

# College of Education

## Department of Secondary Education

Student Learning Outcome Progress Report

Academic Year: 2007-2008

Date: March 1, 2009

---

Degree Program: B.S. in Secondary Education (CIP Code 13.1205)

Person preparing report: *Dr. Lawrence C. Scharmann, Chair, Department of Secondary Education*

---

The link to the department website where degree-program student learning outcomes are posted:

<http://coe.ksu.edu/departments/seced.htm>

Is the Alignment Matrix for the degree program attached? No – see website link above.

**1. Student Learning Outcomes<sup>1</sup>** – *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.*

The department identified a number of student learning outcomes for the B.S. in Secondary 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, based on developmental levels, and 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]).

<sup>1</sup> The student learning outcomes contained in this document are but a subset of a broad, comprehensive evaluation of our secondary education program outcomes, documented for the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). Please refer to the NCATE Institutional Report and accompanying electronic exhibit room at the following website <https://coe.ksu.edu/ncate/login.php?urlreq=/ncate/index.php> (password = available upon request) to examine these outcomes.

**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, based on developmental levels, and 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.

<p>3. <i>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]).</p>	<p><i>Student Teaching Portfolio</i></p>		<p>All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).</p>
	<p><i>Student Teaching Final Evaluation</i></p>		<p>All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).</p>
		<p><i>Undergraduate Program Exit Survey</i></p>	<p>All students completing student teaching (the capstone field experience).</p>
	<p><i>The Principles of Learning and Teaching Test: Praxis II</i></p>		<p>All students who have completed student teaching and are applying for licensure.</p>

**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). Students are expected 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). Table 1 illustrates that 93.6% of the students meet the “proficient” standard for Entry 2 of the student teaching portfolio related to the diversity learning outcome. This result is consistent with data from previous years (See Cumulative Data, Table 1).

Table 1. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 2)

Academic Year	No. of Students	Unsatisfactory (<60%)	Basic (60-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1 (1.2%)</b>	<b>4 (5.1%)</b>	<b>73 (93.6%)</b>
Cumulative Data 2005-2008	353	1 (< 1%)	21 (5.9%)	331 (93.8%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. The following components from the final evaluation of student teaching represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to “diversity” issues:
  - Category 1/Domain 1, component b – Demonstrating Knowledge of Students
  - Category 2/Domain 2, component a – Creating an Environment of Respect
  - Category 3/Domain 3, component e – Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness
  - Category 4/Domain 4, component f – Showing Professionalism

Table 2 illustrates that for each of the four components representing a measure of diversity issues, students scored at a “proficient” level for Category/Domain 2, 3, & 4 at the target level (80% or better). However, the percent of secondary education graduates was slightly less than target (78.8) for Category/Domain 1 (Demonstrating Knowledge of Students). The data for the 2007-2008 academic year are consistent with the cumulative data (78.7) over the past three years.

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

Academic Year	Category/Domain	Component	Percent Proficient
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>78.8</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	1	b	78.7
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>89.4</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	2	a	89.2
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>84.4</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	3	e	84.6
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>86.2</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	f	87.6

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. The exit survey requests students to respond to individual items on a six-point scale (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 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).*

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 diversity learning outcome (See Table 3) illustrate that students meet our expectations for each item. Students are consistent for items 12, 13, 14, and 15, over both years in which these data were available.

Table 3. Diversity Indicators (from Undergraduate Program Exit Survey)

Acad. Year	Item	Section	Topic	N	Mean
2006-2007	12	Students & Learning	Adap/Developmental Stages	99	5.09
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>Students &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Adap/Developmental Stages</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.19</b>
2006-2007	13	Students & Learning	Instr. Oppor./Diverse Learners	100	5.12
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>Students &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Instr. Opp./Diverse Learners</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.24</b>
2006-2007	14	Students & Learning	Lrng. Strat./Diverse Learners	99	5.22
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>Students &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Lrng. Strat./Diverse Learners</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>5.25</b>
2006-2007	15	Students & Learning	Adapt Tchg./Diverse Learners	100	5.13
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>Students &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Adapt Tchg./Diverse Learners</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.21</b>

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). 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. Secondary Education majors passed this test at a 98% rate (See Table 4).

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

Academic Year	Number of Students	Percent Passing	Percent Failing
<b>2007-2008</b>	174	97.7%	2.3%
Cumulative Data 2004-2008	559	98.2%	1.8%

*Instruction: Critical Thinking.*

- Measure 1 (Direct): Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Parts 1-3). Students are expected 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 = 12; max. score part 3 = 6). Table 5 illustrates that 87-98% of the students meet the “proficient” standard 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
  - Entry 3, Part 2 – Instructional Design
  - Entry 3, Part 3 – Demonstration of Integration

Table 5. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Parts 1-3).

Academic Year	Part	No. of Students	Unsatisfactory (<60%)	Basic (60-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1 (1.3%)</b>	<b>1 (1.3%)</b>	<b>76 (97.6%)</b>
Cumulative Data 2005-2008	1	352	1 (< 1%)	20 (5.7%)	332 (94.3%)
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1 (1.3%)</b>	<b>9 (11.5%)</b>	<b>68 (87.0%)</b>
Cumulative Data 2005-2008	2	352	1 (< 1%)	46 (13.1%)	306 (86.9%)
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>3 (3.8%)</b>	<b>5 (6.4%)</b>	<b>70 (89.7%)</b>
Cumulative Data 2005-2008	3	353	3 (<1%)	36 (10.2%)	314 (89.0%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. The following components from the final evaluation of student teaching represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to “critical thinking” issues related to instructional decision-making:
  - Category 1/Domain 1, component c – Establishing Instructional Outcomes
  - Category 1/Domain 1, component e – Designing Coherent Instruction
  - Category 2/Domain 2, component b – Establishing a Culture for Learning
  - Category 3/Domain 3, component a – Communicating with Students
  - Category 3/Domain 3, component b – Questioning and Discussion Techniques
  - Category 3/Domain 3, component c – Engaging Students in Learning
  - Category 3/Domain 3, component d – Using Assessment in Instruction

Table 6 illustrates that for each of the components representing a measure of critical thinking instructional issues, students scored at a “proficient” level for four of the seven components. Components in which students did not reach the critical 80% target percentage were: Category 1 (component c) “Establishing Instructional Outcomes,” Category 3 (component b) “Questioning and Discussion Techniques” (Note: This represents three consecutive years with this same category not reaching the 80% target percentage), and Category 3 (component d) “Using Assessment in Instruction.”

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

Academic Year	Category/Domain	Component	Percent Proficient
2006-2007	1	c	80.7
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>78.8</b>
2006-2007	1	e	87.0
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>80.5</b>
2006-2007	2	b	88.0
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>83.7</b>
2006-2007	3	a	84.5
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>82.1</b>
2006-2007	3	b	73.7
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>71.1</b>
2006-2007	3	c	85.8
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>80.0</b>
2006-2007	3	d	86.4
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>77.9</b>

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. The exit survey requests students to respond to individual items on a six-point scale (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 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).*

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 critical thinking learning outcome (See Table 7) illustrate that students meet our expectations for each item for the two years this data has been assessed.

Table 7. Critical Thinking (from the Undergraduate Program Exit Survey)

Sem.	Item	Section	Topic	N	Mean
2006-2007	1d	General Education	Problem Solving	96	5.09
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>1d</b>	<b>General Education</b>	<b>Problem Solving</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>5.20</b>
2006-2007	9	Students & Learning	Individuals develop intellectually	100	5.02
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>Students &amp; Learning</b>	<b>Individuals develop intellectually</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>5.21</b>
2006-2007	17	Content & Pedagogy	Tools of Inquiry	100	5.08
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>Content &amp; Pedagogy</b>	<b>Tools of Inquiry</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>5.26</b>
2006-2007	19	Content & Pedagogy	Activities to Connect Concepts	100	5.22
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>Content &amp; Pedagogy</b>	<b>Activities to Connect Concepts</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.30</b>
2006-2007	20	Content & Pedagogy	Relationships between Subjects	100	5.22
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>Content &amp; Pedagogy</b>	<b>Relationships between Subjects</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>5.35</b>
2006-2007	30	Instruction	Strategies to encourage critical thinking	100	5.15
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Strategies to encourage critical thinking</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.24</b>
2006-2007	31	Instruction	Strategies to encourage problem solving	100	5.15
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Strategies to encourage problem solving</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.13</b>
2006-2007	32	Instruction	Strategies to encourage reading	100	5.09
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>Instruction</b>	<b>Strategies to encourage reading</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>5.06</b>

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). 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. Secondary Education majors passed this test at essentially a 98% rate (See Table 4).

*Professionalism: Reflection and Professional Integrity.*

- Measure 1 (Direct): Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3; Part 5 – Self-Evaluation of Instructional Unit). Students are expected 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). Table 8 illustrates that only 76.9% of the students meet the “proficient” standard for Entry 3, Part 5 related to the professionalism learning outcome. (Note: This result represents failure to meet the target percentage in two of the past three years, although the overall cumulative data meets the target level).

Table 8. Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 3, Part 5)

Academic Year	No. of Students	Unsatisfactory (< 60%)	Basic (60-79%)	Proficient (80-100%)
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>2 (2.6%)</b>	<b>16 (20.5%)</b>	<b>60 (76.9%)</b>
Cumulative Data 2005-2008	311	5 (1.6%)	46 (14.8%)	260 (83.6%)

- Measure 2 (Direct): Student Teaching Final Evaluation. . Individuals are considered “proficient” for a given component if they score 5.0 or greater on a 0-7 scale. The following

components from the final evaluation of student teaching represent a measure of students’ understanding and responsiveness to specific “professionalism” issues:

- Category 4/Domain 4, component a – Reflecting on Teaching
- Category 4/Domain 4, component b – Maintaining Accurate Records
- Category 4/Domain 4, component c – Communicating with Families
- Category 4/Domain 4, component d – Participating in a Professional Community
- Category 4/Domain 4, component e – Growing and Developing Professionally
- Category 4/Domain 4, component f – Demonstrating Professionalism (new 2007-2008)

Table 9 illustrates that for each of the components representing a measure of professionalism issues, students scored at a “proficient” level for essentially five of six components. (Note: The result for Category 4/Domain, component “c” represents three consecutive years not attaining the target percentage).

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

Academic Year	Category/Domain	Component	Percent Proficient
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>a</b>	<b>87.0</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	a	84.3
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>b</b>	<b>85.4</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	b	85.8
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>c</b>	<b>65.2</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	c	66.8
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>d</b>	<b>79.6</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	d	79.7
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>e</b>	<b>83.3</b>
Cumulative Data 2006-2008	4	e	83.5
<b>2007-2008 *</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>f</b>	<b>86.1</b>

\* New for 2007-2008

- Measure 3 (Indirect): Undergraduate Program Exit Survey. The exit survey requests students to respond to individual items on a six-point scale (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.

Table 10. Reflection and Professional Integrity (from Undergraduate Program Exit Survey)

Acad. Year	Item	Section	Topic	N	Mean
2006-2007	36	Professionalism	Evaluates choices/actions	99	5.43
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>Evaluates choices/actions</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.42</b>
2006-2007	37	Professionalism	Seeks growth opportunities	99	5.41
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>Seeks growth opportunities</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>5.30</b>
2006-2007	38a	Professionalism	Professionalism/School personnel	100	5.63
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>38a</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>Professionalism/School personnel</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>5.51</b>
2006-2007	38b	Professionalism	Professionalism/Parents	99	5.36
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>38b</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>Professionalism/Parents</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>5.26</b>
2006-2007	38c	Professionalism	Professionalism/Community agencies	99	5.19
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>38c</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>Professionalism/Community agencies</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>5.12</b>
2006-2007	39	Professionalism	School improvement	89	5.30
<b>2007-2008</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>Professionalism</b>	<b>School improvement</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>5.35</b>

- Measure 4 (Direct): Principles of Learning and Teaching Test (Praxis II). 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. Secondary Education majors passed this test at a 98% 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.**

Faculty reviewed the results at a faculty meeting on December 18, 2008 and approved the departmental report. Three concerns identified for 2007-2008 are persistent ones; three are exclusive to the reporting year and include for discussion and prospective action:

- Diversity – Category 1/Domain 1 (component b) “Demonstrating Knowledge of Students.” Although nearly rated at target percentage (78.8%), this concern was also identified in 2005-2006.
- Critical Thinking – Category 1/Domain 1 (component c) “Establishing Instructional Objectives.” Although not identified previously as a concern in previous years, this component hovered at or just above the target percentage. This year’s rating fell below the target percentage for the first time (78.8%).
- Critical Thinking – Category 3/Domain 3 (component b) “Questioning and Discussion Techniques.” Only 71.1% of our undergraduate program completers were rated as proficient. This has been a persistent concern for three consecutive academic years.
- Critical Thinking – Category 3/Domain 3 (component d) “Using Assessment in Instruction” is a reworded statement from previous years. Only 77.9% were rated as proficient for the current year. (Note: This is an anomaly from all other reporting years).
- Professionalism – Self-Evaluation of Instructional Unit (Entry 3, Part 5; Student Teaching Portfolio). Only 76.9% of our undergraduate program completers were rated as

proficient. This result represents a failure to meet the target percentage in two of the past three years, although the overall cumulative data meets the target level.

- Professionalism – Category 4/Domain 4 (component c) “Communicating with Families” was rated as 65.2% proficient and is a persistent issue over all reporting years.

**5. Describe the actions and/or revisions that were (or will be) implemented in response to the assessment results.**

Our revised survey at the end of Student Teaching was implemented for the second time (see Tables 3, 7, and 10). Revisions were enacted to directly align the questions on the survey with expected outcomes of the program. Student learning outcomes are based on our *Conceptual Framework*.

The College of Education enacted a professional development seminar series dealing with diversity issues (e.g., poverty, special needs, race/ethnicity, ESL, etc.) intended to more comprehensively accommodate faculty needs and reinforce efforts in courses where diversity is the primary emphasis. This seminar series, highly rated by faculty members, did not appreciatively alter student learning outcomes (See Table 2). Department plans are to examine syllabi for courses in which diversity is a direct outcome and examine related syllabi in courses that should directly apply/reinforce these outcomes.

Department took a series of actions to address lower than expected scores in specific sub-categories of Critical Thinking and Professionalism, since a pattern for specific items has taken place for either three consecutive years or two of the past three years.

With respect to “Establishing Instructional Outcomes” (Critical Thinking), the percentage of students hovers close to 80% proficient. This result is offset by the exceptional results obtained for Entry 3 – Parts 1 & 2, in which related outcomes for “Learning Goals and Objectives” (rated at 97.6% proficient) and Instructional Design (rated at 87% proficient) are so highly and consistently rated well.

With respect to “Questioning and Discussion Techniques” (Critical Thinking), it is still not clear whether students perform more modestly because they lack the skills to perform more adeptly. This was a topic of discussion with clinical instructors and cooperating teachers to be addressed and emphasized over the past academic year. Unfortunately, the same results were obtained.

The same quandary is present with respect to “Communication with Families” (Professionalism), since it is uncertain whether students are performing more modestly or that the teachers with whom they are placed continue to handle communication with parents. Again, this was a topic for discussion with clinical instructors and cooperating teachers. The results here continue to be dismal (as operationally defined as 80% proficient as the target outcome). It is a possibility that we may remove this item as a metric since it appears to be the opinion of cooperating teachers that they do not wish students teacher interns, in such a vulnerable inexperienced position to deal most directly with parents. The cooperating teachers desire to be a both a buffer for the student teacher intern, while modeling best practice in mentoring them. This is also partly a dilemma in using the Danielson Framework, since it is intended to reflect professionally experienced teacher behaviors as much or more so than that of novice teachers. Indeed, the Danielson model does not predict that student teachers should be proficient – the training manual predicts the vast majority of student teachers to be “basic.” Thus, the fact that our target outcomes fail to reach 80% proficient should not be of immediate concern.

Finally, concerning “Self-Evaluation of Instructional Unit” (Professionalism; Entry 3, Part 5), Block 2 instructors, University Supervisors, and clinical instructors were to alert methods students and student teachers to the expectations implied in the scoring key to more appropriately comprehend the import of this criterion. Again, the results did not improve for the current year of assessment [although the cumulative data indicates less cause for concern (See Table 8, cumulative data) since the rating for proficiency is nearly 84% over a three year period].

**6. Describe the assessment activities and results to date, describe your assessment plans for the current year.**

In terms of overall results, students perform at a level lower than expected in only six categories (out of a total of 58 assessed items). Thus, students perform at the expected level or higher on 90% of the program outcomes selected to be monitored for reporting purposes.

Much of our assessment of student learning outcomes involves the use of the Danielson Framework for Teaching, as it is manifest in the Final Evaluation of Student Teaching and Student Teaching Portfolio. The designer of the Framework herself assumes that student teaching interns are expected to be merely “basic” and rarely “proficient.” That our interns are rated on 52 metrics out of 58 as 80% proficient (or higher) is a tribute to the quality of our program (as rated by university supervisors and cooperating teachers/clinical instructors making independent judgments). Nonetheless, as a program fully committed to continuous improvement, our plans for the current year are to reexamine the corpus of expected outcomes. Some may need to be removed or replaced. Others reinforced anew.