge of students. We will continue to monitor student performance in this area and consider whether additional attention needs to be given to this area.

However, there are several other indicators of student strength in the knowledge of diversity and the job decisions related to student diversity. These indicators include: (1) students’ self-ratings on their knowledge and ability to address diversity are high in the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey (see Table 3), (2) their scores on the Principles of learning and Teaching test are high (see Table 4), (3) their student teaching portfolio performance concerning contextual information (e.g., student diversity) are high (see Table 1), and (4) all other diversity indicators in Table 2 indicate students’ capability to use and apply diversity information when making instructional decisions. Therefore, while the score for item 2 (demonstrating knowledge of students) in Table 2 is a little low, we believe the other assessment measures cited above indicate overall competence in this area.

Critical Thinking. Data from Table 5 from the Student Teaching Portfolio indicate a very high level of student proficiency concerning teaching tasks requiring critical thinking.

Three items in Table 6 from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation are slightly below the target level of proficiency. Faculty teaching courses in Block A and Block B gave increased attention to these areas in this past year. Starting in fall 2009, all students will take a required Core Teaching Skills which includes information on questioning and discussion skills, communicating with students, and assessments. Starting in spring 2010, all students will take a required course on Classroom Assessment. We will continue to monitor student performance in this area and consider whether additional attention needs to be given to this area. However, we believe these new required courses will lead to improved student performance in the three low items in Table 6.

Student ratings on the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey (Table 7) were all in the target area for proficiency except item 1d on Problem Solving. The problem solving question was discussed earlier in the section on the Program Exit Survey.

Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity. Data from Tables 8 and 10 do not indicate any problems showing student proficiency about reflection and professional integrity. Data from Table 9 from the Student Teaching Final Evaluation indicate the desired proficiency in all areas except two—item 17 concerning “Reflecting on Teaching” and item 19 on “Communicating with Families.” Faculty teaching courses in Block A and Block B gave increased attention to these areas in this past year. We will continue to monitor student performance in this area and consider whether additional attention needs to be given to this area. The slightly low score on Reflecting on Teaching came as a surprise since written reflections of one’s teaching is a requirement in many courses and practica. However, in student teaching, we do not require written reflections of lessons, and thus the supervisors filling out the student teaching final evaluation may have scored this item lower due to the fact that they never read any written reflections from the student teachers. There also was a lower score on the question on Communicating with Families during student teaching. It may be that this simply not a suitable question concerning the student teaching experience. Cooperating teachers typically communicate with the parents and do not expect the student teacher to do so. Consequently, the supervisors filling out the student teaching final evaluation form may have put a lower rating simply due to the fact that the student teacher did not communicate with the parents (as they were requested not to by the cooperating teacher). We may need to remove this as a viable question.

7. Describe your plans for the current year (2008-2009), including any significant changes to the degree program SLOs or to the general assessment strategy.

Some new courses in the degree program will go into effect starting in fall 2009 and others go into effect in spring 2010 and also fall 2010. Those new courses address many topics, but they should help student knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to some of the weak areas discussed in this report. These include knowledge of students, communicating with students, questioning and discussion techniques, using assessment in instruction, reflecting on teaching, and communicating with families.

A number of the lower scores in the various tables were from the Student Teaching Final Evaluations, which are filled out by the cooperating teachers and the college supervisors. That evaluation form uses a 7-point rubric with rubric score #1 being unsatisfactory, scores 2-4 being basic, and scores 5-7 being proficient. We think that the cooperating teachers and college supervisors who fill out the rating forms have different points of view about what performance is proficient and what performance is basic. That is, one supervisor might put a rating of 4 for upper basic while another supervisor might put a 5, which is in the proficient category. Another issue concerns the label of “basis.” Basic actually is acceptable performance, and thus it may be misleading to label performances with rubric scores of 5-7 as proficient when student receiving rubric scores of 2-4 really are doing acceptable work.

In relation to these scoring issues, the department should next:

- Examine the labels on the rubric (i.e., unsatisfactory, basic, proficient) and consider having more precise labels for each rubric number. (e.g., unsatisfactory, weak, marginal, acceptable, strong, outstanding, extraordinarily distinguished).
- Consider which rubric numbers on the student teaching final evaluation form should be included in the proficient category (i.e., we may go down to a lower number than 5 to indicate the lowest level of acceptable performance).