| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2023-2024** | | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| College of Education and Behavioral Sciences | | School of Teacher Education |
| MAE Gifted Education Program #0482 | | |
| Sue Keesey, Director | | |
| ***Is this an online program***? ☒ Yes ☐ No | Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf . Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don’t match, explain on this page under **Assessment Cycle)** | |

| **Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program.**  **Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.** | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1:** Students will apply data literacy concepts and strategies. (Students will apply foundational concepts of gifted education including terminology, theories, and best practices.) | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Praxis II success** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **District Identification Plan (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **Unit Plan (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2:** Students will actively advocate for gifted learners and are able to highlight best practices for use in their learning environment. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Unit Plan (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Advocacy Video (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **Identification Comparison (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3:** Students will use data from their learning environments to create programs that address the needs in their locations using research to support their activities. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | **Creativity/Leadership Plan Reflection (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Instrument 2** | **Capstone Project (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Instrument 3** | **District Identification Plan (scored by rubric)** | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)** | | | |
| Our assessment data for students interacting in the MAE for Gifted and Talented Education show that performance exceeds the target scores with the exception of Praxis in each of the categories. However, the overall pass rate of Praxis is at 100%.  Assessment Cycle:  The SLOs do not match in Courseleaf as there are no SLOs listed in Courseleaf. | | | |

| **Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Students will apply data literacy concepts and strategies. (Students will apply foundational concepts of gifted education including terminology, theories, and best practices.) | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **The Praxis II** test for Gifted Education Endorsement measures the degree to which the student understands and can apply foundational concepts of gifted education. This test is required for state-wide endorsement in gifted education. The components of the test are Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students, Learning Environment for Gifted Students, Instruction of Gifted Students, Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students, and Professionalism. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **Students are required to obtain a passing score on this exam and score no less than 70% on any individual component.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | **90% on overall pass rate and 90% scoring 70% or higher average score for each of 5 components** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **100% overall pass rate.**  **5 of 5 component categories are above 70%** | |
| **Methods** | The number of students taking the Praxis II for this report was 18. We included 100% of students in this sampling. The percentages of students scoring 70% or higher on each component are listed below:  Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students: 71.95%  Learning Environment for Gifted Students: 78.05%  Instruction of Gifted Students: 77%  Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students: 77.22%  Professionalism: 74.57% | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **District Identification Plan** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **3 out of 4 on rubric or 115 out of 150 points minimum** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **85% or above for each of the indicators** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **100% of students scored at or above the minimum of 115 of 150 points.**  **3 of the 4 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **1 indicator was at 71%** | |
| **Methods** | All students who completed GTE 539 for Summer 23 were included in these data (4 MAE; 3 EDS) for a total of 7 students.  There were four indicators:  Strengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan in regard to Professional Foundations (Policy and Standards for Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.1 – 100%  OrganizationStrengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan related to Professional Foundations (Collaboration with Colleagues and Families on Assessment/ Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.3 – 100%  Plan for Improvement: Instrumentation and How to use Assessment Results: NAGC/CEC 4.4, 6.3 – 100%  Design a Multimedia Presentation of the Content to Present your Findings – 71% | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | **Unit Plan** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each of 6 indicators** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **85% or above for each of the indicators** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **5 of the 6 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **1 indicator was at 83%** | |
| **Methods** | Students who completed GTE 537 for Spring 2023 and cohorts of students from Jefferson County, KY, and Fayette County,  KY, were included in this sample. Number of students was 18. There were 6 indicators with the following success rate:  Curricular Components (CEC 3.1) – 100%  Curricular Components (CEC 2.3, 3.1) – 94%  Differentiation (CEC 3.3) – 100%  Career Education (CEC 5.4) – 94%  Assessment of Learning (CEC 4.3) – 100%  Unit Evaluation (CEC 4.4) – 83% | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1. Highlight met or not met** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results:**  Given the rates of success on the assessments of this learning outcome we will continue to teach as planned. We will review the assignments and assessment results annually to monitor student progress. As a part of the continuous improvement initiative, we will look for opportunities to ensure the courses provide the appropriate level of challenge for students.  Praxis results were higher than the past year. We believe we are integrating better focus on identification of gifted students into our courses.  **Conclusions**:  We provided more emphasis on identification of gifted students, which helped with raising lower performance areas of the Praxis.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:**  During the Fall/Spring/Summer, faculty will focus more on the following categories throughout the courses based on the lower areas of Praxis:  Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students  Learning Environment for Gifted Students  Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students  Faculty in the Fall 24 term are continuing to update the standards alignment for all of the assessments and realigning the rubrics per the CEC Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educations, March 2024. This work will be completed early fall term so that the revised rubrics can be used for 24-25 terms. | | | | | | | |

| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Students will exhibit data analysis skills. (Students will actively advocate for gifted learners and are able to highlight best practices for use in their learning environment.)** | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Gifted Education Unit Plan** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each of 6 indicators** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | **85% or above for each of the indicators** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **5 of the 6 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **1 indicator was at 83%** | |
| **Methods** | Students who completed GTE 537 for Spring 2023 and cohorts of students from Jefferson County, KY, and Fayette County,  KY, were included in this sample. Number of students was 18. There were 6 indicators with the following success rate:  Curricular Components (CEC 3.1) – 100%  Curricular Components (CEC 2.3, 3.1) – 94%  Differentiation (CEC 3.3) – 100%  Career Education (CEC 5.4) – 94%  Assessment of Learning (CEC 4.3) – 100%  Unit Evaluation (CEC 4.4) – 83% | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **Advocacy Video** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **Students will score a minimum of 3 (proficient) on a 4-point rubric.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **85% or above for each indicator** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **9 of the 12 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **3 indicators were below 85%** | |
| **Methods** | All students who completed PSY432G for the 2023-2024 academic year were included in the sample. A rubric that was created according to the SPA standards was used to score the project. There were 9 students completing the course assessment (of the 11 enrolled, 3 Certification only, 3 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 3 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader).  The skills measure were:  –use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 1.2 – 100%  –create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments that engage individuals with gifts and talents in meaningful and rigorous learning activities and social interactions. Standard 2.1 – 100%  –use communication and motivational and instructional strategies to facilitate understanding of subject matter and to teach individuals with gifts and talents how to adapt to different environments. – 67%  –use instructional strategies that enhance the affective development of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 5.5 – 100%  –advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring. Standard 6.5 – 100%  –apply elements of effective collaboration. Standard 7.1 – 78%  –serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues. Standard 7.2 – 100%  –use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with gifts and talents across a wide range of settings, experiences, and collaborators. Standard 7.3 – 67%  –Professional Design – 100%  –Communication is Clear – 89%  –Content – 100%  –Presentation – 100% | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | **Identification Comparison** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students will score a minimum of 3 (proficient) on a 4-point rubric. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 85% or above for each indicator | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | 3 of the 5 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;  2 indicators were below 85% | |
| **Methods** | All students who were enrolled in GTE 540 and completed the Identification Comparison assignment. All students who completed GTE 540 for the 2023-24 academic year were included in this sample. A rubric based on SPA standards was used to score this project. There were 10 students completing the course assessment (of the 12 enrolled, 5 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 2 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader; 2 Gifted EDS).  The skills measured were:  –Description of the Instruments – 100%  –Critique of Instruments – 70%  –Program Planning – 80%  –Recommendation – 90%  –Writing and Grammar – 90% | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results:**  Given the rates of success on the assessments of this learning outcome we will continue to teach as planned.  The Unit Plan involves the assessment cycle and aligns to data analysis with formative and summative assessments.  The students plan and eventually implement in the following class/practicum the Gifted Education Unit, providing an authentic experience.  **Conclusions**:  We provided more emphasis on identification of gifted students, which helped with raising lower performance areas of the Praxis.  With the Identification Comparision assignment, the students analyze data in multiple ways, which is an improvement to our assessments for our program.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:**  Faculty in the Fall 24 term are continuing to update the standards alignment for all of the assessments and realigning the rubrics per the CEC Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educations, March 2024. This work will be completed early fall term so that the revised rubrics can be used for 24-25 terms.  Given the rates of success on the assessments of this learning outcome, we will review the assignments and assessments annually to monitor student learning. As a part of the continuous improvement initiative, we will look for opportunities to ensure the courses provide the appropriate level of challenge for students. | | | | | | | |


| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | **Students will exhibit proficiency in research methods. (Students will use data from their learning environments to create programs that address the needs in their locations using research to support their activities.)** | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **Creativity/Leadership Project Reflection (scored by rubric)** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **Students will score a minimum of 3 (proficient) on a 4-point rubric.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | **85% or above for each indicator** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **3 of the 5 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **2 indicators were below 85%** | |
| **Methods** | All students who were enrolled in GTE 540 Creativity and Leadership were included in this sample. All students who completed GTE 540 for the 2023-24 academic year were included in this sample. A rubric based on SPA standards was used to score this project. There were 11 students completing the course assessment (of the 12 enrolled, 5 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 2 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader; 2 Gifted EDS).  The five skills measured were:  –Program Design – 100%  –Collaboration Plan – 73%  –Program Evaluation – 73%  –Reflection –100%  –Writing – 82% | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **Capstone Project (scored by rubric)** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **Students will score a 3 out of 4 points on each rubric indicator at a rate of 85% proficient or higher on this component of the project rubric.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **85% or above for each indicator** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **All of the indicators had a rate of 85% or above** | |
| **Methods** | Two students were enrolled in TCHL 560 for the Teacher Leader pathway for MAE for Gifted Education for 2023-2024. No students were enrolled in the research pathway capstone EDU 599 for 2023-24. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | **District Identification Plan (scored by rubric)** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | **Students score a minimum of 3 of 4 points on each indicator on rubric at a rate of 85% and achieve an overall holistic score of at least 115 of 150 points at a rate of 85%.** | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | **85% or above for each indicator** | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **100% of students scored at or above the minimum of 115 of 150 points.**  **3 of the 4 indicators had a rate of 85% or above;**  **1 indicator was at 71%** | |
| **Methods** | All students who completed GTE 539 for Summer 23 were included in these data (4 MAE; 3 EDS) for a total of 7 students.  There were four indicators:  –Strengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan in regard to Professional Foundations (Policy and Standards for Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.1 – 100%  –OrganizationStrengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan related to Professional Foundations (Collaboration with Colleagues and Families on Assessment/ Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.3 – 100%  –Plan for Improvement: Instrumentation and How to use Assessment Results: NAGC/CEC 4.4, 6.3 – 100%  –Design a Multimedia Presentation of the Content to Present your Findings – 71% | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Results, Conclusion, and Plans for Next Assessment Cycle (Describe what worked, what didn’t, and plan going forward)** | | | | | | | |
| **Results:**  The three projects in this category research methods gave us a comprehensive view of our students’ capacity in research.  The Creativity/Leadership project reflection from GTE 540 showed us that students are astute with reflection, program design, and writing. Somre are needing to improve in collaboration planning and program evaluation.  From analysis of the District Id. Plan, we learned that our students are able to research the gifted education plans, but some are still lacking in their technology aspect of sharing the data.  For the Capstone Research Project, the written work was excellent. We only have one student where the presentation and reflection Q&A was lacking. This outcome helps us know the importance of professionalism in all aspects of the thesis project.  **Conclusions**:  We will continue our efforts in supporting rich research experiences for our graduate students. The EDS committees have been an integral part of the success in the process.  **Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:**  Faculty in the Fall 24 term are continuing to update the standards alignment for all of the assessments and realigning the rubrics per the CEC Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educations, March 2024. This work will be completed early fall term so that the revised rubrics can be used for 24-25 terms. | | | | | | | |

Curriculum Map with Assessments Aligned to Student Learning Outcomes:

As we move forward into the 2024-25 school year, we are using these SLOs for alignment with CAEP and with CEC.  Our rubrics are also under revisions and updates.

| **Gifted Education** | **RA1.1 - Generic Skills and Abilities** | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evidence (course)** | \*a. Data Literacy | b. Research Methods | \*c. Data Analysis | d. Collaborative Activities | e. Technology Applications | f. Professional Dispositions |

| **MAE Gifted Courses:** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PSY 432G | Advocacy Video |  |  | Advocacy Video | Advocacy Video | Advocacy Video |
| GTE 536 | [Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1g745JcV2lXQY6d9_4bENkfG9Kmfi3-9XSMJBEPhlEDM/edit?usp=sharing) | Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project | Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project | Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project |  |  |
| GTE 537 | [Gifted Instructional Unit](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ZCvRuFJdZymtXnXw98CZ8xlqaR4ECSlX/view?usp=sharing) |  |  |  |  | Gifted Instructional Unit |
| GTE 538 (teacher leader track) | Gifted Unit Implementation (Pre Test) |  | Gifted Unit Implementation (Pre Test) |  |  | Gifted Unit Implementation |
| GTE 539 | [District Id. Plan Review](https://docs.google.com/document/d/115ZRXIomJsr6IJpl9OAr94J1pz5-xcqiAyf7ErEbixg/edit?usp=sharing) |  | District Id. Plan Review |  |  |  |
| GTE 540 | [Comparison of Two ID. Instruments](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1hpunQQ4H7VP3fvgok7VMehpeH9Gno3iFtYFWLbLYKU4/edit) |  | Comparison of Two ID. Instruments |  |  | [Creativity/Leadership Project Reflection](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1WJKEK4eYb3odEptR5vl4nxZNOFNWZSHrkXn7ZxM0YcQ/edit?usp=sharing) |
| GTE 636 (research track) | [Literature Review](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1U2fy3rJCfX3aIs8Tdg0BQuQDYwIZ4AzHzTmeR9tV2V0/edit?usp=sharing) |  |  |  | [Research PD Talk](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1xS3_qg-X84TqpcbTgKuE7A426pF0srpYjor93EASm9A/edit?usp=sharing) |  |
| GTE 637 (research track) | [Case Studies](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1mVCkxC5tYIqXcG_AI2d2RtDy7Cr2AXpyaqvc6yXzcKI/edit?usp=sharing) |  | Case Studies |  |  |  |
| EDU 560 or  EDU 599 (research track) | [Thesis Capstone](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1f4NRHKVUFftubfdX2gKUTEsV48eW7nPBG0cBnxeLCQU/edit?usp=sharing) | Thesis Capstone | Thesis Capstone |  |  |  |

Rubric for GTE 539 District Plan Review:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PSY 432G Advocacy Final Project Rubric** | | | | |
|  | **Novice (1)** | **Developing (2)** | **Competent (3)** | **Distinguished (4)** |
| **Content 75%** |  |  |  |  |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 1.2** | Did not state the needs of gifted students. | Stated Needs of gifted students but lacking references to research. | Clearly state a few key needs of gifted students with references to research. | Clearly state multiple needs of gifted students with references to research |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments that engage individuals with gifts and talents in meaningful and rigorous learning activities and social interactions. Standard 2.1** | Did not address the unique social and academic needs | Discussed the unique social and academic needs of gifted students. Did not provide strategies for support. | Emphasized the unique social and academic environmental needs of gifted students and strategies to engage students. | Provided multiple research-based aspects regarding student social and academic needs and how the classroom environment impacts these needs. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals use communication and motivational and instructional strategies to facilitate understanding of subject matter and to teach individuals with gifts and talents how to adapt to different environments and develop ethical leadership skills. Standard 2.2** | Did not address motivation or did not provide recommendations. | Addressed motivation and provided recommendations but did not reference research. | Addressed motivation and provided research-based recommendations of ways to support motivation | Provided multiple research-based aspects regarding student motivation and evidenced based recommendations to nurture intrinsic motivation. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals design appropriate learning and performance modifications for individuals with gifts and talents that enhance creativity, acceleration, depth and complexity in academic subject matter and specialized domains Standard 3.2** | Did not recommend any strategies for modifications. | Recommended strategies to enhance creativity, acceleration, depth, or complexity for modifications but did not reference research. | Recommended a single strategy that focuses on creativity, acceleration, depth, and complexity in specific subjects for appropriate learning modifications based on research. | Recommend multiple strategies that focus on creativity, acceleration, depth, and complexity in specific subjects for appropriate learning modifications based on research. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals use instructional strategies that enhance the affective development of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 5.5** | Did not provide reasoning or methodology for instructional strategies that could be used to support the social/emotional needs of gifted students. | Provided reasoning and/or methodology for several instructional strategies that could be used to support the social/emotional needs of gifted students however did not cite research. | Provided reasoning and/or methodology for several instructional strategies that could be used to support the social/emotional needs of gifted students based on research. | Provided the reasoning and the methodology for several instructional strategies that could be used to support the social/emotional needs of gifted students based on research. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring. Standard 6.5** | Did not advocate for the needs of gifted students throughout the presentation. | Advocated for the needs of gifted students however most information was personal opinion. | Provided advocacy for the needs of gifted students throughout the presentation by combining facts and personal opinion. | Provided strong advocacy for the needs of gifted students throughout the presentation by using facts and information. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals apply elements of effective collaboration. Standard 7.1** | Presentation lacked elements of collaboration. | Presentation attempted collaboration. | Presentation used some elements of effective collaboration as shown in research. | Presentation used multiple elements of effective collaboration as shown in research. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues. Standard 7.2** | Presentation did not show a willingness to collaborate with other teachers. | Presentation showed a weak to reach out to other teachers. | Presentation showed a willingness to collaborate with other teachers. | Presentation demonstrated a strong willingness to collaborate with other teachers. |
| **Beginning gifted education professionals use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with gifts and talents across a wide range of settings, experiences, and**  **collaborators. Standard 7.3** | Presentation does not show opportunities for collaboration with parents and teachers. | Presentation shows limited opportunities for collaboration and/or only focuses on the school setting. | Presentation shows some opportunities for collaboration with parents and teachers in limited settings. | Presentation shows many opportunities for collaboration with parents and teachers in multiple settings. |
| **Presentation 15%** |  |  |  |  |
| **Professional Design (7.5%)** | Graphics, visuals, and/or font are lacking creating a very amateurish presentation. | Graphics, visuals, and/or fonts show some aspect of quality but need much more work. | Graphics, visuals and fonts are good quality and contribute to the presentation. | Graphics, visuals and font are designed at a high level of quality. |
| **Communication is Clear (7.5%)** | Voice over or recording is unintelligible, cannot understand what is being said. | Speech has so many errors as to be confusing. | Narration is clear. Speaker made 1-2 errors. | Narration is clear and to the point. Message is easy to understand. |
| **Creativity 10%** |  |  |  |  |
| **Content (5%)** | Presented content directly from other resources | Presented some original thoughts and understanding regarding the content | Presented original understandings of the content | Presented individual insight and original understanding that brings new light to the content |
| **Presentation (5%)** | Presentation lacks any individual personality expression. | Some individuality is expressed in the presentation but seems mostly to come from a template or other source. | Individual personality is seen in the presentation. | Authentic, individual personality is expressed in the presentation. |

| **GTE 540 Identification Compariston** | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Excellent** | **Proficient** | **Developing** | **Needs Improvement** |
| **3.2 Beginning gifted education professionals design appropriate learning and performance modifications for individuals with gifts and talents that enhance creativity, acceleration, depth and complexity in academic subject matter and specialized domains.** | 50 (25.00%)  Expected outcomes of the teacher collaboration are research-based and tie with NAGC/CEC standards for programs and demonstrate how they will improve talent development. | Points:42.5 (21.25%)  Expected outcomes of the teacher collaboration are research-based and tie with NAGC/CEC standards for programs. | Points:32.5 (16.25%)  Expected outcomes of the teacher collaboration are missing either research support ties with NAGC/CEC standards for programs. | Points:0 (0.00%)  Expected outcomes lack research support and ties with NAGC/CEC standards for programs. |
| **6.1 Beginning gifted education professionals use professional ethical principles and specialized program standards to guide their practice.** | Points:50 (25.00%)  Collaboration plans are research-based, follow principles of effective collaboration and demonstrate an understanding of the general education teachers' needs. | Points:42.5 (21.25%)  Collaboration plans are research-based and follow principles of effective collaboration. | Points:32.5 (16.25%)  Collaboration plans are missing either research support or following principles of effective collaboration. | Points:0 (0.00%)  Collaboration plans are missing research support and following principles of effective collaboration |
| **6.4 Beginning gifted education professionals are aware of their own professional learning needs, understand the significance of lifelong learning, and participate in professional activities and learning communities.** | Points:50 (25.00%)  Reflection clearly states needs for further professional learning with evidence of how this will translate into more effective practice and indicates plans for obtaining the required professional learning. | Points:42.5 (21.25%)  Reflection clearly states needs for further professional learning with evidence of how this will translate into more effective practice. | Points:32.5 (16.25%)  Reflection is missing needs for further professional learning or is lacking evidence of how this will translate into more effective practice. | Points:0 (0.00%)  Reflection is missing needs for further professional learning. |
| **Survey Results** | Points:10 (5.00%)  Survey responses are included with multiple graphics to accurately reflect important areas or trends in the responses. | Points:8.5 (4.25%)  Survey responses are included and graphics accurately reflect the responses. | Points:6.5 (3.25%)  Survey responses are included. Graphic does not accurately reflect the responses. | Points:0 (0.00%)  Survey responses and graphics are missing. |
| **Writing & Grammar** | Points:20 (10.00%)  Writing is exceptional and at a professional level. | Points:17 (8.50%)  Less than 3 writing/grammar errors are noted | Points:13 (6.50%)  More than 4 writing/grammar errors are noted. | Points:0 (0.00%)  Enough writing/grammar errors exist to make reading difficult. |
| **Research and APA** | Points:20 (10.00%)  More than 10 scholarly references are used. APA formatting of citations and references follows required standards. | Points:17 (8.50%)  At least 8 scholarly references are used. APA formatting of citations and references follows required standards. | Points:13 (6.50%)  Less than 8 scholarly references are used or APA format of citations and references is not evident. | Points:0 (0.00%)  No scholarly references are used. |

**GTE 540 District Creativity/Leadership Plan**

| **Criteria** | **Novice** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | **Distinguished** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Design | Many the components of the program are not addresses, such as identification, services, personnel, and/or grades 4-12; research citations are missing | Addresses some of the components of the program including identification, services, personnel, and/or grades 4-12; research citations are missing | Addresses most of the components of the program including identification, services, personnel, and grades 4-12; program components are research-based | Thoroughly addresses of all components of the program including identification, services, personnel, and grades 4-12; program components are well supported by research |
| Collaboration Plan | Minimally addresses collaboration | Addresses collaboration within the school to meet students’ needs | Addresses collaboration of educators, parents, and/or community to meet students’ needs | Thoroughly addresses collaboration of educators, parents, and community to meet students’ needs |
| Program Evaluation Plan | Lacks clear plan for evaluation; mentions in passing | Basic plan for evaluation; lacks specificity | Reasonable plan for evaluation; some gaps in detail or clarity | Detailed plan for regular evaluation; specific metrics, methods, and timeline |
| Reflection | Lists elements from the course regarding creativity or leadership | Describes basic take-aways regarding creativity or leadership in gifted education | Describes take-aways regarding creativity or leadership in gifted education relevant to current role | Provides thoughtful personal insight regarding creativity or leadership in gifted education |
| Writing Quality | Poorly written; significant issues in organization and coherence; lacks APA 7 citation | Basic writing skills; lacks clear organization; multiple errors in writing and APA 7 citation | Well-written; mostly clear organization; coherent arguments; 1-2 grammar/spelling/punctuation errors; 2-3 APA 7 citation errors | Exceptionally well-written; clear organization; coherent arguments; correct grammar, spelling, and punctuation; follows APA 7 formatting |

WKU GTE 537 Key Assessment **Interdisciplinary Thematic Unit Rubric**

Adapted from the 2024 *CEC Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators* (K-12)

|  | Beginning | Developing | Proficient | Exemplary |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Curricular  Components  (CEC 3.1) | The curriculum unit contains 10 or fewer lessons. Lessons lack connection to a universal theme, and/or do not integrate multiple disciplines, and/or do not utilize structures of the disciplines and tools related to the lessons’ content area(s). In addition, they are not clearly sequenced. | The curriculum unit contains 10 lessons. The lessons may be connected by universal theme, integrate multiple disciplines, and utilize structures of the disciplines and tools related to the lessons’ content areas, but they are not clearly sequenced. | The curriculum unit contains 10 lessons. The lessons may be connected by universal theme, integrate multiple disciplines, and utilize structures of the disciplines and tools related to the lessons’ content areas. They are clearly sequenced and aligned to support learners. | The curriculum unit contains 10 lessons. The lessons are clearly  connected by universal theme,  integrate multiple-disciplines, and utilize structures of the disciplines and tools related to the lessons’ content areas. In addition, they are clearly sequenced and aligned to support learners. |
| Curricular  Components  (CEC 2.3, 3.1) | Lessons lack culturally responsive  resources, materials, and activities such that learning experiences are not  meaningful and challenging for all learners. | In a lesson or two, culturally responsive resources, materials, and activities are utilized so learning experiences are meaningful and challenging for some learners. | In some lessons, culturally responsive resources, materials, and activities are utilized so learning experiences are meaningful and challenging for each learner. | Throughout the unit, culturally  responsive resources, materials, and activities are utilized so learning experiences are meaningful and challenging for each learner. |
| Differentiation (CEC 3.3) | The activities in the unit provide for student choice. However, the activities are not matched to students based on assessment data. | Differentiated activities are utilized in the unit to accommodate the learning needs of high achieving students but only adjustment one of the following is used: content, process, or product. The differentiation is not closely tied to assessment data. | Differentiated activities based on assessment data, including  preassessments, are utilized in the unit to accommodate the learning needs of high achieving students, including adjustments to content, process, or product based on student readiness, interest, or learning profile.  Appropriate grouping to facilitate differentiation is utilized. | Differentiated activities based on assessment data, including  preassessments, are utilized  throughout the unit to accommodate the learning needs of high achieving students, including adjustments to content, process, AND product based on student readiness, interest, and learning profile. Appropriate grouping to facilitates differentiation. |
| Career  Education (CEC 5.4) | Learning activities within the unit do not have a clear tie to real-world skills. | Learning activities within the unit provide opportunities for students to explore careers or develop  communication skills. | Learning activities within the unit provide opportunities for students to explore careers or develop real-world communication skills. | Learning activities within the unit provide opportunities for students to explore careers and develop real-world communication skills. |
| Assessment of Learning  (CEC 4.3) | The unit includes some assessments but they do not measure learner progress and/or content acquisition. | For some lessons, assessments are used to measure learner progress and content acquisition. | Throughout the unit, appropriate assessments are used to measure learner progress and content  acquisition. | Throughout the unit, appropriate assessments are used to measure learner progress and content  acquisition. Assessments are  differentiated for students based on data. |
| Unit Evaluation (CEC 4.4) | There is an attempt to assess the  effectiveness of the unit. | The unit is assessed for effectiveness using multiple data points. | The unit is assessed for effectiveness using multiple data points and sources of information. | The unit is assessed for effectiveness in serving gifted and talented students using multiple data points and sources of information. |

**CEC Standard Initial Practice-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators (2024)**

• 2.3. Candidates apply their understanding of how diversity influences the characteristics, learning, and development of students with gifts and talents and design meaningful and challenging learning experiences.

• 3.1. Candidates organize knowledge, integrate cross-disciplinary skills, and develop meaningful learning progressions within and across grade levels to support culturally responsive curriculum by applying knowledge of the role of central concepts, structures of the discipline, and tools of inquiry of the academic subject-matter content areas they teach. • 3.3. Candidates modify the general or select, modify, or design the specialized curriculum to produce and implement advanced content and culturally responsive curriculum with fidelity by understanding that diverse students with gifts and talents demonstrate a wide range of advanced knowledge and performance levels.

• 4.3. Candidates select, adapt, and/or create classroom assessments that are valid measures of learner progress and content acquisition of curriculum differentiated to meet the needs of students with gifts and talents.

• 4.4. Candidates use qualitative and quantitative data and multiple sources to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum, services, and programs for students with gifts and talents. • 5.1. Candidates select from a repertoire of evidence-based instructional strategies to differentiate, accelerate, and enrich the curriculum and address the diversity of students with gifts and talents by using knowledge of each student’s interests, strengths, needs, and data.

• 5.4. Candidates provide career education, mentorships, and internships and develop communication skills that prepare students for creative and productive careers in a global, multicultural society by using knowledge of each student’s interests, strengths, and needs.

**Scoring Guide : TCHL 560**

|  | **Beginning**  **(1)** | **Developing**  **(2)** | **Proficient**  **(3)** | **Distinguished**  **(4)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The AR Project identifies a problem and relates it to no fewer than 3 Kentucky Teacher Standards** | The Project identifies a problem area related to the candidates’ work but it does not relate to the Kentucky Teacher Standards. | The Project identifies a problem area related to the candidates’ work but it only relates to 1 or 2 Kentucky Teacher Standards. | The Project identifies a problem area related to the candidates’ work and to no fewer than 3 Kentucky Teacher Standards. | The Project identifies a problem area related to the candidates’ work and it relates to 4 or more Kentucky Teacher Standards. |
| **The AR Project conducts an extensive and relevant review of the literature related to the problem area identified** | The AR Project conducts a review of the literature related to the problem area identified but it is not extensive and/or relevant. | The AR Project conducts a relevant review of the literature related to the problem area identified but it only includes 6-9 current resources. | The AR Project conducts an extensive ( at least 10 current sources) and relevant review of the literature related to the problem area identified . | The AR Project conducts an extensive (more than 10 current sources) and relevant review of the literature related to the problem area identified. |
| **The AR Project defines an educationally relevant, focused problem that will be studied, designs an appropriate study, and acquires IRB approval for the study.** | The AR Project defines a problem that is not relevant, methodology designed is inappropriate, OR does not acquire IRB approval for the study**.** | The AR Project defines a problem that is only somewhat relevant, OR methodology is only generally appropriate**.** Study acquires IRB approval. | The AR Project defines an educationally relevant, focused problemthat will be studied, designs appropriate methodology, with triangulation, and acquires IRB approval for the study**.** | The AR Project defines an educationally relevant, focused problemthat will be studied, designs appropriate methodology, with triangulation, and acquires IRB approval for the study**.** The study demonstrates potential for further research by the candidate. |
| **The AR Project collects data, as defined by the methodology and employs data analysis procedure(s) accurately to interpret findings.** | The AR Project collects data that somewhat defined by the methodology and begins to analyze data to interpret findings. | The AR Project collects data defined by the methodology and begins to analyze data to interpret findings. | The AR Project collects data, as defined by the methodology and employs data analysis procedure(s) accurately to interpret findings. | The AR Project collects data, as defined by the methodology and employs data analysis procedure(s) accurately to cogently interpret findings. |
| **The AR Project produces appropriate written and oral presentations of the outcomes of the study representing interpretations of the project’s data along with logical next steps.** | The AR Project produces incomplete written and oral presentations of the outcomes of the study, OR interpretations of the project’s data are incomplete or limited. | The AR Project presentations are generally appropriate and complete, but lacking a thorough discussion of the outcomes of the study or lacking clear interpretations of the project’s data or logical next steps. | The AR Project produces appropriate interpretations of research data with the relationship to other relevant research findings about the same problem discussed along with logical next steps. | The AR Project produces comprehensive written and oral interpretations of research data with the relationship to other relevant research findings about the same problem discussed along with logical next steps. |
| **TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE = 20** | | **TOTAL POINTS EARNED:** | | **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_/20** |
| **NOTE TO STUDENTS:**  After you submit this critical performance, the scores on this analytic rubric will be provided to you for constructive feedback. However, only an overall “holistic score” will be entered into the Electronic Portfolio System (EPS) based on the following scale: 1 – Beginning, 2 – Developing, 3 – Proficient, or 4 – Distinguished. This holistic score will be based on the following ranges of possible points on this analytic rubric:   * Holistic Score of 1 = Analytic Rubric Score Range 5-7 * Holistic Score of 2 = Analytic Rubric Score Range 8-12 * Holistic Score of 3 = Analytic Rubric Score Range 13-17 * Holistic Score of 4 = Analytic Rubric Score Range 18-20   Additionally, you may only receive a holistic score of 4 in the EPS if the critical performance required no revision. This means that, if revisions are required and you make the necessary revisions, even if you score 18 or above on this analytic rubric, the highest score you will receive in the EPS is still “3”. | | | | |