

**SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (SOE)
Undergraduate Department**

**OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN AND 2015 REPORT
for the 2014-2015 Academic Year**

SOE Mission

The Baker University School of Education is committed to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.

SOE Vision

The School of Education provides quality programs grounded in a tradition of academic excellence and responds to the educational needs of the future.

SOE Beliefs

The School of Education believes a confident and competent educational leader

- Advocates for all students and their learning successes;
- Has a strong knowledge base and sense of beliefs and values supported by educational research and best practices;
- Has the commitment and skills to transfer knowledge, beliefs, and values into policy and practice;
- Demonstrates interpersonal practices that advance the welfare and dignity of all persons; and
- Maintains an unremitting drive for improvement.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Undergraduate School of Education (USOE) is guided by the SOE Conceptual Framework that includes 15 undergraduate program objectives. These objectives represent skills that are expected of confident and competent educational leaders. The first ten program objectives are closely linked to the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and Charlotte Danielson's standards outlined in her book, *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. These first thirteen program objectives are closely related to the KSDE professional education standards and are assessed on ratings provided by program graduates and their employers, while program objectives 14 and 15 are unique to the undergraduate education program. Data are collected on all 15 program objectives throughout the teacher education program. The

Baker University's mission statement identifies a community "committed to assuring student learning and developing confident, competent and responsible contributors to society" (Baker University Mission Statement August 2008). The five CAS Educational Goals address 1) liberal studies and scholarship, 2) application of knowledge, 3) effective communication, 4) global citizenship, and 5) health and wellness perspectives (CAS Educational Goals/Student Learning Outcomes adopted by CAS Faculty Senate, May 3, 2005). A review of the Undergraduate Department's program objectives reveals many links with both the university mission statement and the CAS Learning Goals/Student Learning Outcomes, especially the ones that deal with liberal studies and scholarship, application of knowledge, and effective communication.

USOE Program Objectives

Upon completion of their course work, candidates for teacher licensure will demonstrate:

1. The ability to use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline as s/he teaches, creating learning opportunities, including integrated learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for all students.
2. The ability to engage students in learning through the use of multiple and effective instructional strategies appropriate to students' developmental levels and knowledge of content.
3. The ability to use information about students' interests, abilities, skills, backgrounds, and peer relationships to make knowledge accessible to all students, including students with exceptionalities and diverse learners.
4. The ability to use a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage the students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.
5. An understanding of individual and group motivation and student behavior that fosters positive and safe learning environments and encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.
6. The ability to use his/her knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
7. The ability to design and plan instruction based on knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of students, knowledge of resources, and knowledge of learning goals.
8. The ability to use multiple types of both formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continual development for all learners.
9. The ability to be a reflective practitioner capable of being held to a high standard of ethical behavior, professional skills, and personal dispositions in the areas of family communications, accurate record-keeping, professional growth and responsibilities, and contributions to the school and district.
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.
11. The ability to integrate across and within content fields to enrich the curriculum, develop reading and thinking skills, and facilitate all students' abilities to understand relationships between subject areas.
12. The ability to use skills in technology to gather and analyze information, enhance instructional practices, facilitate professional productivity, assist with educational change, and help all students use instructional technology effectively.
13. The ability to be reflective practitioners who use knowledge of historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education to guide educational practices.
14. An understanding of school law, educational policies, local, state and national educational structures, professional licensing procedures, and professional organizations.
15. An understanding of the SOE Conceptual Framework which is defined as the Mission, Vision, Beliefs, Commitments, Program Objectives, Essential Characteristics (Personal and Professional Skills and Dispositions), and Evaluation Process.

The Current Plan

The undergraduate program began collecting summative assessment data via *TaskStream*, a web-based electronic portfolio/data collection program in most professional education courses during the 2005-2006 academic year.

The *USOE Outcomes Assessment Plan* involves standardized assessments, GPA data, and performance assessments based on the program objectives. Additional summative data collected to determine student candidacy are also included in this report.

Multiple performance assessments have been adopted or developed to measure candidate progress on program objectives. Rubrics for performance assessments, when appropriate, can be found within each tabbed section.

Candidate performance in specified areas, such as lesson planning, is measured by the same rubric throughout the program. As previously mentioned, performance assessments are both formative and summative. Most summative performance data is kept on *TaskStream*.

The *USOE Outcomes Assessment Plan* is attached. This plan includes a number of assessments that are a) quantitative and qualitative and b) formative and summative. A matrix linking program objectives to performance assessments in each professional education course is included. This matrix is the *course component* of the larger plan. Each entry in Column 1 identifies the required core professional education course, Column 2 delineates which department member is responsible for collecting the data during that particular course, Column 3 indicates whether the assessment is Formative (F) or Summative (S), Column 4 identifies the performance assessment used, and the remainder of the matrix identifies what program objectives are met by each assessment.

Below are listed the data collected and analyzed by the department.

Data collected from standardized assessments include:

Standardized Assessments

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE, or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST);
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS; and
3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS.

GPA Data

4. Cumulative GPA scores.

Performance Assessments

5. Electronic Portfolio (ED 265)
6. Authentic assessments (ED 309)
7. Unit test writing (ED 309)
8. Life-Long Learning (ED309)
9. Legal Issues (ED309)
10. Parent-Teacher Conference (ED 309)
11. Parent Email (ED 309)
12. Case Studies (ED 313)
13. Group presentations (ED 343)
14. Educational Mission Statement (ED 343)
15. Dispositions (special needs populations), (ED 345)
16. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 345)
17. Basic Components (ED 366/368)
18. Lesson plan writing (ED 366/368)
19. Visual presentation (ED 366/368)
20. Developmental portfolio (ED 440/460)
21. Program objectives (ED 440/460)
22. Differentiated Instruction Cooperating teacher/Supervising teacher (ED 450/470/480)
23. Lesson plan writing (ED 450/470/480)
24. Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio- all tasks (ED 450/470/480)
25. Demographics KPTP Task 1 (diverse populations), (IS 199)
26. Dispositions journal (IS 199)
27. Dispositions (Most Professional Education Courses)
28. Candidate performance ratings/cooperating teachers (ED 450/470/480)

29. Candidate performance ratings/supervising teachers (IHE) (ED 450/470/480)
30. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates
31. Ratings provided by program graduates

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

32. Professional and content area GPA scores
33. Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores (Most Professional Education Courses)
34. PDS practica evaluations (ED 244/ED 320)

Additional Data Collected for the Educator Preparation Providers

35. Advising survey

Additional Data Collected for Federal Reports

36. Title II GPA/ACT data
37. GRIT Scale
38. Education Advisory Council Survey
39. Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of Elementary Content Standards
40. USOE Assessment Data Analysis Responses/Actions/Changes Table

ASSESSMENT DATA ANALYSIS

Summative data are analyzed and evaluated annually by the undergraduate faculty members and shared with the Education Advisory Council and the Council for Undergraduate Teacher Education (CUTE). Feedback from these groups has often led to recommended program changes based on these data. Past examples of program changes include but are not limited to: classroom management being more explicitly addressed in some professional education and methods courses; adding a one credit hour classroom management course for secondary education candidates; and upgrading technology in our classrooms.

Standardized Assessments

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE, or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST);
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS; and
3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS.

GPA Data

4. Cumulative GPA scores.

Performance Assessments

5. Electronic Portfolio (ED 265)
6. Authentic assessments (ED 309)
7. Unit test writing (ED 309)
8. Life-Long Learning (ED309)
9. Legal Issues (ED309)
10. Parent-Teacher Conference (ED 309)
11. Parent Email (ED 309)
12. Case Studies (ED 313)
13. Group presentations (ED 343)
14. Educational Mission Statement (ED 343)
15. Dispositions (special needs populations), (ED 345)
16. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 345)
17. Basic Components (ED 366/368)
18. Lesson plan writing (ED 366/368)
19. Visual presentation (ED 366/368)
20. Developmental portfolio (ED 440/460)
21. Program objectives (ED 440/460)
22. Differentiated Instruction Cooperating teacher/Supervising teacher (ED 450/470/480)
23. Lesson plan writing (ED 450/470/480)
24. Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (KPTP)- all tasks (ED 450/470/480)
25. Demographics KPTP Task 1 (diverse populations), (IS 199)
26. Dispositions journal (IS 199)
27. Dispositions (Most Professional Education Courses)
28. Candidate performance ratings/cooperating teachers (ED 450/470/480)
29. Candidate performance ratings/supervising teachers (IHE) (ED 450/470/480)
30. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates
31. Ratings provided by program graduates

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

32. Professional and content area GPA scores
33. Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores (Most Professional Education Courses)
34. PDS practica evaluations (ED 244/ED 320)

Additional Data Collected for the Educator Preparation Providers

35. Advising survey

Additional Data Collected for Federal Reports

36. Title II GPA/ACT data
37. GRIT Scale
38. Education Advisory Council Survey
39. Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of Elementary Content Standards
40. USOE Assessment Data Analysis Responses/Actions/Changes Table

USOE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

2014-2015

Matrix of Performance Assessments Collected in Courses 2014-2015

Course	Responsible for		Assessment	Program Objectives														
				1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Name	Collecting Data		Area															
ED 243	JF	(F)	Group Presentations	X		X		X	X		X		X		X			
		(F)	Lesson Plans	X		X	X			X								
		(F)	Dispositions			X		X				X						
ED 265	KD	(S)	Electronic Portfolio	X					X			X			X		X	
ED 309	CP	(S)	Authentic Assessment			X					X			X				
		(S)	Unit Test								X							
		(S)	Lifelong Learning									X						
		(S)	Educational Legal Issues														X	
		(S)	Dispositions (P-T Conf)					X	X			X	X					
		(S)	Parent Email						X				X		X			
		(F)	Dispositions				X		X				X					
ED 343	JF	(S)	Group Presentations	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X					
		(F)	PowerPoint						X						X			
		(S)	Educational Mission Statement									X					X	
ED 345	AW	(S)	Dispositions (special needs)			X	X	X	X	X	X		X					
		(S)	Differentiated Instruction Planning		X	X	X	X	X	X	X							
ED 366/368	CP	(S)	Unit-Basic Components	X	X		X	X		X	X			X	X			
		(S)	Lesson Plans	X		X	X	X		X								
		(S)	Visual Presentations		X				X	X				X				
		(S)	Final Project Multi-Genre Pres.	X	X	X	X							X			X	
		(S)	Unit Assessment Plan	X	X	X	X		X		X							
ED 440/460	JF/AW	(S)	Developmental Portfolio	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
		(S)	Program Objectives	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
ED 450/470/480	TS	(S)	Differentiated Instruction Ratings			X				X								
	TS	(S)	Coop. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
	TS	(S)	Sup. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	MS	(S)	Lesson Plans	X			X			X								
	MS	(S)	Dispositions			X		X				X						
	MS	(S)	KPTP Task 2, 3, and 4	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		
IS 199	CP	(S)	Dispositions - Journal (Div. pop. setting)			X		X				X						
		(F)	KPTP Sample Task 1 demographics			X		X				?						

Fall 2014

(F) = Formative Data
(S) = Summative Data

STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS

1. Basic Skills Scores by Content Area (C-BASE) F14-SP15, Attachment 1

The Kansas State Board of Education requires that all teacher education programs use a measurement of basic skills for program admittance. Several years ago, after surveying all Kansas colleges with teacher licensure, the School of Education approved the use of the C-BASE (College Basic Academic Subjects Examination), a standardized test published by the University of Missouri and required for all Missouri teacher licensure candidates as the preferred basic skills test. The cut score for Missouri teacher education candidates (235) was also approved for Baker undergraduate candidates. It is important to note that no student is permitted to student teach without passing all parts of the C-BASE.

A review of the 2014-2015 C-BASE test scores, compiled by majors, reveals that candidate mean scores for most content areas were above the cut score of 235. On an individual basis, out of 110 subtests taken, 101 were passed. This means that 92% of the subtests were passed. Overall, the mean basic skills score for all candidates in each of the three basic skills areas—English/Reading 262, Writing 272, and Math 289 are above the 235 cut score. The overall mean of 274 continues the trend of being significantly above the cut score of 235. Therefore, it appears that the vast majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate skills in English, math, and writing. However, a review of the data reveals three candidates who scored significantly below average on the English subtest.

It is also important to review the results of all teacher education candidates, not just those who were required to take a basic skills test. After a statewide review of basic skills requirements in Kansas teacher education programs, the Professional Education Council (currently known as School of Education Faculty Senate) voted in May 2006 to exempt students with a cumulative ACT score of 26 or above from taking a basic skills test. This year, six individuals were exempt from taking any of the basic skills tests. Therefore, while 29 candidates took the C-BASE in 2014-2015, another 6 students or 17% were exempt. In 2013-2014, 25% were exempt; 2014-2015, 23% were exempt; 26% were exempt in 2011-2012, and 28% were exempt in 2010-2011. The consistent exempt rate speaks well for the quality of the candidates choosing to pursue teacher education at Baker University.

Department Response: The department feels that the majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate basic skills. Based on their scores, the conclusion is that the quality of those students continues to be well above basic skills levels.

In analyzing the non-passing scores, department members agreed to make these students aware of the SAS tutoring opportunities. An electronic C-BASE study guide is posted on Moodle in ED 100 and low-performing candidates are encouraged to take a practice test prior to registering for the C-BASE. In addition, students who fail a section of the C-BASE are required to retake the section at the next testing opportunity. In that way, students who find it difficult to pass the C-BASE will be made aware of this difficulty early and will be counseled to reconsider their career choice.

It is important to understand that the C-BASE is taken during the first education course, ED 100 Teaching as a Career. Since ED 100 is an introductory course, not all students continue in the program; some of them are probably deterred by the basic skills test requirement.

2. Content Area Assessments by Content Areas F14-SP15, Attachment 2

Cut scores for content assessments have been in force since September 2005. A review of the content assessment scores for the 2014-2015 academic year reveals a 100% pass rate; not too shabby.

Department Response: No changes at this time

3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) by Content Area F14-SP15, Attachment 3

During the 2014-2015 academic year, 15 candidates who took the PLT standardized test of pedagogy passed the test for a pass rate of 100%. The mean PLT score for this year's candidates was 176, which is higher than the 161 cut score set by the state of Kansas. PLT tests were taken by candidates majoring in the areas of business, elementary education, Spanish, middle level science, and physical education.

Department Response: The department is pleased with the 100% pass rate and will continue the practice of requiring students in ED 309 to take a sample test and create individualized study guides.

GPA DATA

4. Cumulative GPA by Content Area F14-SP15, Attachment 4

The mean cumulative grade point average for 2014-2015 teacher licensure candidates in all content areas was 3.42. The mean cumulative grade point average for 2014-2015 teacher licensure candidates in elementary education was 3.48; for secondary education was 3.29 and middle-level candidates 3.31 for middle level candidates. The mean cumulative grade point average for teacher education candidates broken down into content areas ranged from a low of 3.11 in physical education to a high of 3.98 in Spanish. In between was art 3.29 (n=1), 3.44 for biology (n=2), business 3.78 (n=3) 3.31 in for middle level science (n=1), and 3.78 in business (N=1).

Department Response: Teacher licensure candidates' mean content GPA of 3.42 is the highest since 2007-2008. The department members decided to identify the two elementary education and one physical education majors with cum GPAs below 2.5 and examine their progress to determine if they transferred in low grade point averages, where they are in the program, how they performed on the C-BASE, and whether they've been counseled by academic advisor.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DATA

5. Electronic Portfolio (During ED 265) F14-SP15 Attachment 5

Data from the 2014- 2015 were reviewed. A mean of 9.49/10 or 94.93% was found for the 23 candidates who took the course. The overall mean for all elementary candidates was 9.63/10 while secondary candidates earned a mean score of 9.34/10.

Department Response: One secondary biology candidate did not do well on criterion 2 and 3 and a secondary math candidate did not do well on criterion 2. In both cases, candidates failed to include certain aspects noted on the rubric. The department will continue to monitor data and candidate performance on this assessment to ascertain whether any changes need to be made. As of this review, no changes are necessary to the assessment or the rubric.

6. Authentic Assessments (During ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 6

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must create an authentic assessment, with detailed assignment guidelines and grading rubrics. A review of the results on the authentic assessment revealed that, out of the 28 students assessed three candidates fell below basic on at least one criterion. Criteria 3, 4, and 5 had unsatisfactory scores. The average for all 28 candidates across all six criteria was 9.12 /10 or 91.15%. The total average for all elementary candidates was 9.03 and for secondary candidates, an average of 9.22. The three candidates who fell in the basic range or below, failed to include integral parts of the requirements outlined on the rubric.

Department Response: Continue with the assessment and analyze data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates. Continue the use of samples to provide model assignments for candidates' review. The instructor conferenced with candidates who had basic/unsatisfactory scores to ensure they understand the deficiency.

7. Unit Test Writing (During ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 7

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must write a unit test composed of objective and subjective questions and create a thorough grading key. A review of the results on the unit test revealed that, out of the 28 students assessed, two candidates fell below basic level on the criterion related to identifying levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The average for all five criteria was 9.23/10 or 92.3%. The total average for elementary candidates was 9.31 and for secondary candidates 9.18. The two candidates who fell in the basic range or below, failed to include integral parts of the requirements outlined on the rubric.

Department Response: Continue with the assessment and analyze data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates. Continue the use of samples to provide model assignments for candidates' review. The department believes the rubric and directions give guidance and the instructor should make candidates aware of the weighting on the rubric. This assessment helps to prepare the candidates for the unit required on the KPTP. The instructor conferenced with candidates who had basic/unsatisfactory scores to ensure they understood the content.

8. Life-Long Learning Paper (ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 8

This paper is assigned to help candidates reflect on their leadership experiences and connect them to current and future personal and professional growth. Candidates are encouraged to think about their capacity to make a positive difference in their teaching career. Twenty-Eight candidates completed the assignment with an over-all average of 9.38/10 or 93.81%. One elementary candidate scored in the basic range on criteria 2, organization and mechanics; all other criteria for all candidates was proficient or above.

Department Response: Continue with limited change. All candidates have access to a writing tutor and are encouraged to attend a peer editing session, especially those who appear to need some additional practice.

9. Educational Legal Issues (ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 9

Candidates review different court cases and discuss the implications for teachers. Twenty-eight candidates completed the assignment averaging 9.95/10 or 99.46%. The lowest score was a 9.25 with no significant difference between elementary and secondary candidates.

Department Response: Continue with current practices.

10. Parent-Teacher Conferences (ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 10

The parent-teacher simulation is designed to better prepare candidates for their actual conferences in the PK-12 setting. Students are given partially scripted scenarios and have to collect data that would fit the student/content/grade level and present their findings to the "parent" (another candidate who has been given a script on how to respond). An average of 9.44/10 or 94.39% was achieved by the 28 candidates, with no significant difference between elementary and secondary candidates.

Department Response: Continue with current practices. A perennial revision of the experience is on-going to make this assignment as authentic as possible.

11. Parent Email Response (ED 309) F14-SP15, Attachment 11

Candidates receive an email from a "parent" during a time frame designated on the syllabus and must respond within 24 hours. Candidates must address the concerns in the email courtesy, respect, and writing skills expected from a professional educator. All 28 candidates fared well with the average being 9.65/10 or 96.51%, with no significant difference occurring between elementary and secondary candidates.

Department Response: Continue with current practices.

12. Case Studies (ED 313) F14-SP15, Attachment 12

Candidates are expected to review a case study about an English Language Learner. After summarizing the case they must make recommendations concerning program options and explain at least eight effective instructional strategies. The 25 candidates averaged 8.72/10 or 87.19%. While the class average was “Proficient” or above, 8/17 elementary candidates had one or more criterion area in the “Basic” category and one candidate had four “unsatisfactory” ratings. While the secondary candidates performed better two of eight had one or more rankings in the “Basic” category.

Department Response: ED 313 is a new course with a new instructor. In an effort to fine tune the class expectations, the rubric for this assignment is being edited for clarity and appropriate detail. Increased “checking for understanding” will be exercised with the full expectation that increased experience will remedy the challenging areas.

13. Group Presentations (During ED 343) F14-SP15, Attachment 13

Candidates make group presentations in ED 343 Educational Psychology. A review of the 2014-2015 results indicated that there was an average score of 9.62/10 or 96.2% on the Group Presentation Assignment. All 26 candidates scored distinguished or proficient. The total average for the elementary candidates was 9.63/10 and for secondary candidates was 9.59/10.

Department Response: Overall, all candidates scored high. The lowest score (8.00, one group) occurred in Criteria 3, “Active Participation of Audience.” Continued modeling is needed for active participation. Analyze future data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates.

14. Educational Mission Statement (During ED 343) F14-SP15, Attachment 14

Candidates are encouraged to develop a mission statement that conveys their personal philosophy with clear evidence of purpose and goals stated with some creativity and originality. The average for the 26 candidates was 9.42/10 or 94.15%. No elementary or secondary candidate scored below proficient and no discrepancy was noted between the two groups.

Department Response: Overall, all candidates scored high. No changes are needed at this time.

15. Dispositions (Special Needs Population, during ED 345) F14-SP15, Attachment 15

Because the ability to display regard for children, be aware of their developmental needs, and treat all children with dignity is critical for successful teaching and learning, the department created a form designed to assess candidates’ disposition for working with Pk-12 students. Specifically in this course candidate Dispositions are rated using the candidate response, after viewing an LD simulation DVD. Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.25/10 (92.5%), while secondary candidates had an average score of 9.49/10 (94.9%). Only two candidates scored less than an 8 (proficient) and those scores were in the writing aptitude and/or the second criteria where the candidate in question failed to address the requirements on the rubric.

Department Response: No changes are needed at this time. All candidates have access to a writing tutor and will be encouraged to attend a peer editing session, especially those who appear to need some additional practice. The instructor conferenced with the candidates to ensure they understood the rubric requirements.

16. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During ED 345) F14-SP15, Attachment 16

Originally entitled “Accommodations,” this assessment is now called “Differentiated Instruction.” A review of the five criteria for this assessment revealed an overall average of 9.24 /10 or 92.44%. Elementary candidates had an average rating of 8.98/10 (N=12), while secondary candidates averaged 9.47/10 (N=14).

Department Response: No changes are needed at this time. While two elementary and one secondary student scored at “Basic” range in one or more criterion, conferences with the candidates revealed poor reading and/or

follow through on rubric requirements. Through conversation the candidates appeared to understand the content that was omitted in the assignment.

17. Unit Basic components and Strategies (During ED 366/368) F14-SP15, Attachment 17

This assignment requires candidates to complete the basic components of lesson planning. The 2014-2015 data, with an N= 29 reveal an overall mean of 9.37/10 or 93.67%. Changes to the instruction and some clarification on the rubric made this a more successful assignment this year over results from last year. Elementary candidates had an average rating of 9.41/10 (N=16), while secondary candidates scored a 9.32/10 (N=13). One elementary candidate and one secondary candidate scored “Basic” or below in six or more categories.

Department Response: Last year’s modifications to the assignment made a significant difference. The two students who had multiple criteria in the “Basic” range received feedback on their rubrics. Both students failed to thoroughly read the rubric and/or failed to include essential parts. Both understood how to do the task but failed to apply their knowledge.

18. Lesson Plan Writing (During ED 366/368) F14-SP15, Attachment 18

This was the second year in which elementary and secondary candidates took the course separately, with developmentally appropriate strategies and focuses of instruction for each group. For the 30 candidates who took the course during the fall ’14 or spring ’15 semester, the overall average of the 9 criteria measured in this assessment was 9.45/10, or 94.54% (N=30). Elementary candidates had an average rating of 9.54/10 (N=16), while secondary candidates scored a 9.35/10 (N=14). No candidate at either level scored below proficient in any area.

Department Response: Continue with current practices and continue to monitor progress.

19. Visual Presentations (During ED 366/368) F14-SP15, Attachment 19

Twenty-eight candidates completed the course during the fall ’14 and spring ’15 semesters, with an average of 9.55/10, or 95.5% on the four criteria of this assessment. Only one secondary candidate received a rating of basic on any criterion; all other scores were at the distinguished or proficient category. Candidates seem quite competent in the use of electronic media in making presentations, whether in the form of PowerPoint, or through the Prezi program. Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.73/10 (N=15), while secondary candidate scored a 9.62/10 (N=15).

Department Response: The department feels like the models available on Moodle are of assistance to candidates in planning for and completing this assignment. We will continue to review data but see no need for any changes at this time.

20. Developmental Portfolio (During ED 440/460) F14-SP15, Attachment 20

In this assessment, candidates are instructed to provide evidence that they have become 1) reflective practitioners, 2) planners of instruction, 3) facilitators of learning, 4) assessors of learning, and 5) technologically literate practitioners. Faculty and peers attend the portfolio presentations and give feedback used in the assessment of candidates. USOE underclassmen are invited to attend for the purpose of modeling this capstone project and inspiration.

Departmental policy states that any student who receives a mean score below 7.0 on a 10-point scale must redo and resubmit his/her developmental portfolio. In the past 10 years only three candidates have had to resubmit their portfolio.

For 14-15, candidates in ED 440 earned an overall mean of 9.2/10 (92%) on this assessment (N=13). The candidates in ED 460 earned an 8.92/10 (89.2%, N=7). Two elementary candidates scored basic in one category. One in the area of “Facilitator of Learning” and the other in the area of “Teacher as an Assessor of Learning.”

Both candidates had some quality artifacts but the quantity was not sufficient.

Department Response: The evidence supports continued monitoring with no changes. The department will continue the peer evaluation because the process shows evidence of being helpful to the candidates and the peers.

21. Program Objectives (During ED 440/460) F14-SP15, Attachment 21

Program objectives surveys are distributed in each professional education course. They provide pre- and post-course self-assessments of growth in program objectives and provide feedback to each professor. The decision was made to include program objectives in the data assessment at the point of ED 440/460 since these courses are taken the semester before student teaching and should provide a point late in the program to review candidate progress in all program objectives. During the 2013-2014 data review it was decided to have candidates rate themselves from their entry into the program in ED 243, Introduction to Education to the Pre-Student Teaching Seminar (ED 440 for elementary and ED 460 for Secondary) While the idea to change the start point for the reflection was a good one; apparently “old habits do die hard.” Results were not gathered during the fall semester (failed to give the assessment). The spring instructor failed to make the change when administering the assessment. In 2014-2015, positive growth was reflected in each program objectives for elementary candidates from a low of +.33 to a high of +1.36. Post-scores for all elementary candidates are above 4.33 on a 5 point scale indicating perceived strengths on all program objectives. For secondary students each candidate reported one or more areas of no growth, yet on average, growth was shown in all areas with the low being +.12 to a high of +.75 in five areas. These scores reflect the perceived growth from the beginning to end of the course for all candidates and not the start and completion of all course work prior to student teaching.

Department Response: The idea to measure growth on program objectives from the entrance to the School of Education to the cusp of student teaching will give insightful information; once it is obtained. Instructors need to make a concerted effort to follow through on the new plan and guide students accordingly.

22. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During Student Teaching) F14-SP15, Attachment 22

The data obtained from this survey was self-reported by the student on their perception of their ability to differentiate instruction for all types of learners and from the cooperating teacher. The final measure was a five point scale with 1= Not effective- no intervention or strategies used; 2= Few interventions or strategies used; 3= Average- minimal intervention/strategies used with limited effect; 4= Varied intervention/strategies used with promising effect; 5= highly effective- multiple and varied interventions used that were effective.

Post test data from the cooperating teacher had an average score of 4.14/5.0 for elementary candidates; 4.25/5.0 for secondary candidates; and 4.50/5.0 for middle level candidates.

Post test data from the student teacher had an average score of 4.15/5.0 for elementary candidates; 4.0/5.0 for secondary candidates; and 3.50/5.0 for middle level candidates.

Department Response: A discussion of the results indicated that there might be some confusion in how the candidates are interpreting the question e.g. “read the IEP” could have included an “IEP at a Glance” for some while others stayed with the literal interpretation of full IEP. Multiple subtest scores had the cooperating teacher rating candidates higher than the student teachers’ self-ratings. It is speculated that the student teachers realize the need to do better and do not have the informed perspective of the cooperating teacher. For their level of experience, the student teachers are making appropriate progress.

23. Lesson Plan Writing (During Student Teaching) F14-SP15, Attachment 23

The mean for all elementary candidates was 8.56/10 (N= 14) for all areas of the lesson plan rubric. The mean for all secondary candidates was 8.61/10 (N= 5). The mean for the middle level candidate was 9.42/10 (N=1) The overall combined mean of the elementary, middle and secondary candidates was 8.8/10. Two elementary candidates had an average score in the “Basic” category (7.41 and 7.98) One of the secondary candidates received

a mean score of 7.57. All candidates who scored in the Basic category omitted some required part(s).

Department Response: The department recommends continued due diligence in the area of lesson plan writing but no program changes at this time. The instructor will give more explicit direction when reviewing the lesson planning expectations with the candidates.

24. Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (ED 450/470/480) F14-SP15, Attachments 24

Observing the KSDE guidelines of a 20/30 cut score, all elementary candidates (N=14) met the passing criterion on their first attempt. Scores ranged from a low of 21.5 to a high of 26 with a mean score of 23.8.

With 6 middle-level and secondary candidates completing the KPTP in 14-15, all 6 passed on the first attempt. Scores ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 26.5 with a mean score of 23.6.

Department Response: Elementary candidates and secondary candidates had a pass rate of 100% . The department will continue to inform and support candidates on the KPTP process. Currently students practice Task 1 in IS 199, all parts are reviewed in ED 440/460 and candidates score sample KPTP then participate in a follow-up class discussion. A pacing guide is used during student teaching to ensure that all deadlines are met.

25. Demographics KPTP (Diverse Population) (During IS 199) F14-SP15, Attachment 25

A review of the results revealed an overall mean of 8.8/10, or 89%. Elementary candidates had an average score of 8.9/10, while secondary candidates had an average score of 8.7/10 and one middle level candidate 9/10. No candidates scored in the unsatisfactory range; one elementary candidate scored in the “Basic” category with a 7.95.

Department Response: At this time no changes will be made. The elementary candidate in the Basic category was given constructive feedback on the rubric and all other progress is within appropriate limits.

26. Dispositions: Journal (During IS 199) F14-SP15, Attachment 26

A review of the results indicate an overall average of 9.6/10 for 15 elementary candidates, an average of 9.48/10 for 16 secondary candidates and a 10/10 for the one middle level candidate. A closer review of the elementary scores show that one of the 15 candidates scored in the category of basic, with a mean score of 7.98. The fourth criterion (Demonstrates process of thoughtful engagement, critical thinking, and willingness to consider alternative ideas/viewpoints) was a 7.9 all other areas received an 8. One secondary candidate received a 7.95 with criterion 2 and 3 receiving a 7.9 and criterion 1 and 4 receiving an 8. The instructor discussed the results with the candidates in question.

Department Response: The department discussed the value of this interterm which allows candidates to have an extended time in a culturally diverse setting. For many of our candidates it is a first time experience and proves to be very rewarding. At this time no program changes are needed.

27. Dispositions F14-SP15, Attachment 27

The USOE completes a Dispositions form for all candidates in most professional education courses. It includes: a belief all people can learn; models ethical behavior; considers attitudes, feelings, and cultural contexts; process of thoughtful engagement and critical thinking. The first one is completed in ED 243 Introduction to Education, where the survey and the expectations are clearly explained and the last one is completed during the Student Teaching semester. Elementary Students in ED 243 averaged 8.20/10 and secondary students 8.61/10. Four of ten elementary candidates had one or more score(s) in the Basic category and three of 14 secondary students had one or more score(s) in the Basic category. ED 264 Foundations of Classroom Management 14 elementary candidates averaged 8.34/10 with eight of 14 receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. Twenty secondary candidates averaged 8.58/10 with 15/20 receiving scores in the Proficient range or above. In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques for the Classroom 28 candidates were evaluated and averaged 9.48/10. Sixteen

elementary candidates averaged 9.37/10 with all receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. Twelve secondary candidates averaged 9.63/10 with all receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. ED 313 Bilingual Education had 25 candidates averaging 8.91/10 with elementary averaging 8.93/10 and secondary having eight candidates averaging 8.84/10. Three of 17 elementary candidates had one or more score(s) in the Basic category and one of eight secondary students had one or more score(s) in the Basic category. In ED 343 Educational Psychology 26 candidates were evaluated and averaged 8.65/10. Nine elementary candidates averaged 8.78/10 with five receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. Seventeen secondary candidates averaged 8.67/10 with 13 receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. In ED 345, 23 candidates were evaluated and averaged 9.69/10. Twelve elementary candidates averaged 9.5/10 with all but one receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. Ten secondary candidates averaged 9.88/10 with all receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. In ED 366 Teaching Elementary Language Arts in the Content Areas 18 candidates were evaluated and averaged 9.47/10. Sixteen elementary candidates averaged 9.41/10 with 15 receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. Three secondary candidates averaged 10/10 (scheduling conflicts with the secondary course). In ED 368 Teaching Reading in the Secondary Content Area candidates were evaluated and averaged 9.06/10 with all but one receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. ED 440 Pre-Student Teaching Seminar for Elementary Majors 12 candidates were evaluated and averaged 8.87/10 with all but two receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. In ED 460 Pre- Student Teaching Seminar for Secondary and/or Middle Level Majors seven candidates averaged 8.9/10 with all but two receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. In ED 450 Student Teaching in the Elementary or Middle School 14 candidates were evaluated and averaged 8.98/10, with all but two receiving scores all in the Proficient range or above. In ED 470 Student Teaching at the Secondary and/or Middle Level five candidates were evaluated and averaged 9.41/10 with all receiving scores in the Proficient range or above. In ED 480 Middle Level Student Teaching one candidate was evaluated and received 10/10; nice way to end.

Department Response: To stress the importance of these ratings and clearly inform the candidates of the criteria, a blank copy of this form is distributed to all candidates in each professional education course. No data driven changes are needed at this time.

28. Cooperating Teacher Evaluations F14-SP15, Attachment 28

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district's cooperating teacher. The items on these evaluation forms are aligned with the Department's program objectives

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2014-2015, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates	Mean score of 4.34/5.0 (N=14)
Middle Level Candidates	Mean score of 5/5.0 (N=1)
Secondary Candidates	Mean score of 4.33/5.0 (N=5)
Overall (All Candidates)	Mean score of 4.37/5.0 (N=20)

Data collected during 2014-2015 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included:

1. Instructional Planning (4.53)
2. Instructional Technology (4.55)
3. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.(4.55)

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2014-2015, as perceived by cooperating teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.01).
2. Making content meaningful. (4.23)

Department Response: The department is pleased with the overall results of this data; as only two of the overall scores is lower than 4.25. However, the criterion dealing with motivation and control of student behavior is below the 4.25 average and is an issue that is never off our radar. We continue to think of ways to fortify this area and visit with recent graduates about ways to improve our current practices.

29. Supervising Teacher Evaluations F14-SP15, Attachment 29

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district's cooperating teacher. The items on these survey forms are aligned with the Department's program objectives 1-12.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2014-2015, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.40/5.0 (N=14)
Middle Level Candidates:	Mean score of 4.62/5.0 (N=1)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.22/5.0 (N=5)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.36/5.0 (N=20)

Data collected during 2014-2015 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

1. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.5).
2. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism. (4.65)

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2014-2015, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.24)
2. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.21)
3. Integrating content (4.13)

Department Response: Again, over-all the results were positive with no deficient outliers. The supervising teacher rated candidates slightly higher in motivation and classroom management but this will not deter our effort to continue on the path of improvement. The department considered the fact that scores provided by the supervising teacher were higher than the ratings provided by the cooperating teachers. We will monitor and compare the scores provided by supervising and cooperating teachers for consistency and will not be deluded by our own thinking.

30. Graduate Surveys Completed by Employers after the First and Third Years of Teaching F14-SP15

Department Response: We are still waiting on an acceptable return rate for the 1st and 3rd year graduate surveys. The department brainstormed ways in which we could increase the return rate. We acted on previous suggestions to increase the return rate but had limited success. This data will need to be discussed at a later date.

31. Graduate Surveys Completed by Program Graduates after the First and Third Years of Teaching F14-SP15

Department Response: We are still waiting on an acceptable return rate for the 1st and 3rd year graduate surveys. The department brainstormed ways in which we could increase the return rate. We acted on previous suggestions to increase the return rate but had limited success. This data will need to be discussed at a later date.

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

32. Professional and Content GPAs F14-SP15, Attachment 32

Elementary overall professional and content GPA is 3.57/4.00. Middle level overall professional and content GPA is 3.57 and secondary overall professional and content GPA is 3.40. Out of 97 candidates, zero had professional and content GPAs of less than 2.8. All candidates had a mean overall GPA average of 3.45/4.00.

Department Response: The chair had contacted all candidates this summer to discuss their lower GPA, what they need to do to improve, and the ramifications of continued low performance. We will continue this process in the future.

33. Personal and Professional Skills Survey Scores, F14-SP15, Attachment 33

This survey looks at various areas deemed essential for the personal and professional traits of educators. Like the Dispositions survey it is filled out at the end of most Professional Education courses. Candidates review the form at the beginning of each course. Elementary overall average performance is 4.16/5.00. Middle level overall is 4.85/5 and the secondary candidates' overall performance is 4.11/5. Only three of the 97 candidates have ratings below the 3.5 (required proficiency), one being in Elementary (3.48), one in music education (3.41) and one physical education (3.33).

Department Response: In past semesters a concerted effort has been made to increase the awareness level of students, concerning the importance of this measure. Dr. Foil continues to give the ED 243 candidates a mid-term draft copy so if they are low, they know and can attempt to make changes, or he may have candidates self-evaluate. We've seen an upward trend in scores so will continue with current practices.

34. PDS Practica Evaluations (ED 244/ED 320) F14-SP15, Attachment 34

Data are collected for practicums in ED 244 (20 hours) and ED 320 (30 hours). The mentor teacher evaluates the candidate on each of the criteria and then gives an overall evaluation score for the candidate. In ED 244, elementary candidates' average overall performance is 4.5/5 (N=11), middle level 5.0/5, (N=1) while the overall average for secondary candidates 4.47/5 (N=14). The overall average for all candidates is 4.6/5.

In ED 320, elementary candidates' average overall performance is 4.75/5 (N=13), middle level 4.0/5 (N=1), while the overall average for secondary candidates 4.2/5 (N=9). The overall average for all candidates is 4.3/5.

Department Response: The department observed that candidate performance is high but will still continue monitoring of data and performance to see whether any changes need to be made.

35. Advising Survey F14-S15, Attachment 35

Advising survey results were obtained for fall 2014, and spring 2015. There are seven items that the candidates rate their experience with advising and their advisor. Rating is on a 6-point scale. Highest average score was 5.89 on advisor accessible and responsive, and the lowest average was 5.63 on the advisor understands and communicates Quest and general education requirements. Overall evaluation of advisors was 5.68 (N=19).

Department Response: We ask the candidate to immediately fill out the survey after being advised and have left the office space. This is an anonymous process. Department felt that the scores indicated satisfaction on the part of the candidates for the advising process and their individual advisor.

36. Title II GPA/ACT data F14-S15, Attachment 36

The USOE is very interested in tracking ACT scores since they have the capacity to, in part, dictate admission to the University and to the USOE. An example of interest is one candidate who had a composite score of 15. It was later discovered that he had a diagnosed disability but was not aware that he could have accommodations when he took the ACT. His lower score is not indicative of his ability to perform in the classroom.

Department Response: We will continue to monitor the ACT scores and the grade point averages of our candidates at program entry and exit. Of interest to the department is seeing if ACT scores have any predictive value for future success in the professional arena.

37. GRIT Scale data S15, Attachment 37

GRIT Pilot - The university received permission from Dr. Angela Duckworth to use the GRIT survey. The supervisor of student teachers completed it for the spring candidates. The maximum score on the scale is a 5 (extremely gritty) and 1 is not at all gritty. The nine candidates who completed all requirements for licensure in the spring had scores ranging from a high of 4.67 to a low of 3.25. Initial review reveals that the highest ACT composite score of 29 had the lowest (3.25) GRIT score and the lowest GPA.

Department Response: Ideally the department can follow-up candidates to review whether the GRIT Scale is a predictor of candidates success in their coursework and after graduation their effectiveness in teaching.

38. Education Advisory Council Survey data F14-S15, Attachment 38

The USOE annually solicits feedback from our colleagues in the Pk-12 arena to provide constructive feedback for program improvement. This year the survey asked respondents to rate BU beginning educators to non-BU beginning educators. Thirty-six surveys were returned with some respondents not answering each item.

A full account of all results can be viewed in the attachment. The chart below shows the top two categories for Baker University USOE beginning educators and non-USOE beginning educators

	BU candidates proficient	Non-BU candidates proficient	BU candidates distinguished	Non-BU candidates distinguished
Implement classroom mgt. strategies	42.31%	19.05%	19.23%	0.0%
Understand & utilize PLC's	53.85%	23.81%	15.38%	9.52%
Understand purpose/participate in MTSS	57.69%	19.05%	7.69%	4.76%
Implement multiple facets of effective instruction	46.15%	66.67%	42.31%	4.76%
Implement multiple facets of reflection, collaboration & communication	61.54%	28.57%	34.62%	9.52%
Utilize technology	53.85%	80.95%	23.80%	4.76%
Engage and motivate students	61.54%	61.90%	26.92%	4.76%
Utilize assessment data	36.00%	38.10%	36.00%	0.0%
Differentiate instruction	44.00%	19.05%	32.00%	4.70%
Utilize strategies to deal with stress	42.31%	42.86%	7.69%	0.0%
Keep up w/ workload demands for being a quality educator	38.46%	40.00%	23.08%	0.0%

Department Response:

The USOE experimented with Survey Monkey for the first time. In the past data was largely gathered at a face to face gathering that was experiencing a dwindling attendance. The above data demonstrates that relative to non-

Baker University beginning educators, respondents found USOE candidates better equipped to begin teaching. In addition to the electronic data, department members obtained anecdotal feedback from the visiting first year teacher panel, alumni visits and comments on the survey. The results yield a positive experience with the USOE with candidates noting they felt prepared to begin their teaching career. General areas of improvement to address include the continued integration of technology and emphasis on classroom management.

39. Cooperating Teacher Evaluation of Elementary Content Standards F14-S15, Attachment 39

In process; forms to obtain this information have been disseminated.

40. USOE Assessment Data Analysis Responses/Actions Table F14-S15, Attachment 40

This table is constructed utilizing the feedback from the USOE data retreat. It serves to streamline the discussion and serve as an accountability tool.

ASSESSMENT AS FEEDBACK FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Multiple yet somewhat minimal changes, as compared to previous years, are being implemented at both the course and program level. It is our belief that the changes will support our commitment “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.” During 2014-2015 the changes made will be monitored through TaskStream and our annual data review.

TaskStream and Assessment Plan Data Analysis

- **Lesson Planning:**
Lesson planning data continues to show improvement, especially in a past area of relative weakness, differentiating instruction. Specific instructions to the candidates informing them which student they are adapting for has been beneficial in targeting the adaptations for their specific student. Prior to Student Teaching the supervising instructor had a one day “boot camp” reviewing the facets and expectations for lesson planning during student teaching. The department will continue to monitor in order to make decisions in the future.
- **Cooperating and supervising teacher evaluations**
Classroom management continues to surface as the presenting area of need. Faculty continues to address classroom management in all courses and discuss ways to make the practicum experiences more beneficial for all candidates. Secondary methods candidates generally always do whole group instruction. The instructor for the elementary methods candidates is working with the host schools to move from their preference of small group instruction to more whole group instruction. It is believed that the transition to whole group would be more beneficial for experienced based learning for classroom management.
- **Graduate follow-up surveys:**
The USOE needs to problem solve and find a better path for obtaining the graduate follow-up surveys.

CONCLUSION

The Undergraduate Education Department has formally collected data on the performance of teacher education candidates since 2005. Some of the data, such as the cumulative grade point information and scores on standardized tests, are required for licensure at the state level. Other data are collected in individual courses and evaluated through department-created rubrics which are collected on TaskStream. All data is reviewed annually at a data meeting in the summer and suggestions for The Department has systematically collected and organized a large amount of data in recent years, with data-driven decisions made regarding program and course changes. We feel that this process of data analysis strengthens the program and results in increasing our support of commitment to the candidates “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.”

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION Undergraduate Department

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN AND 2013 REPORT for the 2012-2013 Academic Year

SOE Mission

The Baker University School of Education is committed to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.

SOE Vision

The School of Education provides quality programs grounded in a tradition of academic excellence and responds to the educational needs of the future.

SOE Beliefs

The School of Education believes a confident and competent educational leader

- Advocates for all students and their learning successes;
- Has a strong knowledge base and sense of beliefs and values supported by educational research and best practices;
- Has the commitment and skills to transfer knowledge, beliefs, and values into policy and practice;
- Demonstrates interpersonal practices that advance the welfare and dignity of all persons; and
- Maintains an unremitting drive for improvement.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Undergraduate Department of the School of Education is guided by the SOE Conceptual Framework that includes 15 undergraduate program objectives. These objectives represent skills that are expected of confident and competent educational leaders. The first ten program objectives are closely linked to the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and Charlotte Danielson's standards outlined in her book, *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. These first thirteen program objectives are closely related to the KSDE professional education standards and are assessed on ratings provided by program graduates and their employers, while program objectives 14 and 15 are unique to the undergraduate education program. Data are collected on all 15 program objectives throughout the teacher education program.

Baker University's mission statement identifies a community "committed to assuring student learning and developing confident, competent and responsible contributors to society" (Baker University Mission Statement August 2008). The five CAS Educational Goals address 1) liberal studies and scholarship, 2) application of knowledge, 3) effective communication, 4) global citizenship, and 5) health and wellness perspectives (CAS Educational Goals/Student Learning Outcomes adopted by CAS Faculty Senate, May 3, 2005). A review of the Undergraduate Department's program objectives reveals many links with both the university mission statement and the CAS Learning Goals/Student Learning Outcomes, especially the ones that deal with liberal studies and scholarship, application of knowledge, and effective communication.

SOE Undergraduate Program Objectives

Upon completion of their course work, candidates for teacher licensure will demonstrate:

1. The ability to use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline as s/he teaches, creating learning opportunities, including integrated learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for all students.
2. The ability to engage students in learning through the use of multiple and effective instructional strategies appropriate to students' developmental levels and knowledge of content.
3. The ability to use information about students' interests, abilities, skills, backgrounds, and peer relationships to make knowledge accessible to all students, including students with exceptionalities and diverse learners.
4. The ability to use a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage the students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.
5. An understanding of individual and group motivation and student behavior that fosters positive and safe learning environments and encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
6. The ability to use his/her knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
7. The ability to design and plan instruction based on knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of students, knowledge of resources, and knowledge of learning goals.
8. The ability to use multiple types of both formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continual development for all learners.
9. The ability to be a reflective practitioner capable of being held to a high standard of ethical behavior, professional skills, and personal dispositions in the areas of family communications, accurate record-keeping, professional growth and responsibilities, and contributions to the school and district.
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being.
11. The ability to integrate across and within content fields to enrich the curriculum, develop reading and thinking skills, and facilitate all students' abilities to understand relationships between subject areas.
12. The ability to use skills in technology to gather and analyze information, enhance instructional practices, facilitate professional productivity, assist with educational change, and help all students use instructional technology effectively.
13. The ability to be reflective practitioners who use knowledge of historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education to guide educational practices.
14. An understanding of school law, educational policies, local, state and national educational structures, professional licensing procedures, and professional organizations.
15. An understanding of the SOE Conceptual Framework which is defined as the Mission, Vision, Beliefs, Commitments, Program Objectives, Essential Characteristics (Personal and Professional Skills and Dispositions), and Evaluation Process.

SOE UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

Background Information

The undergraduate program began collecting summative assessment data via *TaskStream*, a web-based electronic portfolio/data collection program in most professional education courses during the 2005-2006 academic year. Because of the valuable information available in this format, the decision was made to collect elementary education program data through *TaskStream* starting with the 2006-2007 year. Assessments from the social studies, math, reading, and science methods courses were uploaded to *TaskStream* in 2007 and assessments from Art, Music and Physical Education methods courses in 2007-2008. These data were used extensively to support the portfolios that were submitted to KSDE in September 2008.

After meeting with Dr. Rob Flaherty, CAS Acting Associate Dean, in late 2005, we implemented several data

collection/analysis changes designed to strengthen our process in the 2006-2007 academic year. We began compiling data in categories of *unsatisfactory*, *basic*, *proficient*, or *distinguished* rather than by mean scores. Determining the percentage of candidates who scored in the different categories allowed us to analyze the data more thoroughly. We also began presenting data yearly rather than by semester in order to make it easier to see substantial trends, rather than one-semester anomalies.

The Current Plan

The *SOE Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Plan* involves standardized assessments, GPA data, and performance assessments based on the program objectives. Additional summative data collected to determine student candidacy are also included in this report.

Multiple performance assessments have been adopted or developed to measure candidate progress on program objectives. Rubrics for performance assessments, when appropriate, can be found within each tabbed section. Candidate performance in specified areas, such as lesson planning, is measured by the same rubric throughout the program. As previously mentioned, performance assessments are both formative and summative. Most summative performance data is kept on *TaskStream*, a web-based educational resource and portfolio program.

The *SOE Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Plan* is attached. This plan includes a number of assessments that are a) quantitative and qualitative and b) formative and summative. A matrix linking program objectives to performance assessments in each professional education course is included. This matrix is the *course component* of the larger plan. Each entry in Column 1 identifies the required core professional education course, Column 2 delineates which department member is responsible for collecting the data during that particular course, Column 3 indicates whether the assessment is Formative (F) or Summative (S), Column 4 identifies the performance assessment used, and the remainder of the matrix identifies what program objectives are met by each assessment.

Below are listed the data collected and analyzed by the department.

Data collected from standardized assessments include:

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE, or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST);
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS; and
3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS.

Data collected from grade point averages include:

4. Cumulative GPA scores.

Data collected from performance assessments include:

5. Alternative assessments;
6. Unit test writing;
7. Group presentations;
8. Dispositions (special needs populations);
9. Dispositions (diverse populations);
10. Dispositions (journal)
11. Differentiated instruction ratings;
12. Differentiated instruction ratings (during student teaching);
13. Unit writing;
14. Lesson plan writing;
15. Lesson plan writing (during student teaching);
16. Visual Presentation;
17. Electronic Portfolio;
18. Developmental Portfolio;

19. Program Objectives;
20. KPTP;
21. Candidate performance ratings completed by cooperating teachers;
22. Candidate performance ratings completed by supervising teachers;
23. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates; and
24. Ratings provided by program graduates.

Additional data that are collected to determine student candidacy (vs. program changes) include:

- Professional and content area GPA scores;
- Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores; and
- PDS practica evaluations.

Additionally, we discussed collecting the following data:

- Title II GPA/ACT data

ASSESSMENT DATA ANALYSIS

Summative data are analyzed and evaluated annually by the undergraduate faculty members and shared with the Education Advisory Council and the Undergraduate Teacher Education Committee (UTEC) at the annual EAC meeting and with all SOE faculty during the annual retreat. Feedback from these groups has often led to recommended program changes based on these data.

**SOE UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN
2012-2013**

Standardized Assessments

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST)
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS (longitudinal)
3. Principals of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS (longitudinal)

GPA Data

4. Cumulative GPA scores (longitudinal)

Performance Assessments

5. Alternative assessments (ED 309)
6. Unit test writing (ED 309)
7. Group presentations (ED 343)
8. Dispositions (special needs populations) (ED 345)
9. Dispositions (diverse populations) (IS 199) (Sample KPTP Task 1)
10. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 345)
11. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 450/470/480)
12. Unit writing (ED 366/368)
13. Lesson plan writing (ED 366/368)
14. Lesson plan writing (ED 450/470/480)
15. Visual Presentation (ED 366/368)
16. Electronic Portfolio (ED 265)
17. Developmental Portfolio (ED 440/460)
18. Program Objectives (ED 440/460)
19. KPTP (ED 450/470/480)
20. Candidate performance ratings completed by cooperating teachers (longitudinal)
21. Candidate performance ratings completed by supervising teachers (longitudinal)
22. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates (longitudinal)
23. Ratings provided by program graduates (longitudinal)

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

Professional and content area GPA scores (longitudinal)
Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores
PDS practica evaluations

Additional Data Collected for Federal Reports to be shared at data retreat

Title II GPA/ACT data

Matrix of Performance Assessments Collected in Courses 2012-2013

Course Name	Responsible Collecting Data	Assessment Area	Program Objectives														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
ED 243	KW	(F) Group Presentation	X				X	X		X		X					
		(F) Lesson Plans	X			X			X								
		(F) Dispositions			X		X					X					
ED 309	CD	(S) Alternative Assessments									X						
	CD	(F) Personal Webpage (peer eval)						X	X			X		X			
		(S) Unit Test									X			X			
ED 343	CD	(F) Dispositions			X		X					X					
		(S) Group Presentation	X				X	X		X		X					
		(F) PowerPoint						X						X			
ED 345	AW	(S) Dispositions (special needs)			X		X					X					
		(F) PowerPoint												X			
		(S) Differentiated Instruction			X												
ED 367	CD	(S) Unit	X	X		X				X	X			X	X		
	CD	(S) Lesson Plans	X		X	X				X							
		(S) PowerPoint		X					X	X					X		
ED 462	AW	(S) Personal Web Page															
ED 440/460	AW	(S) Developmental Portfolio	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
	AW	(S) Program Objectives	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
	AW	(S) KPTP	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		
ED 450/470/480	SCS	(S) Accommodation Ratings			X						X						
	TS	(S) Coop. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	TS	(S) Sup. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	SCS	(S) Lesson Plan	X			X				X							
IS 199	SCS	(S) Dispositions (diverse pop.)			X		X					X					

March 2012

STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS

1. Basic Skills Scores by Content Area (C-BASE) F12-S13, Attachment 1

The Kansas State Board of Education requires that all teacher education programs use a measurement of basic skills for program admittance. Several years ago, after surveying all Kansas colleges with teacher licensure, the School of Education approved the use of the C-BASE (College Basic Academic Subjects Examination), a standardized test published by the University of Missouri and required for all Missouri teacher licensure candidates as the preferred basic skills test. The cut score for Missouri teacher education candidates (235) was also approved for Baker undergraduate candidates. It is important to note that no student is permitted to student teach without passing all parts of the C-BASE.

A review of the 2012-2013 C-BASE test scores, compiled by majors, reveals that candidate mean scores for most content areas were above the cut score of 235. On an individual basis, out of 110 subtests taken, 101 were passed.

This means that 92% of the subtests were passed. Overall, the mean basic skills score for all candidates in each of the three basic skills areas—English/Reading 262, Writing 275, and Math 287 are above the 235 cut score. The overall mean of 274 continues the trend of being significantly above the cut score of 235. Therefore, it appears that the vast majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate skills in English, math, and writing. However, a review of the data reveals three candidates who scored significantly below average on the English subtest.

It is also important to review the results of all teacher education candidates, not just those who were required to take a basic skills test. After a statewide review of basic skills requirements in Kansas teacher education programs, the Professional Education Council voted in May 2006 to exempt students with a cumulative ACT score of 26 or above from taking a basic skills test. This year, twelve individuals were exempt from taking any of the basic skills tests. Therefore, while 40 candidates took the C-BASE English subtest, another 12 students (23%) were exempted from the C-BASE. In 2011-2012, 26% were exempt, 28% were exempt in 2010-2011 and 25% were exempt in 2009-2010. The consistent exempt rate speaks well for the quality of the candidates choosing to pursue teacher education at Baker University.

Department Response: The department feels that the majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate basic skills. Based on their scores, the conclusion is that the quality of those students continues to be well above basic skills levels.

In analyzing the non-passing scores, department members agreed to make these students aware of the SAS tutoring opportunities. It was decided that the electronic C-Base study guide will be posted on Moodle in ED 100 and low-performing candidates will be required to take a practice test prior to registering for the C-Base. In addition, students who fail a section of the C-Base will be required to retake the section at the next testing opportunity. In that way, students who find it difficult to pass the C-Base will be made aware of this difficulty early and will be counseled to reconsider their career choice.

It is important to understand that the C-BASE is almost always taken during the first education course, ED 100 Teaching as a Career. Since ED 100 is an introductory course, not all students continue in the program; some of them are probably deterred by the basic skills test requirement.

2. Content Area Assessments by Content Areas F12-S13, Attachment 2

Cut scores for content assessments have been in force since September 2005. A review of the content assessment scores for the 2012-2013 academic year reveals an 89% pass rate. While this pass rate does not put us in jeopardy, it is lower than pass rates in the past. In 2012-2013 content assessments (with pass rates) were taken in the areas of biology, elementary education, English, history, middle level mathematics, music education and

physical education. Areas in which there was less than 100% pass rate included elementary education (93%) and history (67%).

Department Response: The department is pleased with the 2012-2013 performance of candidates on content assessments and plans to continue the practice of requiring that students in ED 309 take a sample content test. Based on the past results of history majors, it was suggested that we make the history department aware of the low pass rate pattern. It was also suggested that we develop a course which covers geography and economics, areas included on the history content test but not included in the curriculum of the history major. The department will encourage candidates to take the content test as soon as they have completed their content coursework. The overall pass rate of 89% for Praxis II content tests will be monitored to determine if the lower pass rate continues. Annual reports and the PEDS reports are reviewed by NCATE every year and inquiries will be sent out when overall pass rates approach 80%.

3. PLT by Content Area F12-S13, Attachment 3

During the 2012-2013 academic year, 25 of the 26 candidates who took the PLT (Principles of Learning and Teaching) standardized test of pedagogy passed the test for a pass rate of 96%. The mean PLT score for this year's candidates was 176, which is higher than the 161 cut score set by the state of Kansas. PLT tests by candidates majoring in the areas of biology, business, elementary education, English, history, middle level math, music education, and physical education were taken during the 2012-2013 academic year.

Department Response: The department is pleased with the 96% pass rate, which is higher than the year before. The department will continue the practice of requiring students in ED 309 to take a sample test and create individualized study guides. The only candidate who did not pass the PLT was a middle level math major. This person had difficulty with both the PLT and the Praxis II content test. Department members will monitor the progress of this student to determine if these test scores are reflected in course grades and if we need to recommend additional remediation in order for this candidate to continue in the program.

GPA DATA

4. Cumulative GPA by Content Area F12-S13, Attachment 4

The mean cumulative grade point average for 2012-2013 teacher licensure candidates in all content areas was 3.39. The mean cumulative grade point average for 2012-2013 teacher licensure candidates in elementary education was 3.44. The mean cumulative grade point average for 2012-2013 teacher licensure candidates in secondary education was 3.33 and middle-level candidates was 3.52. The mean cumulative grade point average for teacher education candidates broken down into content areas ranged from a low of 2.71 in physics to a high of 3.97 in Spanish. The highest GPAs were 3.97 for Spanish (n=1), 3.79 in for middle level science and biology (n=1 in each area), and 3.67 in business (N=1). The lowest GPAs were for physics with 2.71 (n=1), physical education with 3.04 (N= 14) and Chemistry with 3.13 (N=1).

Department Response: Teacher licensure candidates' mean content GPA of 3.39 is the highest since 2007-2008. The department members decided to identify the two elementary education and one physical education majors with cum GPAs below 2.5 and examine their progress to determine if they transferred in low grade point averages, where they are in the program, how they performed on the C-Base, and whether they've been counseled by academic advisor. The decision was made to continue the current policy of requiring conferences for all students who are in conditional or non-candidate status to be sure that no candidates fall through the cracks.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DATA

5. Alternative Assessments (During ED 309) F12-S13, Attachment 5

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must create an alternative assessment, with detailed assignment guidelines and grading rubrics. A review of the results on the alternative assessment revealed that, out of the 33 students assessed in summer, fall, and spring, three candidates fell below basic on at least one criterion. Criteria 3, 4, and 5 had unsatisfactory scores. The average for all 33 candidates across all six criteria was 9.24 /10 or 92.4%. The total average for all elementary candidates was 9.48. The lower secondary candidates' average (9.18) was impacted by one biology major who did not complete criteria 4 and 5.

Department Response: Continue with the assessment and analyze data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates. Continue the use of samples to provide model assignments for candidates' review.

6. Unit Test Writing (During ED 309) F12-S13, Attachment 6

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must write a unit test composed of objective and subjective questions and create a thorough grading key. A review of the results on the unit test revealed that, out of the 34 students assessed in summer, fall, and spring, two candidates fell below basic level on the criterion related to identifying levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The average for all five criteria was 9.23/10 or 92.3%. The total average for elementary candidates was 9.31 and for secondary candidates 9.18.

Department Response: Continue with the assessment and analyze data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates. Continue the use of samples to provide model assignments for candidates' review. The department believes the rubric and directions give guidance and the instructor should make candidates aware of the weighting on the rubric. This assessment helps to prepare the candidates for the unit in the KPTP.

7. Group Presentations (During ED 343) F12-S13, Attachment 7

Candidates make group presentations in ED 343 Educational Psychology. A review of the 2012-2013 results indicated that there was an average score of 9.76/10 or 97.6% on the Group Presentation Assignment. All 21 candidates scored distinguished or proficient. The total average for the elementary candidates was 9.93/10 (99.3%) and for secondary candidates was 9.63/10 (96.3%).

Department Response: Overall, all candidates scored high. The lowest score (8.00) occurred in Criteria 3, "Active Participation of Audience" and Criteria 4, "Establishing Collegial Relationships." Continued modeling is needed for active participation. Analyze future data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates.

8. Dispositions (Special Needs Population) (During ED 345) F12-S13, Attachment 8

The disposition rating scale adopted in 2002 by the Education Department was created by Dr. Mark Wasicsko of Eastern Kentucky University. His instrument, "Defining and Measuring Educator Dispositions" was adapted from the research of Dr. Arthur Combs' on the preferred dispositions for professionals in the field of counseling and modified to focus on educator dispositions. Disposition training was completed by all full-time department faculty in 2003 and our inter-rater reliability was computed. All faculty scores fell within the acceptable range. Two new faculty completed the disposition training and achieved the acceptable range in 2006. The remaining faculty were retrained and rechecked for inter-rater reliability in spring 2008. All faculty inter-rater reliability was verified as above the criteria of 80%.

A dispositions curriculum was created and results have been tracked for several years. Because the ability to display regard for children, be aware of their developmental needs, and treat all children with dignity is critical for successful teaching and learning, the department created a procedure for dealing with those candidates whose behaviors and belief patterns raised concern regarding their suitability for working with young people. (Information on the disposition curriculum and the follow-up process are available from the Department.)

Initially, dispositions ratings were collected in every professional education course; however, the decision was made in 2005 to only collect disposition ratings four times over the course of the program. We deleted the disposition assignment in ED440/460 since candidates are in their student teaching semester at that point and any concerns about a candidates' disposition for teaching are likely to be identified in teacher/student interactions, rather than in outside assignments, and would be addressed by cooperating and supervising teachers. Our formative assessment plans call for disposition assessment in ED 243 Introduction to Education and ED 343 Educational Psychology. Summative disposition assessment occurs in ED 345 Psychology of the Exceptional Child and IS 199 Diversity in Education.

Results are computed separately for elementary and secondary education candidates. Mean scores and distribution charts for the 2012-2013 academic year on summative disposition ratings are attached. Disposition ratings are made on a 10-point scale, with any score of 7 or above considered evidence of a belief system compatible with the teaching profession. Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.23/10 (92.3%), while secondary candidates had an average score of 9.35/10 (93.5%). Only two candidates scored less than an 8 (and those were in the area of writing aptitude) meaning all candidates' scores in the criteria dealing with teacher dispositions fell in the areas of distinguished or proficient.

Department Response: These results provide evidence that teacher education candidates received scores in the acceptable range on the disposition rubric. The department members feel that the current assignment for this data collection needs to be modified. For future analysis, the department decided to look for consistency in disposition scores across courses. When we are assessing the same group of candidates, we should see some consistency. Analyzing disposition scores across years, we hope to see growth in candidate dispositions as reflected in the scores. To assist in this analysis, the new dispositions form will be placed on Taskstream to ensure that all disposition ratings use the newly revised dispositions.

9. Dispositions (Diverse Population) (During IS 199) F12-S13, Attachment 9

A review of the results revealed an overall mean of 8.76/10, or 87.6%. Elementary candidates had an average score of 8.99/10, while secondary candidates had an average score of 8.39/10. No candidates scored in the unsatisfactory range, while two candidates scored in basic category on criteria 3 and one scored basic on criteria 2.

Department Response: Department members discussed the fact that this assignment focuses on the "demographics" section of the KPTP more than on our candidate dispositions; therefore we should look to rename the assignment and rubric. We also need to review scores on the different sections of the rubric to note actions to correct this discrepancy.

10. Dispositions: Journal (During IS 199) F12-S13, Attachment 10

This is a new addition to our Outcomes Assessment Report this year after an absence of several years. A review of the results indicate an overall average of 8.91/10 for 17 elementary candidates and an average of 9.72/10 for 9 secondary candidates. A closer review of the elementary scores show that four of the 17 candidates scored in the category of basic, with mean scores of 7.38, 7.5, 7.75, and 7.88. The fourth criterion (Demonstrates process of thoughtful engagement, critical thinking, and willingness to consider alternative ideas/viewpoints) had more scores in the basic category than any of the other criteria, possibly because it is harder to rate from journal entries. The lowest scores in the secondary group belong to one music education candidate who received one

score of 7 on Criterion 4 and a score of 8 on Criterion 3, with an overall mean of 8.5.

Department Response: The department discussed the difference in scoring of the elementary and secondary candidates. The suggestion was made that we discuss the rubric and make sure our department members are on the same page with what distinguished, proficient, and basic looks like. We also need to be sure and orient new faculty on this rubric. Jeanne Duncan suggested that ratings of candidate dispositions be included in more courses than it is currently. The suggestion was made that we have candidates self-rate on dispositions throughout the program.

A dispositions discussion, including the topic of social media, with a self-reflection will be added to ED 100. The dispositions rubric will be put on Taskstream and will be used in ED 309 with the Parent-Teacher Conference assignment. It will also be completed by the instructor in ED 343, IS 199, and during the student teaching semester. In student teaching, the rating should be completed by supervising and cooperating teachers and the candidate. Each time the rubric is used it should be done with a self-reflection with the exception of ED 100, where only the self-reflection is completed. This increased use of the dispositions rubric and self-reflections should help candidates become more familiar with department expectations in this area.

11. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During ED 345) F12-S13, Attachment 11

Originally entitled “Accommodations”, this assessment is now called “Differentiated Instruction.” A review of the five criteria for this assessment revealed an overall average of 8.87/10. Elementary candidates had an average rating of 8.74/10 (N=10), while secondary candidates averaged 8.89/10 (N=13). These scores represent an increase in all criteria from last year.

Department Response: The instructor explained the changes she had made in how this particular assignment was taught. Candidates no longer make up their own pupil and the instructor makes sure candidates have a clear understanding of which pupil they are to use in completing this assignment. It appears that these changes have had a positive impact on performance this year. Continued discussion regarding the possibility of adding a second semester of ED 345 was held.

12. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During Student Teaching) F12-S13, Attachment 12

This is a new addition to our Outcomes Assessment Report after an absence of collected data for several years. A review of the data reveals an overall mean of 8.04/10 or 80.4% (N=35). A breakdown by level reveals a mean of 8.33/10 for elementary education majors and a 7.74/10 mean for secondary education majors. It appears that candidates do not differentiate instruction well during student teaching.

Department Response: Using this data as a baseline and comparing to the differentiated instruction ratings from ED 345 should allow a comparison between a class assignment (with improved directions and higher results) to the performance during student teaching. The department also stressed the need to include this assignment on Taskstream. We will monitor and analyze these results over time.

13. Unit Writing (During ED 366/368) F12-S13, Attachment 13

The summer 2012 data (N=4) was evaluated on 12 criteria. The overall mean 8.5/10 or 85%, with elementary and secondary candidates performing equally well. In both groups, criterion #5 (Bibliography including internet resources) was not completed. The fall ‘12 and spring ‘13 data, with an N= 28 reveal an overall mean of 8.98/10 or 89.85%. Comparing the “Bibliography including Internet Resources” criterion results of 0.00 for summer ‘12 to the 9.63/10 for the fall and spring semesters reveals the type of improvement that can be made when the instructor draws additional attention to a particular area. Students did not score well in Criterion #2 (Student Demographics) and Criterion #13 (Organization and Identification), both new for the fall/spring semesters. The mean score for Criterion 2 was 6.61/10 and 6.59/10 for Criterion 13. Other than these two criteria, all candidates scored basic or above in all other criteria. Elementary candidates had an average rating of 9.39/10 (N=12), while secondary candidates scored an 8.6/10 (N=19).

Department Response: Instructor feels like Criterion #13 was added as a bookkeeping step for her convenience and wasn't clearly explained to candidates. Instructor is thinking about removing this component. The decision was made to use the KPTP section that deals with demographics instead of the state report cards for Criterion #2, which will also stress the importance of this assessment and its application to the KPTP.

14. Lesson Plan Writing (During ED 366/368) F12-S13, Attachment 14

Summative lesson plan data have been collected in our Content Area Reading course (ED 366/368) for many years and the 2012-2013 data can be found in Attachment 14. This was the first year in which elementary and secondary candidates took the course separately, with developmentally appropriate strategies and focuses of instruction for each group. The performance of the 4 candidates in the summer course was high with a combined mean of 9.69/10 for the 2 elementary and 2 secondary candidates. All scores fell in the distinguished or proficient categories. For the 26 candidates who took the course during the fall '12 or spring '13 semester, the overall average of the 9 criteria measured in this assessment was 9.44/10, or 94.4% (N=26). Elementary candidates had an average rating of 9.4/10 (N=10), while secondary candidates scored a 9.47/10 (N=16). The criterion related to differentiated instruction (#7) continues to be the lowest area for students with an average score of 8.21/10. Six candidates scored less than basic on this criterion and were required to revise and re-submit their lessons, addressing deficiencies in this area. Criterion #4 (Assessment) also was lower than the others with an overall mean score of 8.73/10. Four secondary candidates (history, music, and two physical education) received scores below basic on this criterion.

Department Response: As more candidates experience the revised differentiation assignment in ED 345, these improved skills may be reflected in ED 366/368. The department decided to discuss with the new instructor for this course the possibility of changing the name of this assessment to Lesson Plan Writing-Task 2 and encourage the new instructor to emphasize the two lower categories (Assessment and Differentiated Instruction) when making this assignment.

15. Lesson Plan Writing (During Student Teaching) F12-S13, Attachment 15

The mean for all elementary candidates was 8.58 for all areas of the lesson plan rubric. The mean for all secondary candidates was 8.41. The overall combined mean of the elementary and secondary candidates was 8.5/10. One of the secondary candidates received a mean score of 6.5 on this assessment.

Department Response: The department recommends a follow-up to determine if the lesson plan format and rubric in ED 366/368 and ED 450/470/480 are identical in order to be able to make comparisons. The department stressed the need to put the rubric and possibly the lesson plan form on Taskstream next year so we can get individual criteria.

16. Visual Presentations (During ED 366/368) F12-S13, Attachment 16

The four candidates who took the course in the summer earned a mean score of 9.03/10 on this assessment. Of concern were the two candidates (1 elementary and 1 secondary) who received scores of 6/10 on Criterion #2 (quality and number of images).

Twenty-four candidates completed the course during the fall '12 and spring '13 semesters, with an average of 9.57/10, or 95.7% on the four criteria of this assessment. Only one candidate received a rating of basic on one criterion; all other scores were at the distinguished or proficient category. Candidates seem quite competent in the use of electronic media in making presentations, whether in the form of PowerPoint, or through the Prezi program. Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.68/10 (N=10), while secondary candidate scored a 9.5/10 (N=14).

Department Response: The department feels like the models available on Moodle are of assistance to candidates in planning for and completing this assignment. We will continue to review data but see no need for any changes at this time.

17. Electronic Portfolio (During ED 265) F12-S13 Attachment 17

Data from summer '12 and fall '12/spring'13 were reviewed. A mean of 8.64/10 or 86.4% was found for the 7 candidates who took the course in the summer. Candidates received the lowest ratings on two criteria, "Introduction" and "Teaching" with 57% of the scores falling in basic and unsatisfactory.

Ratings for these sections were higher for the 15 students who took the course during the fall '12 and spring '13 semesters, with only one candidate receiving a unsatisfactory rating (on teaching) and 4 candidates falling in the basic category. All other candidates were rated as distinguished or proficient. The overall fall/spring mean was 9.28/10.

The overall mean for all 22 candidates was 9.05/10. Elementary candidates have a mean of 9.12 while secondary candidates earned a mean score of 8.98/10. This is the second year in which this assessment has been moved to the technology course (ED 265). This is now a summative assignment within that course, which is currently being taught by a local elementary school teacher on an adjunct basis.

Department Response: The department was aware that one candidate had forgotten about the fall enrollment in this online course and consequently failed it and had to retake it in the spring. We will ensure that the adjunct instructor for this course (as well as all adjunct instructors) are aware of the policy of checking their course roster and notifying the Registrar's Office if a candidate is not attending. In this way, we hope to reduce the number of unpleasant surprises. A comparison of the assignment guidelines and the rubric reveal some differences. The rubric does not mention differentiated instruction, although the assignment guidelines do. Tonya will contact the adjunct instructor and oversee these Taskstream changes. In addition, we will ask the instructor to provide more guidance and explanation on this assessment.

18. Developmental Portfolio (During ED 440/460) F12-S13, Attachment 18

This is the second full academic year in which the developmental portfolio assessment has been solely attached to ED 440/460, the course taken the semester before student teaching by elementary and secondary candidates. In this assessment, candidates are instructed to provide evidence that they have become 1) reflective practitioners, 2) planners of instruction, 3) facilitators of learning, 4) assessors of learning, and 5) technologically literate practitioners. Departmental faculty, along with interested underclassmen from the department attend the portfolio presentations, and give feedback used in the assessment of candidates.

Departmental policy states that any student who receives a mean score below 7.0 on a 10-point scale must redo and resubmit his/her developmental portfolio. Several years ago, three candidates had to resubmit their portfolios; however, for the 2005-2007 years, no one was required to resubmit. One student needed to redo the portfolio during 2007-2008. The overall mean score of all 2008-2009 developmental portfolios was 9.3 on a 10-point scale; no candidate was required to redo the portfolio during that academic year. In 2009-2010, one student's work fell below the proficiency level. That student redid her portfolio and scored at a proficient level. All students met the proficiency level during 2010-2011, and again for the 2011-2012 academic year.

For 12-13, candidates in ED 440 earned an overall mean of 9.65/10 (96.54%) on this assessment (N=13). The candidates in ED 460 also earned the exact same mean (N=13). All ratings were exactly the same on every criteria.

Department Response: Because of the strange coincidence of duplicate ratings across these two courses, the department decided to check the data before further discussion. The department will continue the peer evaluation because the process shows evidence of being helpful to the candidates.

19. Program Objectives (During ED 440/460) F12-S13, Attachment 19

Program objectives surveys are distributed in each professional education course. They provide pre- and post-course self-assessments of growth in program objectives and provide valuable feedback to each professor. The

decision was made to include program objectives in the data assessment at the point of ED 440/460 since these courses are taken the semester before student teaching and should provide a point late in the program to review candidate progress in all program objectives. In 2012-2013, positive growth was reflected in each program objectives for both elementary and secondary candidates from a low of +.33 to a high of +2.03. Post-scores for all candidates are above 4.33 on a 5 point scale indicating perceived strengths on all program objectives.

Department Response: Jeanne Duncan stated that NCATE is not going to be interested in this data since it is self-reported, however, it is great data for program review analysis. Department members decided that we are not concerned about the strength of the growth because, at this point, it is expected that candidates start with high ratings on the pre-scores. It was decided to revise this program objective form and ask candidates to evaluate themselves from the point they were when they first began the teacher education program to this point one semester prior to student teaching. Tonya will modify this assessment and the instructor will emphasize the revised guidelines.

20. Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (During ED 440/460) F12-S13, Attachments 20

For the 2011-2012 year, candidates' KPTP scores were reported to KSDE for licensure purposes (for the first time). Observing the KSDE guidelines of a 20/30 cut score, all elementary candidates (N=18) met the passing criterion on their first attempt. Scores ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 29.5 with a mean score of 24.72 for all 18 elementary candidates.

With 17 middle-level and secondary candidates completing the KPTP in 12-13, 15 passed on the first attempt. One middle level math candidate received a score of 19.5 on the first attempt; the second attempt earned a passing score. One music candidate received an initial score of 17.5, but received a passing score on the second attempt. The scores of all 17 middle-level and secondary candidates ranged from a low of 17.5 to a high of 29.5, with a mean of 22.71.

Of the 35 candidates who completed the KPTP during 12-13, 33 passed on the first attempt for a pass rate of 94%. The two candidates who did not pass initially, passed after remediation.

Department Response: Elementary candidates had a 100% pass rate and middle-level and secondary candidates had a pass rate of 94% prior to remediation for 2012-2013. After remediation, all candidates achieved the cut score. The department will continue to inform and support candidates on the KPTP process because we are seeing score growth in the KPTPs. In the future, we will include the fall and spring KSDE KPTP Score Report in the data packets.

Task 3 and 4 of the KPTP (During 450, 470, 480), F 11- S 12, Attachment 20

The KPTP provided useful assessment data by which to measure candidates' instructional practices, reflection and professionalism. Through data drawn from Tasks 3 (teaching and learning) and 4 (reflection and professionalism), candidates could provide evidence of skills in authentic teaching practice. Elementary candidates (N=18) had an average score of 2.47/3 on Task 3, and an average score of 2.33 on Task 4. All of the candidates met the minimum subscores of 2/3 or higher on Tasks 3 and 4. Middle-level and secondary candidates (N=17) had an average score of 2.28/3 on Task 3, and an average score of 2.26 on Task 4. Two candidates had a score less than 2 on Task 3, while all candidates had satisfactory scores on Task 4.

Department Response: This year the department looked at subscores on Tasks 3 and 4. We will include subscores for Task 2 in the future.

21. Cooperating Teacher Evaluations F12-S13, Attachment 21

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district's cooperating teacher. The items on these evaluation forms are aligned with the Department's program objectives. For comparison purposes, data from 2008-2013 are included below.

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2008-2009, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.16/5.0 (N=11)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.86/5.0 (N=4)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.39/5.0 (N=23)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.37/5.0 (N=38)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2009-2010, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=15)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 3.77/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.23/5.0 (N=34)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.34/5.0 (N=51)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2010-2011, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.60/5.0 (N=20)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of NA/5.0 (N=0)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.50/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=40)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2011-2012, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.56/5.0 (N=21)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 3.92/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.39/5.0 (N=18)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.46/5.0 (N=41)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2012-2013, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates	Mean score of 4.59/5.0 (N=18)
Middle Level Candidates	Mean score of 3.85/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates	Mean score of 4.32/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates)	Mean score of 4.42/5.0 (N=40)

Data collected during 2008-2009 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included:

1. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values;
2. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning;
3. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2008-2009, as perceived by cooperating teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.20).
2. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.08).
3. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.24).

Data collected during 2009-2010 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included the following.

1. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.58).
2. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.56).
3. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.79).
4. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.52).

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2009-2010, as perceived by cooperating teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.08).
2. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.23).
3. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.12).
4. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.21).

Data collected during 2010-2011 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included the following, which are all but one criterion.

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.68)
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.53)
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.53)
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.63)
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.55)
6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.51)
7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.58)
8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.59)
9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.78).
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.51).
11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.54)
12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.67).

There were no candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2010-2011, as perceived by cooperating teachers.

Data collected during 2011-2012 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performances which indicate a particular strength are reflected in scores greater than a 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. Average scores less than a 4.25 indicate areas of needed growth. Six criteria, as measured by cooperating teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. Overall scores are as follows:

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.40)
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.34)
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.54)
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving,

- reflection, and performance skills (4.35)
- 5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.27)
- 6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.41)
- 7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.46)
- 8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.53)
- 9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.51).
- 10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.53).
- 11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.51)
- 12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.70).

There were no candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2011-2012, as perceived by cooperating teachers.

Data collected during 2012-2013 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performances which indicate a particular strength are reflected in scores equal to or greater than a 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. Average scores less than a 4.25 indicate areas of needed growth. Four criteria, as measured by cooperating teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. One of the overall scores fell under 4.25. Overall scores are as follows:

- 1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.36)
- 2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.38)
- 3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.49)
- 4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.23)
- 5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.26)
- 6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction **(4.51)**
- 7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.33)
- 8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.40)
- 9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.42).
- 10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning **(4.55)**.
- 11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.36)
- 12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices **(4.50)**.
- 13. Ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticisms **(4.65)**.

Department Response: The department is pleased with the overall results of this data; as only one of the overall scores (#4-4.23) is lower than 4.25. However, the criterion dealing with motivation and classroom management continues to be close to the 4.25 average, which is a concern. Department members decided to look into the impact of changing our 1-hour Classroom Management course to a 3-hour course. It was also suggested that we make ED 320 and Classroom Management co-requisites to enable candidates to immediately apply classroom management theory in their practicum classrooms. We will stress classroom management in all classes and focus on whole class procedures rather than just the small group strategies that we've been using in elementary content methods courses.

There was some concern last year about middle level candidates and this concern continued in 2012-2013. Middle level was the only area with mean scores of 3 and 3.5. Since the sample size is small (N=2), we will continue to monitor middle level scores to determine performance over time.

22. Supervising Teacher Evaluations F12-S13, Attachment 22

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district's cooperating teacher. The items on these survey forms are aligned with the Department's program objectives 1-12. For comparison purposes, data from 2008-2013 are included in this report.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2008-2009, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=13)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.66/5.0 (N=4)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.29/5.0 (N=15)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.41/5.0 (N=32)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=32) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=38) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2009-2010, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.70/5.0 (N=15)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.00/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.40/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.50/5.0 (N=37)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=37) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=51) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2010-2011, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.96/5.0 (N=20)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of NA/5.0 (N=0)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.69/5.0 (N=13)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.85/5.0 (N=33)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=33) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=40) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2011-2012, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.83/5.0 (N=21)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.73/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.85/5.0 (N=12)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.84/5.0 (N=35)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=35) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=41) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2012-2013, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary

candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.80/5.0 (N=17)
Middle Level Candidates:	Mean score of 4.77/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.75/5.0 (N=16)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.77/5.0 (N=35)

Note: Since many P-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teachers evaluations (N=35) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=40) do not match.

Data collected during 2008-2009 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

1. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students;
2. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction;
3. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values;
4. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning; and
5. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2008-2009, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (3.95);
2. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (3.92); and
3. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.23).

Data collected during 2009-2010 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

1. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.68);
2. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.62);
3. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.86);
4. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.76);
5. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.81); and
6. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.84).

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2009-2010, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.11);
2. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.16);
3. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.14); and
4. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.20).

Data collected during 2010-2011 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included all criteria.

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.82).
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.86).
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.76).
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.77).
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.79).
6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.86).
7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.88).
8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.67).
9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes and ethical values (4.97).
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.94).
11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.74).
12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.98).

None of the candidate performance areas needed further attention because none of the yearly mean scores fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale as perceived by supervising teachers.

Data collected during 2011-2012 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

- 1—The ability to make content meaningful (5.00);
- 2—Understanding of human development and learning (4.89);
- 3—The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.80);
- 4—The ability to plan effective strategies for learning (4.91);
- 6—The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.68);
- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.83);
- 8—The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.79);
- 9—Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.97);
- 10—The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.94);
- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.97);
- 12—Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.94); and
- 13—The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.94).

None of the mean performances areas fell below 4.25. The candidate performance area needing monitoring, where the yearly mean score was 4.31 on a 5.0 scale in 2012-2013, as perceived by supervising teachers is listed below.

- 5—The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.31).

Data collected during 2012-2013 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

- 1—The ability to make content meaningful (4.89);
- 2—Understanding of human development and learning (4.76);
- 3—The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.78);
- 4—The ability to plan effective strategies for learning (4.89);

- 6—The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.51);
- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.67);
- 8—The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.75);
- 9—Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.88);
- 10—The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.86);
- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.96);
- 12—Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.95); and
- 13—The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.82).

None of the mean performances areas fell below 4.25. The candidate performance area needing monitoring, where the yearly mean score was 4.34 on a 5.0 scale in 2012-2013, as perceived by supervising teachers is listed below.

- 5—The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.34).

Department Response: Yearly mean scores above 4.50 were achieved for all but one criterion. The yearly mean score on Criterion 5 was 4.34. Overall mean scores for elementary (4.80), middle level (4.77) and secondary (4.75) were considered high. Motivation and classroom management ratings were lower than other criteria—elementary (4.41), middle level (4.00) and secondary (4.31). The lowest rating of any criteria was (4.00) for middle level (N=2) in motivation and classroom management. The department considered the fact that overall the scores provided by the supervising teacher were higher, especially for the middle level candidates, than the ratings provided by the cooperating teachers. We will monitor and compare the scores provided by supervising and cooperating teachers for consistency.

23. Graduate Surveys Completed by Employers after the First and Third Years of Teaching F12-S13, Attachment 23

Twelve surveys were received this year, which is the most ever, other than the 13 which were sent back in 2008. Eight of the surveys came from 1st year graduates, while 4 came from 3rd year graduates. Administrators of secondary graduates (N=7) in the areas of business, chemistry, English, history, and music returned surveys, with five elementary graduate surveys also returned. All but one of the 13 criteria were assessed by their administrators at the 4.0 to 5.0 level for elementary candidates, with a 3.8 on making content meaningful. Secondary teachers were rated lower than a 4.0 on criterion 3 (working with diverse learners—3.86), criterion 4 (Instructional Strategies—3.71) criterion 8 (assessment of student learning—3.71), and criterion 11 (integrating content—3.83). All other criteria were rated between 4.0 and 5.0 by secondary graduates’ administrators responding to the survey.

Department Response: Even though the number of surveys were larger this year, they are still much lower than desired and too low to consider reliable measures of our graduates’ abilities. The department brainstormed ways in which we could increase the return rate. It was suggested that we set these up in survey monkey rather than sending paper surveys. It was also suggested that, as we make visits to schools, we inform administrators that these surveys are sent out annually so they can watch for them.

24. Graduate Surveys Completed by Program Graduates after the First and Third Years of Teaching F12-S13, Attachment 24

Twenty-four surveys, the largest number ever received, were returned by 1st and 3rd year graduates of our teacher education programs. An overall self-assessed rating of 4.62/5.0 from our elementary graduates, and a self-assessed rating of 4.35/5.0 from our secondary graduates was reported. Elementary graduates (N=14) self-assessed all fifteen criteria with scores of 4.07 to 4.79. The criteria with the highest score (4.79) for the elementary graduates were “Making Content Meaningful,” “Teaching Diverse Learners,” “Reflection and Professional Development,” “Integrating Content,” and “Ability to Receive and Respond to Suggestions and

Criticism.” The criterion with the lowest rating (4.07) was in the area of “Instructional Technology.” Elementary candidates rated the criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” as a 4.68 and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation?” as a 4.61. These scores represent an improvement from the scores of last year.

The secondary graduates (N=10) self-reported scores of 4.1 to 4.7 in all criteria, with an overall mean of 4.35. The criteria with the highest score (4.7) were “Ability to Collaborate,” and “Ability to Receive and Respond to Suggestions and Criticism.” The lowest score (4.1) was in the criterion of “Assessment of Student Learning.” Secondary candidates rated both criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation” as a 4.2. These two criteria dropped slightly from the previous year but were still above the 4.0 level.

Department Response: Even though the response rate was higher than it has been in the past, the department would like to see an even larger number of survey responses in order to analyze the data effectively. In addition, department members wish to see data broken out by 1st and 3rd year graduates. We discussed combining three years’ worth of data, broken down into elementary and secondary candidates in order to get a more robust N.

25. Professional and Content GPAs F12-S13, Attachment 25

Elementary overall professional and content GPA is 3.64/4.00. Middle level overall professional and content GPA is 3.66 and secondary overall professional and content GPA is 3.43. Out of 102 candidates, only six candidates had professional and content GPAs of less than 2.8 (one each from chemistry, elementary, math, and physics and two physical education/health candidates). These six GPAs ranged from a low of 2.42 (physical education/health) to 2.78 (chemistry). All candidates (N=102) had a mean overall GPA average of 3.53/4.00.

Department Response: The chair had contacted all probationary candidates this summer to discuss their standing, what they need to do to gain a higher status, and the ramifications of continued low performance. We will continue this process in the future.

26. Personal and Professional Skills Surveys by Content Area F12-S13, Attachment 26

Elementary overall average performance is 4.00/5.00. Middle level overall is 4.22 and the secondary candidates’ overall performance is 3.73. Twelve of the 104 candidates have ratings below the 3.5. History and Physics each have one candidate below the required average while math and music each have two candidates below 3.5. There are three elementary and three physical education/health candidates with scores below the required average.

Department Response: In order to stress the importance of these ratings and clearly inform the candidates of the criteria, it was decided that a blank copy of this form will be distributed to all candidates in each professional education course. We will discuss expectations and explain how the form is used. Each candidate will write his/her name on the form and return it to the instructor. These forms will be completed by the instructor at the end of the semester and turned in. Tonya will continue to make candidates aware of their ratings every semester.

27. PDS Practica Evaluations by Mentor Teacher F12-S13, Attachment 27

Data are collected for practicums in ED 244 and ED 320. The mentor teacher evaluates the candidate on each of the criteria and then gives an overall evaluation score for the candidate. In ED 244, elementary candidates’ average overall performance (N=6) is 5.00/5.00, while the overall average for secondary candidates (N=3) is 4.67 with all candidates’ overall average at 4.75. The lowest overall score (4.44) was on the “Is Present on Scheduled Day” criteria and the highest rating at 4.89 was on the “Takes Initiative to Help Students.”

In ED 320, elementary candidates’ overall performance (N=2) is 5.00, the overall average for secondary candidates (N=8) is 4.86 with all candidates’ overall average at 4.89. The lowest overall score (4.3) was on the

“Makes Every Effort to be a Good Fit with the Classroom Climate” criteria and the highest ratings at 4.80 were on the “Arrives on Time,” “Always Appropriately Dressed,” and “Tutors.” There were no middle level candidates.

Department Response: The department notes that all scores are above the required average. Amy explained that if a candidate in ED 244 does not have 10 hours completed by midterm, they are administratively dropped from the course. In ED 320, candidates must have 15 hours completed before midterm in order to remain in the course. It was decided that this policy will be implemented in the secondary content methods courses.

28. Title II GPA/ACT data F-12-S13, Attachment 28

Jeanne Duncan explained some of the changes coming from the new CAEP accreditation guidelines and the impact these changes may have on our program.

Department Response: We will continue to monitor the ACT scores and the grade point averages of our candidates at program entry and exit.

ASSESSMENT AS FEEDBACK FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Multiple department changes, at both the course and program level, went into effect during 2012-2013. It is our belief that the changes will support our commitment “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.” During 2013-2014 the changes made will be monitored through TaskStream and our annual data review.

TaskStream and Assessment Plan Data Analysis

- Lesson Planning:
Lesson planning data continues to indicate a need for improvement. The area for concern is that of differentiated instruction. Specific instructions to the candidates informing them which student they are adapting for will assist the candidates in targeting the adaptations for their specific student. Criterion #4 on Assessment was lower than others with an overall mean score of 8.73/10. ED 345 Psychology of the Exceptional Learner is not a pre-requisite for ED 366/368 so the topic of differentiation in instruction may be stressed in 366/368 for the first time. Department faculty will continue to require students to redo inadequate work in this area of assessment and differentiated instruction. It would also be helpful if the lesson plan format and rubric in ED 366/368 and ED 450/470/480 be in the same order so that comparisons can be made. The department will continue to monitor in order to make decisions in the future.
- Cooperating and supervising teacher evaluations
Cooperating teachers evaluated the candidates overall high in all areas and only one criterion below 4.25/5.00. There was some concern about middle level candidates scoring 3.50 on several criteria but because of a small “N” it remains a concern to monitor longitudinally. Classroom management is still a concern and will continue to be monitored. Faculty are asked to address classroom management in all courses. Supervising teachers’ evaluations were higher than the cooperating teachers’ evaluations.
- Graduate follow-up surveys:
The survey returns from employers and graduates were limited. Changes in gathering this data should improve the return rate and yield dependable data. Utilizing the KSDE Employment Tracking Database will assist in locating graduates that remain employed in the state in their first and third year.

Recommendations from 2012 Education Advisory Council (EAC)

EAC members made several recommendations and responded to a survey sent by Baker.

- One area in which they indicated a concern was Classroom Management. The recommendations were as follows:
 - *Attach Classroom Management to a Practicum*
 - *More hours of Classroom Management*
 - *Separate Elementary and Secondary Classroom Management*
 - *Help students understand that they cannot be scared and have no confidence in front of their classroom and that they cannot always be nice.*
 - *Train Cooperating Teachers that it is okay to be firm with student teachers and to make sure and communicate to them what they need to do – put it out there.*

Another concern was Diversity and they suggested more courses in that area.

- A question the department asked was about 21st Century Learning/Skills. What does this term mean; what does this mean in terms of how you educate and prepare students.; how should Baker prepare its education candidates to teach 21st Century Learning/Skills? The EAC group made the following suggestions:
 - *Teach problem solving; applications, real-life situations, collaboration, creativity, communications, prepare them to be independent, use thinking processes, alternative assessments*
 - *How to learn, make choices, do research, career/tech ed*
 - *How you teach the material, use technological skills,*
 - *Multiple modalities,*
 - *Prepare students for the “real world”,*
 - *Teach candidates how to think “outside the box”.*

The department does address 21st Century Learning/Skills in ED 243; ED 309; ED 440/460; Secondary Methods; and during Student Teaching.

- The department asked the questions about how their districts were transitioning and implementing Common Core Standards.
 - *They utilize in-services, identify what they are doing and what they are touching on; what is not being done. Secondary methods could be a place to read through.*
 - *How does Baker teach teachers to do writing across the curriculum?*
 - *How are they assessed?*
 - *Have candidates prepare lessons in common core.*

The department does address Common Core Standards in ED 243; Secondary Content Methods; ED 309; ED 366/368; Student Teaching and faculty inservice/department meetings.

- The department also asked for feedback on these questions. Should Baker have a process to aid 1st year teachers who graduated from this institution? Could this process/program collaborate with the mentoring that districts have to support 1st year teachers?
 - *They suggested to meet twice a year; new teacher panel, and IHE faculty email 1st and 3rd year grads.*
 - *How much is school responsibility?*
 - *Yes, it would be beneficial.*
 - *Good to have input.*

- *Work harder campus-wide to be better mentors (not just education)*

CONCLUSION

The Undergraduate Education Department has formally collected data on the performance of teacher education candidates since 2005. Some of the data, such as the cumulative grade point information and scores on standardized tests, are required for licensure at the state level. Other data are collected in individual courses and evaluated through department-created rubrics which are collected on TaskStream. All data is reviewed annually at a data meeting in the summer. The Department has systematically collected and organized a large amount of data in recent years, with data-driven decisions made regarding program and course changes. We feel that this process of data analysis strengthens the program and results in increasing our support of commitment to the candidates “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.”

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Undergraduate Department

OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN AND 2014 REPORT
for the 2013-2014 Academic Year

SOE Mission

The Baker University School of Education is committed to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.

SOE Vision

The School of Education provides quality programs grounded in a tradition of academic excellence and responds to the educational needs of the future.

SOE Beliefs

The School of Education believes a confident and competent educational leader

- Advocates for all students and their learning successes;
- Has a strong knowledge base and sense of beliefs and values supported by educational research and best practices;
- Has the commitment and skills to transfer knowledge, beliefs, and values into policy and practice;
- Demonstrates interpersonal practices that advance the welfare and dignity of all persons; and
- Maintains an unremitting drive for improvement.

IDENTIFICATION OF PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The Undergraduate Department of the School of Education is guided by the SOE Conceptual Framework that includes 15 undergraduate program objectives. These objectives represent skills that are expected of confident and competent educational leaders. The first ten program objectives are closely linked to the standards of the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS), and Charlotte Danielson's standards outlined in her book, *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching*. These first thirteen program objectives are closely related to the KSDE professional education standards and are assessed on ratings provided by program graduates and their employers, while program objectives 14 and 15 are unique to the undergraduate education program. Data are collected on all 15 program objectives throughout the teacher education program.

Baker University's mission statement identifies a community "committed to assuring student learning and developing confident, competent and responsible contributors to society" (Baker University Mission Statement August 2008). The five CAS Educational Goals address 1) liberal studies and scholarship, 2) application of knowledge, 3) effective communication, 4) global citizenship, and 5) health and wellness perspectives (CAS Educational Goals/Student Learning Outcomes adopted by CAS Faculty Senate, May 3, 2005). A review of the Undergraduate Department's program objectives reveals many links with both the university mission statement and the CAS Learning Goals/Student Learning Outcomes, especially the ones that deal with liberal studies and scholarship, application of knowledge, and effective communication.

SOE Undergraduate Program Objectives

Upon completion of their course work, candidates for teacher licensure will demonstrate:

1. The ability to use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline as s/he teaches, creating learning opportunities, including integrated learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for all students.
2. The ability to engage students in learning through the use of multiple and effective instructional strategies appropriate to students' developmental levels and knowledge of content.
3. The ability to use information about students' interests, abilities, skills, backgrounds, and peer relationships to make knowledge accessible to all students, including students with exceptionalities and diverse learners.

4. The ability to use a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage the students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.
5. An understanding of individual and group motivation and student behavior that fosters positive and safe learning environments and encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self motivation.
6. The ability to use his/her knowledge of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
7. The ability to design and plan instruction based on knowledge of content and pedagogy, knowledge of students, knowledge of resources, and knowledge of learning goals.
8. The ability to use multiple types of both formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continual development for all learners.
9. The ability to be a reflective practitioner capable of being held to a high standard of ethical behavior, professional skills, and personal dispositions in the areas of family communications, accurate record-keeping, professional growth and responsibilities, and contributions to the school and district.
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with school colleagues, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well being.
11. The ability to integrate across and within content fields to enrich the curriculum, develop reading and thinking skills, and facilitate all students' abilities to understand relationships between subject areas.
12. The ability to use skills in technology to gather and analyze information, enhance instructional practices, facilitate professional productivity, assist with educational change, and help all students use instructional technology effectively.
13. The ability to be reflective practitioners who use knowledge of historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education to guide educational practices.
14. An understanding of school law, educational policies, local, state and national educational structures, professional licensing procedures, and professional organizations.
15. An understanding of the SOE Conceptual Framework which is defined as the Mission, Vision, Beliefs, Commitments, Program Objectives, Essential Characteristics (Personal and Professional Skills and Dispositions), and Evaluation Process.

SOE UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN

Background Information

The undergraduate program began collecting summative assessment data via *TaskStream*, a web-based electronic portfolio/data collection program in most professional education courses during the 2005-2006 academic year. Because of the valuable information available in this format, the decision was made to collect elementary education program data through *TaskStream* starting with the 2006-2007 year. Assessments from the social studies, math, reading, and science methods courses were uploaded to *TaskStream* in 2007 and assessments from Art, Music and Physical Education methods courses in 2007-2008. These data were used extensively to support the portfolios that were submitted to KSDE in September 2008.

After meeting with Dr. Rob Flaherty, CAS Acting Associate Dean, in late 2005, we implemented several data collection/analysis changes designed to strengthen our process in the 2006-2007 academic year. We began compiling data in categories of *unsatisfactory*, *basic*, *proficient*, or *distinguished* rather than by mean scores. Determining the percentage of candidates who scored in the different categories allowed us to analyze the data more thoroughly. We also began presenting data yearly rather than by semester in order to make it easier to see substantial trends, rather than one-semester anomalies.

The Current Plan

The *SOE Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Plan* involves standardized assessments, GPA data, and performance assessments based on the program objectives. Additional summative data collected to determine student candidacy are also included in this report.

Multiple performance assessments have been adopted or developed to measure candidate progress on program objectives.

Rubrics for performance assessments, when appropriate, can be found within each tabbed section. Candidate performance in specified areas, such as lesson planning, is measured by the same rubric throughout the program. As previously mentioned, performance assessments are both formative and summative. Most summative performance data is kept on *TaskStream*, a web-based educational resource and portfolio program.

The *SOE Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Plan* is attached. This plan includes a number of assessments that are a) quantitative and qualitative and b) formative and summative. A matrix linking program objectives to performance assessments in each professional education course is included. This matrix is the *course component* of the larger plan. Each entry in Column 1 identifies the required core professional education course, Column 2 delineates which department member is responsible for collecting the data during that particular course, Column 3 indicates whether the assessment is Formative (F) or Summative (S), Column 4 identifies the performance assessment used, and the remainder of the matrix identifies what program objectives are met by each assessment.

Below are listed the data collected and analyzed by the department.

Data collected from standardized assessments include:

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE, or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST);
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS; and
3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS.

Data collected from grade point averages include:

4. Cumulative GPA scores.

Data collected from performance assessments include:

5. Alternative assessments (ED 309) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
6. Unit test writing (ED 309) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
7. Group presentations (ED 343)
8. Dispositions (special needs populations), (ED 345)
9. Dispositions (diverse populations), (IS 199) (Sample KPTP Task 1)
10. Dispositions (IS 199) (journal)
11. Dispositions (Prof Ed Courses)
12. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 345)
13. Accommodations/Modifications ratings (ED 450/470/480) – Std Tchr/Coop Tchr
14. Unit writing (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
15. Lesson plan writing (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
16. Lesson plan writing (ED 450/470/480)
17. Visual presentation (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
18. Electronic Portfolio (ED 265) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
19. Developmental portfolio (ED 440/460)
20. Program objectives (ED 440/460)
21. KPTP Actual Task 2, 3 & 4 (ED 440/460) (longitudinal)
22. Candidate performance ratings/cooperating teachers (longitudinal)
23. Candidate performance ratings/supervising teachers (IHE) (longitudinal)
24. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates (longitudinal)
25. Ratings provided by program graduates (longitudinal)

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

26. Professional and content area GPA scores (longitudinal)
27. Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores
28. PDS practica evaluations

Additional Data Collected for the EPP

29. Advising survey

Additional Data Collected for Federal Reports

30. Title II GPA/ACT data

ASSESSMENT DATA ANALYSIS

Summative data are analyzed and evaluated annually by the undergraduate faculty members and shared with the Education Advisory Council and the Undergraduate Teacher Education Committee (UTECE) at the annual EAC meeting and with all SOE faculty during the annual retreat. Feedback from these groups has often led to recommended program changes based on these data.

**SOE UNDERGRADUATE OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN
2013-2014**

Standardized Assessments

1. Basic skills scores provided by C-BASE or ETS on the Pre-Professional Skills Test (PPST)
2. Content area test scores provided by ETS (longitudinal)
3. Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) scores provided by ETS (longitudinal)

GPA Data

4. Cumulative GPA scores (longitudinal)

Performance Assessments

5. Alternative assessments (ED 309) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
6. Unit test writing (ED 309) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
7. Group presentations (ED 343)
8. Dispositions (special needs populations), (ED 345)
9. Dispositions (diverse populations), (IS 199) (Sample KPTP Task 1)
10. Dispositions (IS 199) (journal)
11. Dispositions (Prof Ed Courses)
12. Differentiated instruction ratings (ED 345)
13. Accommodations/Modifications ratings (ED 450/470/480) – Std Tchr/Coop Tchr
14. Unit writing (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
15. Lesson plan writing (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
16. Lesson plan writing (ED 450/470/480)
17. Visual presentation (ED 366/368) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
18. Electronic Portfolio (ED 265) (Summer 2013 & 13-14)
19. Developmental portfolio (ED 440/460)
20. Program objectives (ED 440/460)
21. KPTP Actual Task 2, 3 & 4 (ED 440/460) (longitudinal)
22. Candidate performance ratings/cooperating teachers (longitudinal)
23. Candidate performance ratings/supervising teachers (IHE) (longitudinal)
24. Ratings provided by employers of program graduates (longitudinal)
25. Ratings provided by program graduates (longitudinal)

Additional Data Collected to Determine Student Candidacy

26. Professional and content area GPA scores (longitudinal)
27. Personal and Professional Skills Survey scores
28. PDS practica evaluations

Additional Data Collected for the EPP

29. Advising survey

Additional Data Collected for Federal Reports

30. Title II GPA/ACT data

Matrix of Performance Assessments Collected in Courses 2013-2014

Course	Responsible for	Assessment	Program Objectives															
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	
		(F)	Group Presentations	X		X	X	X		X	X		X					
ED 243	JF	(F)	Lesson Plans	X		X	X			X								
		(F)	Dispositions			X	X					X						
ED 265	KD	(S)	Electronic Portfolio	X					X			X			X		X	
		(S)	Alternative Assessment			X					X			X				
		(S)	Unit Test								X							
ED 309	PH	(S)	Lifelong Learning									X						
		(S)	Educational Legal Issues														X	
		(S)	Dispositions (P-T Conf)					X	X			X	X					
		(S)	Parent Email						X			X		X				
		(F)	Dispositions			X	X					X						
ED 343	JF	(S)	Group Presentations	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X		X				
		(F)	PowerPoint						X						X			
		(S)	Educational Mission Statement									X					X	
		(S)	Dispositions (special needs)			X	X					X						
ED 345	AW	(F)	PowerPoint												X			
		(S)	Differentiated Instruction Planning			X												
		(S)	Unit-Basic Components	X	X		X	X		X	X			X	X			
		(S)	Lesson Plans	X		X	X	X		X								
ED 366/368	CP	(S)	Visual Presentations		X				X	X					X			
		(S)	Final Project Multi-Genre Pres.	X	X	X	X								X		X	
		(S)	Unit Assessment Plan	X	X	X	X		X	X								
ED 440/460	JF/AW	(S)	Developmental Portfolio	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X		X	X	X		
		(S)	Program Objectives	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
	SCS	(S)	Differentiated Instruction Ratings			X				X								
	TS	(S)	Coop. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
ED 450/470 /480	TS	(S)	Sup. Tchr. Evals	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X			
	SCS	(S)	Lesson Plans	X			X			X								
	SCS	(S)	Dispositions			X	X					X						
	SCS	(S)	KPTP Task 2, 3, and 4	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X		X		
IS 199	SCS	(S)	Dispositions - Journal (Div. pop. setting)			X	X					X						
		(F)	KPTP Sample Task 1 demographics			X	X					?						

Fall 2013

(F) = Formative Data

(S) = Summative Data

STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENTS

1. Basic Skills Scores by Content Area (C-BASE) F13-S14, Attachment 1

The Kansas State Board of Education requires that all teacher education programs use a measurement of basic skills for program admittance. Several years ago, after surveying all Kansas colleges with teacher licensure, the School of Education approved the use of the C-BASE (College Basic Academic Subjects Examination), a standardized test published by the University of Missouri and required for all Missouri teacher licensure candidates as the preferred basic skills test. The cut score for Missouri teacher education candidates (235) was also approved for Baker undergraduate candidates. It is important to note that no student is permitted to student teach without passing all parts of the C-BASE.

A review of the 2013-2014 C-BASE test scores, compiled by majors, reveals that candidate mean scores for most content areas were above the cut score of 235. On an individual basis, out of 163 subtests taken, 142 were passed. This means that 87% of the subtests were passed. Overall, the mean basic skills score for all candidates in each of the three basic skills areas—English/Reading 260, Writing 278, and Math 294 are above the 235 cut score. The overall mean of 277 continues the trend of being significantly above the cut score of 235. Therefore, it appears that the vast majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate skills in English, math, and writing. However, a review of the data reveals two elementary candidates who scored significantly lower in two subtests and one of them scored lower in the third subtest. One history candidate scored significantly lower in all subtests.

It is also important to review the results of all teacher education candidates, not just those who were required to take a basic skills test. After a statewide review of basic skills requirements in Kansas teacher education programs, the Professional Education Council voted in May 2006 to exempt students with a cumulative ACT score of 26 or above from taking a basic skills test. This year, fourteen individuals were exempt from taking any of the basic skills tests. Therefore, while 55 candidates took the C-BASE English subtest, another 14 students (25%) were exempted from the C-BASE. In 2012-2013, 23% were exempt, 26% were exempt in 2011-2012 and 28% were exempt in 2010-2011. The consistent exempt rate speaks well for the quality of the candidates choosing to pursue teacher education at Baker University.

Department Response: The department feels that the majority of teacher education candidates possess adequate basic skills. Based on their scores, the conclusion is that the quality of those students continues to be well above basic skills levels.

In analyzing the non-passing scores, department members agreed to make these students aware of the SAS tutoring opportunities. In 2012-2013 it was decided that the electronic C-Base study guide will be posted on Moodle in ED 100 and low-performing candidates will be required to take a practice test prior to registering for the C-Base. In addition, students who fail a section of the C-Base will be required to retake the section at the next testing opportunity. In that way, students who find it difficult to pass the C-Base will be made aware of this difficulty early and will be counseled to reconsider their career choice. A change was made to the C-BASE policy that will go into effect Fall 2014. This new policy dictates that a candidate that does not pass any of the sections of the C-BASE exam, they are required to retake the exam at the very next offering. This will mean that candidates will have to complete this task before they can move forward in the program.

It is important to understand that the C-BASE is almost always taken during the first education course, ED 100 Teaching as a Career. Since ED 100 is an introductory course, not all students continue in the program; some of them are probably deterred by the basic skills test requirement.

2. Content Area Assessments by Content Areas F13-S14, Attachment 2

Cut scores for content assessments have been in force since September 2005. A review of the content assessment scores for the 2013-2014 academic year reveals an 88.5% pass rate. While this pass rate does not put us in jeopardy, it is lower than pass rates in the past. In 2013-2014 content assessments (with pass rates) were taken in the areas of biology, chemistry, elementary education, English, history, mathematics, middle level English, music education and physical

education. Areas in which there was less than 100% pass rate included elementary education (71%) and history (0%).

Department Response: The department is pleased with the 2013-2014 performance of candidates on content assessments and plans to continue the practice of requiring that students in ED 309 take a sample content test. Based on the past results of history majors, it was suggested that we again make the history department aware of the low pass rate pattern. It was recommended that Dr. Foil or a History Department faculty member take the Praxis History Content exam. The department will encourage candidates to take the content test as soon as they have completed their content coursework. The overall pass rate of 88.5% for Praxis II content tests will be monitored to determine if the lower pass rate continues. Annual reports and the PEDS reports are reviewed by NCATE every year and inquiries will be sent out when overall pass rates approach 80%. Elementary had seven candidates that took the Praxis exam and five passed. The two candidates are scheduled to retake the exam soon.

3. PLT by Content Area F13-S14, Attachment 3

During the 2013-2014 academic year, 25 candidates who took the PLT (Principles of Learning and Teaching) standardized test of pedagogy passed the test for a pass rate of 100%. The mean PLT score for this year's candidates was 176, which is higher than the 161 cut score set by the state of Kansas. PLT tests by candidates majoring in the areas of biology, chemistry, elementary education, English, history, mathematics, middle level English, music education, and physical education were taken during the 2013-2014 academic year.

Department Response: The department is pleased with the 100% pass rate, which is higher than the year before. The department will continue the practice of requiring students in ED 309 to take a sample test and create individualized study guides.

GPA DATA

4. Cumulative GPA by Content Area F13-S14, Attachment 4

The mean cumulative grade point average for 2013-2014 teacher licensure candidates in all content areas was 3.36. The mean cumulative grade point average for 2013-2014 teacher licensure candidates in elementary education was 3.36. The mean cumulative grade point average for 2013-2014 teacher licensure candidates in secondary education was 3.35 and middle-level candidates was 3.60. The mean cumulative grade point average for teacher education candidates broken down into content areas ranged from a low of 3.03 in speech/theatre to a high of 4.0 in Middle Level English. The highest GPAs were 3.98 for Spanish (n=1), 3.80 in biology (n=1), and 3.72 in business (N=1). The lowest GPAs were for speech/theatre with 3.03 (n=1), physical education with 3.14 (N= 14) and Chemistry with 3.26 (N=1).

Department Response: Teacher licensure candidates' mean content GPA of 3.36 is the highest since 2007-2008 except for 12-13 when it was 3.39. The recommendation was made to monitor the Elementary candidate that had a 1.04 GPA to see if this is a one year concern from the accident or if there are other issues. The decision was made to create an assignment in ED 100 and/or ED 243 that covers the page of the handbook that explains the various levels of candidate status in the program.

PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT DATA

5. Alternative Assessments (During ED 309) F13-S14, Attachment 5

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must create an alternative assessment, with detailed assignment guidelines and grading rubrics. A review of the results on the alternative assessment revealed that, out of the 26 students assessed in summer, fall, and spring, eight candidates fell below basic on at least one criterion. Criteria 2, 3, 4, and 5 had unsatisfactory scores. The average for all 26 candidates across all six criteria was 8.47 /10 or 84.7%. The total average for all elementary candidates was 8.04 and was impacted by three candidates who did not complete criteria 2 and 5. The secondary candidates' average (8.66) was impacted by one music major who scored four points on the last four criteria.

Department Response: Continue with the assessment and analyze data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates. Note that candidates must complete each criterion and be encouraged by faculty to complete the assessment. Faculty member will meet with music candidate about efforts

6. Unit Test Writing (During ED 309) F13-S14, Attachment 6

In ED 309 Evaluation Techniques, candidates must create a variety of formative and summative assessments. They must write a unit test composed of objective and subjective questions and create a thorough grading key.

A review of the results on the unit test revealed that, out of the 25 students assessed in summer, fall, and spring, three candidates fell below basic level on the criterion related to identifying levels of Bloom's Taxonomy. The average for all five criteria was 9.00/10 or 90%. The total average for elementary candidates was 9.10 and for secondary candidates 8.92.

Department Response: Continue monitoring of data and performance to see whether any changes need to be made. Continue the use of samples to provide model assignments for candidates' review. As of this review, no changes are necessary to the assessment or rubric. Lack of response of a candidate on the assessment should be addressed at the time of the assessment. This assessment helps to prepare the candidates for the unit in the KPTP.

7. Group Presentations (During ED 343) F13-S14, Attachment 7

Candidates make group presentations in ED 343 Educational Psychology. A review of the 2013-2014 results indicated that there was an average score of 9.96/10 or 99.6% on the Group Presentation Assignment. All 14 candidates scored distinguished or proficient. The total average for the elementary candidates was 9.94/10 (99.4%) and for secondary candidates was 9.97/10 (97%).

Department Response: Overall, all candidates scored high. The lowest score (9.00) occurred in Criterion 3, "Active Participation of Audience". Continued modeling is needed for active participation. Analyze future data to determine ongoing differences between elementary and secondary candidates.

8. Dispositions (Special Needs Population) (During ED 345) F13-S14, Attachment 8

Previously the disposition rating scale adopted in 2002 by the Education Department was created by Dr. Mark Wasiecko of Eastern Kentucky University. His instrument, "Defining and Measuring Educator Dispositions" was adapted from the research of Dr. Arthur Combs' on the preferred dispositions for professionals in the field of counseling and modified to focus on educator dispositions.

A dispositions curriculum was created and results have been tracked for several years. Because the ability to display regard for children, be aware of their developmental needs, and treat all children with dignity is critical for successful teaching and learning, the department created a procedure for dealing with those candidates whose behaviors and belief patterns raised concern regarding their suitability for working with young people.

During the spring semester of 2012, SOE began to look at revising dispositions to align with NCATE definition of dispositions and with the InTASC dispositions. Multiple meetings with undergraduate and graduate departments with discussions of the NCATE and InTASC dispositions, looking at alignment and consulting dispositions of other institutions resulted in the decision to pilot four dispositions and to collect data. Criterion 3 on the rubric is the first disposition—demonstrate a belief that all people can learn. Criterion 4 is a grouping of the remaining three dispositions.

Results are computed separately for elementary and secondary education candidates. Mean scores and distribution charts for the 2013-2014 academic year on summative disposition ratings are attached. Disposition ratings are made on a 10-point scale, with any score of 7 or above considered evidence of a belief system compatible with the teaching profession.

Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.22/10 (92%), while secondary candidates had an average score of 9.10/10 (91%). Only one candidate scored less than an 8 (and that was in the area of writing aptitude) meaning all candidates' scores in the criteria dealing with teacher dispositions fell in the areas of distinguished or proficient.

Department Response: These results provide evidence that teacher education candidates received scores in the

acceptable range on the disposition rubric. The department members feel that the current assignment for this data collection needs to be modified. For future analysis, the department decided to look for consistency in disposition scores across courses. When we are assessing the same group of candidates, we should see some consistency. Analyzing disposition scores across years, we hope to see growth in candidate dispositions as reflected in the scores. To assist in this analysis, the new dispositions form will be placed on Taskstream to ensure that all disposition ratings use the newly revised dispositions.

9. Diverse Populations Sample KPTP Task 1 (During IS 199) F13-S14, Attachment 9

A review of the results revealed an overall mean of 9.61/10, or 96.1%. Elementary candidates had an average score of 9.50/10 (95%), while secondary candidates had an average score of 9.71/10 (97.1%). No candidates scored in the unsatisfactory range, while one candidate scored in basic category on criterion 2.

Department Response: This assignment focuses on the “demographics” section, Task 1 of the KPTP. The rubric needs to be modified. The Distinguished column is missing descriptors in the rubric. Candidates performed well. Assignment/Assessment provides good practice for Task 1 of the teacher work sample, KPTP.

10. Dispositions: Journal (During IS 199) F13-S14, Attachment 10

This is the second year this assessment has been included in our Outcomes Assessment Report. A review of the results indicates an overall average of 9.49/10 for 2 elementary candidates and an average of 10.0/10 for three secondary candidates. A closer review of the elementary scores show that one of the candidates scored in a mean score of 8.90 (lowest score) on the second criterion (Models ethical behavior; treat others with fairness, dignity and respect. All candidates scored above the required level. There were eight secondary candidates and 15 elementary candidates enrolled in IS 199. There were extenuating circumstances that impacted the assessments conducted in IS 199 in 13-14.

Department Response: The department discussed the need to create a rubric on how to write the journal to elicit some consistency on expectations. Some journals are very informative and others were vague. There is typically one instructor that evaluates the journals but the rubric would be helpful to candidates to set expectations.

11. Dispositions: (Professional Education Courses) F13-S14, Attachment 11

This was added to the data collection but there was confusion as to when the data collection would start with the new dispositions. Faculty were not consistent in collecting so the data collection will be discussed in a department meeting and begin the data collection next academic year.

Department Response: The department discussed the data collection and dispositions will be evaluated during 2014-2015 in the professional education courses.

12. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During ED 345) F13-S14, Attachment 12

Originally entitled “Accommodations”, this assessment is now called “Differentiated Instruction.” A review of the five criteria for this assessment revealed an overall average of 9.07/10. Elementary candidates had an average rating of 9.21/10 (N=14), while secondary candidates averaged 8.83/10 (N=9). These scores represent an increase in all criteria from last year for the group. The elementary candidates showed an increase in the overall average from 8.74 to 9.21. Secondary candidates’ average decreased from 8.89 to 8.83.

Department Response: The department noted that all candidates performed within the acceptable range of performance. However, two of the secondary candidates did not perform as well on criteria 4 and 5 but still met the passing level of Basic. Department will continue monitoring data and candidate performance to review for necessary changes. As of this review, no changes are necessary for the assessment or the rubric.

13. Differentiated Instruction Ratings (During Student Teaching) F13-S14, Attachment 13

This is a new addition to our Outcomes Assessment Report after an absence of collected data for several years. The department reviewed the candidates’ self-evaluation rubrics and noted the elementary ratings were improved from first to last visit. Secondary ratings were higher than elementary, both from the student teacher and the cooperating teacher.

Department Response: The department discussed revising the rubric for data collection. Candidates could utilize self-reflection using the rubric as they work with a student/s. Discussion is ongoing as to how often this assessment needs to be filled out. Perhaps a summative one for data collection but not done on every visit from the university supervisor. The rubric needs to be revised and put on TaskStream. We will monitor data collection for further revisions.

14. Unit Writing (During ED 366/368) F1-S14, Attachment 14

The summer 2013 data (N=7) was evaluated on 13 criteria. The overall mean 8.97/10 or 89.7%, with elementary and candidates performing at 8.46 and secondary candidates at 9.65. The fall '13 and spring '14 data, with an N= 7 elementary and 8 secondary reveal an overall mean of 9.89/10 or 98.9% for the elementary candidates. TaskStream did not record the secondary candidate data. Tonya will look into why TS did not report the data. Fall/Spring 13-14 elementary candidates performed at a higher level than the summer 2013 elementary candidates. Lowest scores in summer were 6.0 on Criteria 7 and 13. Fall/Spring candidates lowest score was 9.0 on several criteria for two of the seven candidates.

Department Response: Instructor indicates that she will pull building report cards from the KSDE website to distribute to candidates to assist the candidates with this assessment. Instructor will also modify the rubric to make it more usable for assessment now that she has taught the course for a full year now. Tonya will look into why TaskStream did not report the secondary candidates' data.

15. Lesson Plan Writing (During ED 366/368) F13-S14, Attachment 15

This is the second year in which elementary and secondary candidates took the course separately, with developmentally appropriate strategies and focuses of instruction for each group. The performance of the 7 candidates in the summer course was high with a combined mean of 9.86/10 for the 4 elementary and 3 secondary candidates. All scores fell in the distinguished or proficient categories except for a physics candidate who scored 7.0 in criteria 3 (objectives) and 6 (instructional components). For the 4 candidates who took the course during the fall '13 or spring '14 semester, the overall average of the 9 criteria measured in this assessment was 9.92/10, or 99.2% (N=4). Elementary candidate had an average rating of 10.0/10 (N=1), while secondary candidates scored a 9.89/10 (N=3). The lowest score (7.0) was in criterion 4 (assessment) for an English candidate.

Department Response: Data numbers for summer and fall/spring are small. Elementary and secondary performed well with exception of one physics candidate who is no longer in the program. Still had some TaskStream issues with this course and the data. Not all candidate data was able to be pulled into the report.

16. Lesson Plan Writing (During Student Teaching) F13-S14, Attachment 16

The mean for all spring elementary candidates was 8.67 for all areas of the lesson plan rubric. The mean for all secondary candidates was 8.00. The overall combined mean of the elementary and secondary candidates was 8.29/10. One of the secondary candidates received a mean score of 5.14 and one elementary candidate received a mean score of 7.20 on this assessment.

Department Response: No fall data were collected during student teaching due to a personnel issue. Spring data were collected with a new university supervisor. She made notes about the lesson plan assessment and will emphasize that candidates much write something in each area of the lesson plan. A rubric added to TaskStream will allow for data collection on separate criteria of the rubric in addition to a final score.

17. Visual Presentations (During ED 366/368) F13-S14, Attachment 17

The seven candidates who took the course in the summer earned a mean score of 9.59/10 on this assessment. Of concern was the one candidate (history) who received score of 6/10 on Criterion #2 (quality and number of images). Three candidates completed the course during the fall '13 and spring '14 semesters, with an average of 9.67/10, or 96.7% on the four criteria of this assessment. All scores were at the distinguished or proficient category.

Department Response: Small numbers in data for summer and then for the 13/14 year. More TaskStream issues for this

course which were reflected above in items 14 and 15.

18. Electronic Portfolio (During ED 265) F13-S14 Attachment 18

Data from fall '13/spring'14 were reviewed. During the fall '13 and spring '14 semesters only two candidates receiving a rating in the basic category. One on criterion 1 (introduction) and one candidate on criterion 3 (format/organization). All other candidates were rated as distinguished or proficient. The overall fall/spring mean was 9.33/10.

Elementary candidates have a mean of 9.63 while secondary candidates earned a mean score of 9.27/10. This is a summative assignment in ED 265, which is currently being taught by a local elementary school teacher on an adjunct basis.

Department Response: The department will continue to monitor data and candidate performance on this assessment to ascertain whether any changes need to be made. As of this review, no changes are necessary to the assessment or the rubric.

19. Developmental Portfolio (During ED 440/460) F13-S14, Attachment 19

This is the third full academic year in which the developmental portfolio assessment has been solely attached to ED 440/460, the course taken the semester before student teaching by elementary and secondary candidates. In this assessment, candidates are instructed to provide evidence that they have become 1) reflective practitioners, 2) planners of instruction, 3) facilitators of learning, 4) assessors of learning, and 5) technologically literate practitioners. Departmental faculty, along with interested underclassmen from the department attend the portfolio presentations, and give feedback used in the assessment of candidates.

Departmental policy states that any student who receives a mean score below 7.0 on a 10-point scale must redo and resubmit his/her developmental portfolio. For the 2005-2007 years, no one was required to resubmit. One student needed to redo the portfolio during 2007-2008. The overall mean score of all 2008-2009 developmental portfolios was 9.3 on a 10-point scale; no candidate was required to redo the portfolio during that academic year. In 2009-2010, one student's work fell below the proficiency level. That student redid her portfolio and scored at a proficient level. All students met the proficiency level during 2010-2011, and again for the 2011-2012 academic year. For 12-13, candidates in ED 440 earned an overall mean of 9.65/10 (96.54%) on this assessment (N=13). The candidates in ED 460 also earned the exact same mean (N=13). All ratings were exactly the same on every criteria.

In the 13-14 academic year, all 21 candidates met the proficiency level and no one was required to resubmit. In ED 440, the 12 candidates earned an overall mean of 9.57/10 (95.7%) on this assessment. In ED 460, the nine candidates earned an overall mean of 9.38/10 (93.8%). One secondary candidate (PE) scored 7.0/10 on criterion 4 (assessor of learning).

Department Response: The department had to drill down to individual candidates and review the data because TaskStream reported some elementary candidates in 460 and some secondary in 440. Tonya will call TaskStream figure out the issues with this course. This is the second course that we have had some data issues. The numbers are small enough that Tonya identified the candidates by which program they were enrolled in so that we could figure the data correctly. All candidates scored within the required proficiency level.

20. Program Objectives (During ED 440/460) F13-S14, Attachment 20

Data are not available for this assessment. Data are collected in a hard-copy process and the hard copies were lost in the process.

Department Response: We will continue to monitor this self-reported data for use in program improvement.

21. Kansas Performance Teaching Portfolio (During ED 440/460) F13-S14, Attachments 21

For the 2011-2012 year, candidates' KPTP scores were reported to KSDE for licensure purposes (for the first time). Observing the KSDE guidelines of a 20/30 cut score, all elementary candidates (N=18) met the passing criterion on their first attempt. Scores ranged from a low of 20 to a high of 29.5 with a mean score of 24.72 for all 18 elementary candidates.

With 17 middle-level and secondary candidates completing the KPTP in 12-13, 15 passed on the first attempt. One middle level math candidate received a score of 19.5 on the first attempt; the second attempt earned a passing score. One music candidate received an initial score of 17.5, but received a passing score on the second attempt. The scores of all 17 middle-level and secondary candidates ranged from a low of 17.5 to a high of 29.5, with a mean of 22.71. Of the 35 candidates who completed the KPTP during 12-13, 33 passed on the first attempt for a pass rate of 94%. The two candidates who did not pass initially, passed after remediation.

In 13-14 there were 29 candidates who completed the KPTP. Twenty-eight candidates passed on the first attempt for a pass rate of 97%. The one elementary candidate passed after remediation and a second scoring.

Department Response: Elementary candidates had a 87.5% pass rate and middle-level and secondary candidates had a pass rate of 100% prior to remediation for 2013-2014. After remediation, all candidates achieved the cut score. The department will continue to inform and support candidates on the KPTP process because we are seeing score growth in the KPTPs. In the future, we will include the fall and spring KSDE KPTP Score Report in the data packets.

Task 2, 3 and 4 of the KPTP (During 450, 470, 480), F 13- S 14, Attachment 21

The KPTP provided useful assessment data by which to measure candidates' instructional practices, reflection and professionalism. Through data drawn from Tasks 2, (designing instruction), 3 (teaching and learning) and 4 (reflection and professionalism), candidates could provide evidence of skills in authentic teaching practice. Elementary candidates (N=8) had an average score of 2.33/3 on Task 2, 2.35/3 on Task 3, and an average score of 2.19 on Task 4. All but one of the elementary candidates met the minimum subscores of 2/3 or higher on Tasks 2, 3 and 4. Middle-level and secondary candidates (N=21) had an average score of 2.52 on Task 2, 2.53/3 on Task 3, and an average score of 2.38 on Task 4. All candidates had a score of 2 or more on Tasks 2, 3, and 4.

Department Response: This year the department looked at subscores on Tasks 2, 3 and 4. When remediation was finished with the one candidate, we found that the second scorer from KSDE was completely off from the other scorer. The department discussion indicates that we believe the skill set of our candidates is not reflected in the KPTP. We need to continue to support the candidates and give opportunities for them to practice the skills needed for the teacher work sample.

22. Cooperating Teacher Evaluations F13-S14, Attachment 22

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district's cooperating teacher. The items on these evaluation forms are aligned with the Department's program objectives. For comparison purposes, data from 2008-2013 are included below.

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2008-2009, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.16/5.0 (N=11)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.86/5.0 (N=4)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.39/5.0 (N=23)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.37/5.0 (N=38)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2009-2010, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=15)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 3.77/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.23/5.0 (N=34)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.34/5.0 (N=51)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2010-2011, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.60/5.0 (N=20)
------------------------	-------------------------------

Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of NA/5.0 (N=0)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.50/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=40)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2011-2012, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.56/5.0 (N=21)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 3.92/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.39/5.0 (N=18)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.46/5.0 (N=41)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2012-2013, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates	Mean score of 4.59/5.0 (N=18)
Middle Level Candidates	Mean score of 3.85/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates	Mean score of 4.32/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates)	Mean score of 4.42/5.0 (N=40)

Mean scores of cooperating teacher evaluations from 2013-2014, divided by elementary, middle level, and secondary candidates, are listed below.

Elementary Candidates	Mean score of 4.40/5.0 (N=6)
Middle Level Candidates	Mean score of 4.69/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates	Mean score of 4.53/5.0 (N=16)
Overall (All Candidates)	Mean score of 4.49/5.0 (N=24)

Data collected during 2008-2009 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included:

1. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values;
2. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning;
3. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2008-2009, as perceived by cooperating teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.20).
2. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.08).
3. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.24).

Data collected during 2009-2010 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included the following.

1. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.58).
2. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.56).
3. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.79).
4. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.52).

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2009-2010, as perceived by cooperating teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse

- learners (4.08).
- 2. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.23).
- 3. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.12).
- 4. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.21).

Data collected during 2010-2011 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by cooperating teachers, included the following, which are all but one criterion.

- 1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.68)
- 2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.53)
- 3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.53)
- 4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.63)
- 5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.55)
- 6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.51)
- 7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.58)
- 8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.59)
- 9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.78).
- 10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.51).
- 11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.54)
- 12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.67).

There were no candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2010-2011, as perceived by cooperating teachers.

Data collected during 2011-2012 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performances which indicate a particular strength are reflected in scores greater than a 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. Average scores less than a 4.25 indicate areas of needed growth. Six criteria, as measured by cooperating teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. Overall scores are as follows:

- 1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.40)
- 2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.34)
- 3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.54)
- 4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.35)
- 5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.27)
- 6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.41)
- 7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.46)
- 8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.53)
- 9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.51).
- 10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.53).
- 11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.51)
- 12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.70).

There were no candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2011-2012, as perceived by cooperating teachers.

Data collected during 2012-2013 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performances which indicate a particular strength are reflected in scores equal to or greater than a 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. Average scores less than a 4.25 indicate areas of needed growth. Four criteria, as measured by cooperating teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. One of the overall scores fell under 4.25. Overall scores are as follows:

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.36)
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.38)
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.49)
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.23)
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.26)
6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction **(4.51)**
7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.33)
8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.40)
9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.42).
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning **(4.55)**.
11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.36)
12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices **(4.50)**.
13. Ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticisms **(4.65)**.

Department Response: The department is pleased with the overall results of this data; as only one of the overall scores (#4-4.23) is lower than 4.25. However, the criterion dealing with motivation and classroom management continues to be close to the 4.25 average, which is a concern. Department members decided to look into the impact of changing our 1-hour Classroom Management course to a 3-hour course. It was also suggested that we make ED 320 and Classroom Management co-requisites to enable candidates to immediately apply classroom management theory in their practicum classrooms. We will stress classroom management in all classes and focus on whole class procedures rather than just the small group strategies that we've been using in elementary content methods courses. There was some concern last year about middle level candidates and this concern continued in 2012-2013. Middle level was the only area with mean scores of 3 and 3.5. Since the sample size is small (N=2), we will continue to monitor middle level scores to determine performance over time.

Data collected during 2013-2014 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performances which indicate a particular strength are reflected in scores equal to or greater than a 4.5 on a 5.0 scale. Average scores less than a 4.25 indicate areas of needed growth. Five criteria, as measured by cooperating teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. None of the overall scores fell under 4.25. Overall scores are as follows:

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.48)
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.44)
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.46)
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.25)
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.33)
6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.44)
7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively **(4.50)**
8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.48)
9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values **(4.58)**.
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning **(4.65)**.

11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.46)
12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.63).
13. Ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticisms (4.71).

Department Response: The department is very pleased with the overall performance of the candidates. However, criterion 5 dealing with motivation and classroom management continues to be close to the 4.25 average, which is a concern. Elementary scored at 4.17, middle level scored at 4.00 and secondary scored at 4.44 on criterion 5. Department members decided to look into the impact of changing our 1-hour Classroom Management course to a 3-hour course. The department is working on a scope and sequence chart indicating what is being done in the professional education courses to address classroom management. Middle level performance is higher this year.

23. Supervising Teacher Evaluations F13-S14, Attachment 23

All candidates are evaluated during the student teaching semester by both their university supervising teacher and the school district’s cooperating teacher. The items on these survey forms are aligned with the Department’s program objectives 1-13. For comparison purposes, data from 2008-2014 are included in this report.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2008-2009, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.55/5.0 (N=13)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.66/5.0 (N=4)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.29/5.0 (N=15)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.41/5.0 (N=32)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=32) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=38) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2009-2010, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.70/5.0 (N=15)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.00/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.40/5.0 (N=20)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.50/5.0 (N=37)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=37) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=51) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2010-2011, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.96/5.0 (N=20)
Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of NA/5.0 (N=0)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.69/5.0 (N=13)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.85/5.0 (N=33)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=33) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=40) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2011-2012, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.83/5.0 (N=21)
------------------------	-------------------------------

Middle Level Candidate	Mean score of 4.73/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.85/5.0 (N=12)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.84/5.0 (N=35)

Note: Since many K-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teacher evaluations (N=35) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=41) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2012-2013, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.80/5.0 (N=17)
Middle Level Candidates:	Mean score of 4.77/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.75/5.0 (N=16)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.77/5.0 (N=35)

Note: Since many P-12 student teachers had more than one cooperating teacher, there were more of these evaluations than there were student teachers. This is the reason that the number of supervising teachers evaluations (N=35) and the number of cooperating teacher evaluations (N=40) do not match.

Mean scores of supervising teacher evaluations from 2013-2014, divided by elementary, middle, and secondary candidates are listed below.

Elementary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.65/5.0 (N=7)
Middle Level Candidates:	Mean score of 4.21/5.0 (N=2)
Secondary Candidates:	Mean score of 4.50/5.0 (N=11)
Overall (All Candidates):	Mean score of 4.53/5.0 (N=20)

Note: Because of personnel issues, there were no elementary evaluations from the university supervising teacher turned in fall 13. Only two secondary evaluations were turned in fall 13.

Data collected during 2008-2009 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

1. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students;
2. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction;
3. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values;
4. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning; and
5. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2008-2009, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (3.95);
2. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (3.92); and
3. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.23).

Data collected during 2009-2010 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

1. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.68);
2. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.62);

3. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.86);
4. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.76);
5. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.81); and
6. The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.84).

The candidate performance areas needing further attention, where the yearly mean score fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale in 2009-2010, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

1. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.11);
2. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.16);
3. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.14); and
4. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.20).

Data collected during 2010-2011 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included all criteria.

1. The ability to make content meaningful (4.82).
2. An understanding of learning and development sufficient to enhance learning for all students (4.86).
3. The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.76).
4. Skills in using appropriate instructional strategies to develop critical thinking, problem solving, reflection, and performance skills (4.77).
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.79).
6. The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.86).
7. A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.88).
8. The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.67).
9. Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes and ethical values (4.97).
10. The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.94).
11. The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.74).
12. Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.98).

None of the candidate performance areas needed further attention because none of the yearly mean scores fell below 4.25 on a 5.0 scale as perceived by supervising teachers.

Data collected during 2011-2012 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

- 1—The ability to make content meaningful (5.00);
- 2—Understanding of human development and learning (4.89);
- 3—The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.80);
- 4—The ability to plan effective strategies for learning (4.91);
- 6—The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.68);
- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.83);
- 8—The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.79);
- 9—Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.97);
- 10—The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.94);
- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.97);
- 12—Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.94); and

13—The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.94).

None of the mean performances areas fell below 4.25. The candidate performance area needing monitoring, where the yearly mean score was 4.31 on a 5.0 scale in 2012-2013, as perceived by supervising teachers is listed below.

5—The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.31).

Data collected during 2012-2013 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

- 1—The ability to make content meaningful (4.89);
- 2—Understanding of human development and learning (4.76);
- 3—The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners (4.78);
- 4—The ability to plan effective strategies for learning (4.89);
- 6—The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction (4.51);
- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.67);
- 8—The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.75);
- 9—Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values (4.88);
- 10—The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning (4.86);
- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.96);
- 12—Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.95); and
- 13—The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.82).

None of the mean performances areas fell below 4.25. The candidate performance area needing monitoring, where the yearly mean score was 4.34 on a 5.0 scale in 2012-2013, as perceived by supervising teachers is listed below.

5—The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.34).

Department Response: Yearly mean scores above 4.50 were achieved for all but one criterion. The yearly mean score on Criterion 5 was 4.34. Overall mean scores for elementary (4.80), middle level (4.77) and secondary (4.75) were considered high. Motivation and classroom management ratings were lower than other criteria—elementary (4.41), middle level (4.00) and secondary (4.31). The lowest rating of any criteria was (4.00) for middle level (N=2) in motivation and classroom management. The department considered the fact that overall the scores provided by the supervising teacher were higher, especially for the middle level candidates, than the ratings provided by the cooperating teachers. We will monitor and compare the scores provided by supervising and cooperating teachers for consistency.

Data collected during 2013-2014 identified the following candidate strengths and areas in need of further attention. Eight criteria, as measured by supervising teacher evaluations indicate strengths for our candidates. Candidate performance strengths where the yearly mean scores of student teachers exceeded 4.5 on a 5.0 point scale, as perceived by supervising teachers, included:

- 1—The ability to make content meaningful (4.45);
- 2—Understanding of human development and learning **(4.55)**;
- 3—The ability to provide different approaches to learning sufficient to meet the needs of exceptional and diverse learners **(4.50)**;
- 4—The ability to plan effective strategies for learning **(4.50)**;
5. The ability to motivate students and control student behavior (4.45);
- 6—The ability to communicate effectively and encourage classroom interaction **(4.50)**;
- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.30);
- 8—The ability to make and interpret student assessments (4.47);
- 9—Professional skills, responsibilities, attitudes, and ethical values **(4.77)**;
- 10—The ability to establish collegial relationships with colleagues, parents, and community that supports student learning **(4.60)**;

- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.28);
- 12—Skills in using technology to enhance instructional practices (4.60); and
- 13—The ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism (4.87).

None of the mean performances areas fell below 4.25. The candidate performance areas needing monitoring, where the yearly mean score was 4.30 and 4.28 on a 5.0 scale in 2013-2014, as perceived by supervising teachers are listed below.

- 7—A strong knowledge base and the ability to plan effectively (4.30);
- 11—The ability to integrate curriculum across and within subject areas (4.28);

24. Graduate Surveys Completed by Employers after the First and Third Years of Teaching F13-S14, Attachment 24

In spring 2014 fifteen surveys were received this year, which is the most ever, other than the 13 which were sent back in 2008. Twenty surveys were sent and we had a return rate of 75%. Seven of the surveys came from 1st year graduates, while 8 came from 3rd year graduates. Administrators of first year secondary graduates (N=3) in the areas of speech/theatre and music returned surveys, with 4 elementary graduate surveys also returned. All but one of the 13 criteria were assessed by their administrators at the 4.0 to 5.0 level for elementary candidates, with a 3.75 on making content meaningful. Secondary teachers were rated lower than a 4.0 on criterion 5 (motivation and classroom management—3.67), criterion 7 (instructional planning—3.67), and criterion 9 (reflection and professional development—3.67). All other criteria were rated between 4.0 and 5.0 by secondary graduates' administrators responding to the survey.

Administrators of third year secondary graduates (N=3) in the areas of business, physical education, and music returned surveys, with 5 elementary graduate surveys also returned. All but three of the 13 criteria were assessed by their administrators at the 4.0 to 5.0 level for elementary candidates, with a 3.80 on making content meaningful, 3.80 on instructional strategies, and 3.60 on collaboration. Secondary teachers were rated lower than a 4.0 on criterion 2 (human development and learning—3.67), criterion 8 (assessment of student learning—3.67), and criterion 11 (integrating content—3.67). All other criteria were rated between 4.0 and 5.0 by secondary graduates' administrators responding to the survey.

Department Response: The first and third year graduates as an aggregate group scored lowest in criterion 1 (making content meaningful). Looking at the first and third year groups separately and the individual teachers, it is obvious that the low scores in the aggregate group came from the third year graduates. The numbers are so small it is hard to judge if there is a program issues or a graduate issue. The scores are not low enough to bring about significant changes but the department feels that classroom management still needs to stay on our radar and to continue to monitor.

25. Graduate Surveys Completed by Program Graduates after the First and Third Years of Teaching F13-S14, Attachment 25

Nineteen surveys were returned by 1st and 3rd year graduates of our teacher education programs. An overall self-assessed rating for 1st and 3rd year graduates of 4.30/5.0 from our elementary graduates, and a self-assessed rating of 4.49/5.0 from our secondary graduates was reported. Sixty-five surveys were sent and we had 19 returned with a return rate of 29%. Ten of the surveys came from 1st year graduates, while 9 came from 3rd year graduates.

First year secondary graduates (N=5) in the areas of speech/theatre, English, and music returned surveys, with 5 elementary graduate surveys also returned. All of the 13 criteria were self-assessed by the first year graduates at the 4.0 to 5.0 level for elementary candidates with an overall mean of 4.63. Secondary teachers self-assessed lower than a 4.0 on criterion 5 (motivation and classroom management—3.80). All other criteria were rated between 4.0 and 5.0 by secondary graduates responding to the survey.

Elementary graduates (N=5) self-assessed all fifteen criteria with scores of 4.40 to 4.80. The criteria with the highest score (4.80) for the elementary graduates were "teaching diverse learners," "assessment of student learning," "reflection and professional development," "collaboration," "instructional technology," and "ability to receive and respond to

suggestions and criticism.” The criteria with the lowest rating (4.40) were in the area of “making content meaningful,” “instructional strategies,” and “motivation and classroom management.” Elementary candidates rated the criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” as a 4.60 and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation?” as a 4.40.

The first year secondary graduates (N=5) self-reported scores of 3.80 to 5.00 in all criteria, with an overall mean of 4.51. The criteria with the highest score (5.0) were “reflection and professional development,” and “ability to receive and respond to suggestions and criticism.” The lowest score (3.8) was in the criterion of “motivation and classroom management.” Secondary candidates rated both criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” (4.60) and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation” (4.40). These two criteria were higher from the previous year.

Third year secondary graduates (N=3) in the areas of business, physical education, and music returned surveys, with 6 elementary graduate surveys also returned. All of the 13 criteria were self-assessed by the third year graduates for elementary candidates with an overall mean of 4.02. Secondary teachers self-assessed with an overall mean of 4.46. This group were 2010-2011 graduates and were evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors higher than the teacher have rated themselves in their third year of teaching.

Elementary graduates (N=6) self-assessed all fifteen criteria with scores of 3.67 to 4.50. The criterion with the highest score (4.50) for the elementary group was “collaboration.” The criterion with the lowest rating (3.67) was in the area of “teaching diverse learners.” Elementary candidates rated the criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” as a 4.17 and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation?” as a 4.00.

The third year secondary graduates (N=3) self-reported scores of 4.00 to 5.00 in all criteria. The criterion with the highest score (5.0) was “instructional technology.” The lowest score (4.00) was in the criterion of “communication.” Secondary candidates rated both criteria “Was pleased with the Baker Teacher Education Program” (4.00) and “How well did Baker prepare you for the teaching occupation” (4.33). These two criteria were lower from the previous year.

Department Response: The department feels that classroom management still needs to be monitored. It was suggested that during student teaching, that there be midway and end of term meetings for debriefing and discussing classroom management. Comments by graduates were very positive about the program. The department sends multiple reminders to graduates to fill out the surveys but the return rate for third year graduates is still not what it should be.

26. Professional and Content GPAs F13-S14, Attachment 26

Elementary overall professional and content GPA is 3.48/4.00. Middle level overall professional and content GPA is 3.73 and secondary overall professional and content GPA is 3.43. Out of 103 candidates, only six candidates had professional and content GPAs of less than 2.8 (required proficiency) (three from elementary, two from mathematics, and one from physical education candidates). These six GPAs ranged from a low of 0.87 (elementary-dropped due to severe injury) to 2.72 (mathematics). All candidates (N=103) had a mean overall GPA average of 3.47/4.00. This is slightly lower than 12-13.

Department Response: We will continue our process of contacting all probationary candidates to discuss their standing, what they need to do to gain a higher status, and the ramifications of continued low performance. The lower performing candidates will continue to be monitored.

27. Personal and Professional Skills Surveys by Content Area F13-S14, Attachment 27

Elementary overall average performance is 4.04/5.00. Middle level overall is 4.65 and the secondary candidates’ overall performance is 3.79. Five of the 101 candidates have ratings below the 3.5 (required proficiency). Physical Education and mathematics each have one candidate below the required average. There are three elementary candidates with scores below the required average of 3.5. The five scores ranged from a low of 2.99 (elementary) to 3.43 (elementary).

Department Response: A blank copy of this form will be distributed to all candidates in each professional education

course. We will discuss expectations and explain how the form is used. Each candidate will write his/her name on the form and return it to the instructor. These forms will be completed by the instructor at the end of the semester and turned in. Tonya will continue to make candidates aware of their ratings every semester.

The department suggested that we look at this form and discuss what each faculty member is doing in order that all faculty have a good understanding of this measurement and expectations of what each rating means. The suggestion was made that Dr. Foil evaluate the ED 243 candidates at mid-term so if they are low, they know and can attempt to make changes. Or he could have candidates self-evaluate at mid-point.

28. PDS Practica Evaluations by Mentor Teacher F13-S14, Attachment 28

Data are collected for practicums in ED 244 and ED 320. The mentor teacher evaluates the candidate on each of the criteria and then gives an overall evaluation score for the candidate. In ED 244, elementary candidates' average overall performance (N=7) is 4.59/5.00, overall average performance for middle level (N=1) is 4.00, while the overall average for secondary candidates (N=15) is 4.27 with all candidates' overall average at 4.35. The lowest overall score (4.24) was on the "tutors, works one to one/small group, outside classroom duties" criterion and the highest rating at 4.78 was on the "is always appropriately dressed."

In ED 320, elementary candidates' overall performance (N=15) is 4.53, the overall average for middle level (N=1) 5.00, and the overall average for secondary candidates (N=10) is 4.35 with all candidates' overall average at 4.48. The lowest overall score (4.27) was on the "ask relevant inquiry questions to ascertain why the mentor is doing what they're doing" criteria and the highest rating at 4.77 was on the "is always appropriately dressed."

Department Response: The department observed that candidate performance is high but will still continue monitoring of data and performance to see whether any changes need to be made.

29. Advising Survey F13-S14, Attachment 29

This is a new survey for the undergraduate education department. There are seven items that the candidates rate their experience with advising and their advisor. We have reported aggregate data on each item and an overall evaluation of advisory. Rating is on a 6-point scale. Thirty-eight surveys were returned. Highest average score was 5.82 on three criteria (advisor accessible and responsive, tracking progress towards graduation and completion of all SOE requirements, receiving sound academic guidance to keep on track in timely fashion) and the lowest average was 5.42 on the advisor understands and communicates Quest and gen. ed. requirements. Overall evaluation of advisors was 5.71 (N=38).

Department Response: Faculty will keep track of how many surveys are handed out during the process of advising. We ask the candidate to immediately fill out the survey after being advised. This is an anonymous process. Department felt that the scores indicated satisfaction on the part of the candidates for the advising they receive.

30. Title II GPA/ACT data F-13-S14, Attachment 30

This is the first year of compiling this data and to make comparisons. Thirty-nine students were admitted to USOE under current guidelines. As we compare the candidates' ACT and GPA scores to the 39 admissions, the data indicates that only 22 of those admitted would have ACT scores of 23 and above. Two of the 22 candidates did not have a 3.0 GPA. A review of candidates exiting from the program in 13-14 revealed that two candidates entered with an ACT of 16 and 18, exited with 2.90 and 2.94 cum GPA. Three candidates entered with ACT scores of 19, 18, and 17. Respectively each exited with a cum GPA of 3.25, 3.74 and 3.19. Six candidates with ACT scores of 20 (cum GPA 3.42), 21 (3.27, 3.56, 3.25) and 22 (3.63, 3.56) all exited with acceptable GPA.

Department Response: We will continue to monitor the ACT scores and the grade point averages of our candidates at program entry and exit. As a department, we may be able to make a case for admission to have a lower ACT score. Follow-up on graduates using employer surveys on teacher effectiveness of the candidates that entered with lower ACT and lower GPA would assist in decision making. The department will pilot the use of the GRIT survey with candidates to be a predictor of success in the program and with a follow-up study of their effectiveness in teaching. Students entering with an ACT score of 19 or better may prove to be effective teachers.

ASSESSMENT AS FEEDBACK FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Multiple department changes, at both the course and program level, went into effect during 2013-2014. It is our belief that the changes will support our commitment “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.” During 2014-2015 the changes made will be monitored through TaskStream and our annual data review.

TaskStream and Assessment Plan Data Analysis

- C-BASE policy
The new policy requires that a candidate that does not pass any of the sections of the C-BASE exam must retake the exam at the very next offering. Candidates will have to complete the C-BASE before they can move forward in the program. Tracking these individuals through the program, final outcomes, and employer data to see if they have success will assist the program in setting further parameters for the C-BASE and to compare data to the ACT.
- GRIT Pilot
The university received permission from Dr. Angela Duckworth to use the GRIT survey. We will continue the discussion of when and how to administer to candidates in the program. The university supervisor will use with student teachers. The department could follow-up candidates to review whether the GRIT Scale is a predictor of candidates success in their program and also of their effectiveness in teaching.
- Cooperating and supervising teacher evaluations
Aggregate ratings are all above 4.00—lowest score 4.25 on instructional strategies by cooperating teachers. Aggregate ratings by university supervisor all above 4.00—lowest was 4.28 in integrating content. Classroom management is still a concern and will continue to be monitored. Faculty are asked to address classroom management in all courses.
- Graduate follow-up surveys:
The survey returns from employers and graduates were limited. Changes in gathering this data should improve the return rate and yield dependable data. The KSDE Employment Tracking Database has shown some gaps in data that the state and IHEs will collaborate on in order to troubleshoot the technical problem.

Recommendations from 2013-14 Education Advisory Council (EAC)

The department had a discussion this year about the declining attendance for EAC. We discussed using a form of technology to connect with EAC. School building faculty and building leaders are finding it more difficult to find time to meet. The decision was to pilot an electronic survey and set up having faculty meet at the building with school faculty and building leader. This was piloted in 14-15. Decisions will be made about future meetings and format after the pilot. Data from the survey is reflected in 14-15.

CONCLUSION

The Undergraduate Education Department has formally collected data on the performance of teacher education candidates since 2005. Some of the data, such as the cumulative grade point information and scores on standardized tests, are required for licensure at the state level. Other data are collected in individual courses and evaluated through department-created rubrics which are collected on TaskStream. All data is reviewed annually at a data meeting in the summer. The Department has systematically collected and organized a large amount of data in recent years, with data-driven decisions made regarding program and course changes. We feel that this process of data analysis strengthens the program and results in increasing our support of commitment to the candidates “to learning and to developing confident and competent educational leaders.”