

## Impact on Student Learning

### Teacher Work Sample Data (Secondary Education)

During student teaching the candidates prepare a 'teacher work sample' (TWS). This project includes the development of a unit of instruction, that includes a Course outline/concept map, a statement related to curricular coherence, a list of content standards to be addressed, unit goals/learning targets, and an instruction and assessment table that includes daily objectives, instructional strategies, accommodations, and assessment strategies.

### Ag Education

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | Assignment: High Score | Assignment: Low Score | Assignment: Mean Score |
|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Fall 2016     | 16                   | 97                     | 80                    | 83.7                   |
| Fall 2017     | 20                   | 97                     | 23                    | 85                     |
| Fall 2018     | 1                    | IP                     | IP                    | IP                     |

Interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards: Overall, the scores of students on the assignments related to providing evidence of students' mastery of the standards. With average grades received being in the mid-80s range, this suggests acceptable or better performance. In Fall 2017, if the lowest score (23%) were removed from the class statistics, the C average would increase to an 92%, rather than an 85%. In this particular case, the student receiving the low score earned a D for the student teaching experience – and thus was unable to meet the certification requirements for teaching. Those students who earned passing grades in student teaching (all As or Bs), performed at higher levels on these assignments as well.

### Biology

No data available

### Chemistry

| Academic Semester | Number of candidates | Evaluation: 0-15 point Unacceptable | Evaluation: 16-24 points Acceptable | Evaluation: 25-32 points Target |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2017-2018         | 0                    |                                     |                                     |                                 |
| 2016-2017         | 3                    | 0                                   | 0                                   | 3                               |
| 2015-2016         | 0                    |                                     |                                     |                                 |

Although the number of Chemistry education candidates is small, only 3 candidates during the last three semesters, it appears that all of them have demonstrated the skills needed to plan instruction.

### English

| Academic Semester | Number of candidates | Evaluation:<br>0-15 points<br>Unacceptable | Evaluation:<br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | Evaluation:<br>Target level 25-32 points<br>Target |
|-------------------|----------------------|--|---|--|
| Fall 2016         | 2                    | 0  | 2   |  |
| Spring 2017       | 2                    | 0  | 0   | 2  |
| Fall 2018         | 4                    | 0  | 0   | 4  |

Although the number of English education students is small, only 8 students during the last three semesters, it appears that they have demonstrated the skills needed to plan instruction. The grading rubric statement regarding the TARGET level plan is that the required elements are included and there was enough detail to understand why the unit was important and how the unit was to be conducted. The reflection statement is that the unit reflection clearly articulates candidate's perception of challenges, successes, and ways to improve the unit and shows connection to feedback from cooperating teacher, students, and daily reflections

### Family & Consumer Sciences Education

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | Assignment:<br><i>High Score</i> | Assignment:<br><i>Low Score</i> | Assignment:<br><i>Mean Score</i> |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Fall 2016     | 6                    | 100%                             | 76%                             | 90%                              |
| Fall 2017     | 6                    | 100%                             | 72%                             | 93%                              |
| Fall 2018     | 5                    | IP                               | IP                              | IP                               |

Students in the Fall 2016 cohort demonstrated an ability to design, implement, and evaluate a variety of assessment tools. Students in the 2017/2018 cohorts demonstrated an ability to conduct pre-assessments, differentiate education as needed based on student needs, evaluate student learning and teaching effectiveness. The average scores noted above indicate proficiency in these skills sets.

### History

| Academic Year | Number of Candidates | Evaluation:<br>0-12 Unacceptable | Evaluation:<br>13-26 Acceptable |
|---------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 2017-2018     | 17                   |                                  | 17                              |
| 2016-2017     | 10                   |                                  | 10                              |
| 2015-2016     | 9                    | 3                                | 6                               |

The program is meeting student needs as there is a three-year average of 92% of candidates have successfully completed this project and demonstrated that they have assessed learners in ways that document their instructional impact on student learning.

## Math

| Academic Semester | Number of candidates | Evaluation:<br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | Evaluation:<br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | Evaluation:<br>25-32 points<br>Target |
|-------------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2017-2018         | 11                   | 0   | 2   | 9                                     |
| 2016-2017         | 7                    | 0   | 1   | 6                                     |
| 2015-2016         | 6                    | 0   | 0   | 6                                     |

Mathematics education candidates have demonstrated the skills needed to plan instruction. The grading rubric statement regarding the TARGET level plan is that the required elements are included and there was enough detail to understand how the lesson was to be conducted. The reflection statement is that the unit reflection clearly articulates candidate's perception of challenges, successes, and ways to improve the unit and shows connection to feedback from cooperating teacher, students, and daily reflections.

## Physics

No Data Available

## Psychology

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | Evaluation:<br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | Evaluation:<br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | Evaluation:<br>25-32 points<br>Target |
|---------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2017-2018     | 1                    |   |   | 1                                     |
| 2017-2016     | 0                    | NA  | NA  | NA                                    |
| 2016-2015     | 3                    |   | 1   | 2                                     |

The psychology student teacher education candidates were able to demonstrate that they were able to provide a course outline, lesson plan, assessment plan, and meet content standards at an above average level.

## Sociology

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | Evaluation:<br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | Evaluation:<br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | Evaluation:<br>25-32 points<br>Target |
|---------------|----------------------|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2017-2018     | 0                    |   |   |                                       |
| 2017-2016     | 1                    |   |   | 1                                     |
| 2016-2015     | 0                    |   |   |                                       |

The sociology student teacher education candidates were able to demonstrate that they were able to provide a course outline, lesson plan, assessment plan, and meet content standards at an above average level.

## Speech

No Data Available

## World Languages

### *French*

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>*added Target level<br>25-32 points Target |
|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2017-2018     | 0                    |  |  |  |
| 2016-2017     | 0                    |  |  |  |
| 2015-2016     | 0                    |  |  |  |

### *German*

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>*added Target level<br>25-32 points Target |
|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2017-2018     | 0                    |  |  |  |
| 2016-2017     | 1                    |  |  | 1  |
| 2015-2016     | 0                    |  |  |  |

### *Spanish*

| Academic Year | Number of candidates | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>0-15 point<br>Unacceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>16-24 points<br>Acceptable | <b>Evaluation:</b><br>*added Target level<br>25-32 points Target |
|---------------|----------------------|--|--|--|
| 2017-2018     | 0                    |  |  |  |
| 2016-2017     | 5                    |  |  | 5  |
| 2017-2018     | 3                    |  |  | 3  |

Although the number of foreign language education students is small, it appears that they have demonstrated the skills needed to plan instruction. The grading rubric statement regarding the TARGET level plan is that the required elements are included and there was enough detail to understand why the unit was important and how the unit was to be conducted. The reflection statement is that the unit reflection clearly articulates candidate's perception of challenges, successes, and ways to improve the unit and shows connection to feedback from cooperating teacher, students, and daily reflections.

### Child Study Data (Early Childhood Education)

The Family Case Study assignment is completed during ECE 464 Parent Child Relationships in the old curriculum and beginning in Spring 2018 it is completed in ECE 240 Child Development I in the new curriculum. The assignment unfolds in three phases. First, students identify a family to study and establish rapport with them. Second, they conduct three home visits in which they assess the home environment, observe family interactions, and interview the family to identify their values and thoughts on parenting. Third, they analyze and reflect on the family's environment, relationships, and educational strategies while building connections to theory and current research. As a final outcome, they develop an action plan for ways they could support the family. The case studies are evaluated on 5 different areas.

| <b>Academic Year</b> | <b>Mean Score Element 1<br/>10 points</b> | <b>Mean Score Element 2<br/>30 points</b> | <b>Mean Score Element 3<br/>20 points</b> | <b>Mean Score Element 4<br/>30 points</b> | <b>Mean Score Element 5<br/>10 points</b> |
|----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2015-2016            | 10  | 18  | 18  | 28  | 8   |
| 2016-2017            | 10  | 23  | 19  | 28  | 8   |
| 2017-2018            | 10  | 20  | 18  | 29  | 8   |

Interpretations of how that data provides evidence of meeting standards: Students generally perform well on this assessment by performing in the meets to exceed range. However, there is noted area for improvement in area of assessment and data analysis. Faculty have discussed including more instruction on statistics and assessment prior to this experience to help students gain more confidence in this area.