|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assurance of Student Learning Report**  **2023-2024** | | |
| College of Education and Behavioral Sciences | | School of Teacher Education |
| Special Elementary (Learning and Behavioral Disorders)/Elementary Education - #5003 | | |
| 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 their elementary education content knowledge to develop and teach an effective whole class lesson. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction (scored by rubric) | | |
| **Instrument 2** | Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample (scored by rubric) | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **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 analyze assessment data to drive instruction and improve student outcomes. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment (scored by rubric) | | |
| **Instrument 2** | Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning (scored by rubric) | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **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 demonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher. | | | |
| **Instrument 1** | Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – PLT K-6 | | |
| **Instrument 2** | Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – Content Areas | | |
| **Instrument 3** |  | | |
| **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.)** | | | |
| Overall, this analysis demonstrates program effectiveness in the areas measured. Moving forward, we will collect key assessment data in each course. Data will be retained in Blackboard within the assigned course.  \*NOTE: Our SLOs were developed before the CourseLeaf system was put in place. | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome 1** | | | | | | | |
| **Program Student Learning Outcome** | Students will apply their elementary education content knowledge to develop and teach an effective whole class lesson. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Direct: Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction  This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design effective instruction based on pre-assessment results. They must use their knowledge of students, the classroom environment, teaching methods, and students’ prior knowledge to determine the most effective strategy of instruction.  **Fall 23 (n=9)**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | DI1 | 0% | 11.11% | 33.33% | 55.56% | | DI2 | 0% | 0% | 66.67% | 33.33% | | DI3 | 0% | 0% | 88.89% | 11.11% | | DI4 | 11.11% | 11.11% | 22.22% | 55.56% | | DI5 | 11.11% | 11.11% | 33.33% | 44.44% |   **Spring 24: (n=9)**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | DI1 | 0% | 0% | 77.78% | 22.22% | | DI2 | 0% | 0% | 44.44% | 55.56% | | DI3 | 0% | 0% | 44.44% | 55.56% | | DI4 | 0% | 11.11% | 11.11 % | 77.76% | | DI5 | 0% | 0% | 44.44% | 55.56% | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Average score of 3 out of 4 on the Key Assessment rubric. (4 indicators)  The overall success rate for all students on the Design for Instruction Key Assessment will be no less than 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 80% of or more students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on each of the Key Assessment rubric indicators. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **NOT MET.**  **DI 4 Fall 23**  **DI 5 Fall 23** | |
| **Methods** | Data is collected each semester as part of ELED 405. Faculty evaluated this assignment, which requires students to use pre-assessment data to plan a unit of instruction. They must reflect on the data and justify instructional decisions in terms of content and methods. In addition, they create formal formative assessments and make plans to differentiate instruction for students in the classroom. This is a detailed document explaining the learning goals, objectives of the lesson, instructional methods, assessments and modifications/accommodations for different students. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Direct: Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample  This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design a unit of instruction from beginning to end. They design a pre and post assessment, instructional strategies, lesson plans, describe and evaluate the learning context, differentiate for students’ needs, use formative and summative assessments to evaluate student learning, analyze assessment data and reflect on their own practice as a teacher.  Fall 23:  N=3   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | UGA1 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | UGA2 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | UGA3 | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | | DI1 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | DI2 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | DI3 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | DI4 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | DI5 | 0% | 0% | 66.67% | 33.33% | | ASL1 | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | | ASL2 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | ASL3 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | ASL4 | 0% | 33.33% | 33.33% | 33.33% |   Spring 2024:  N=10   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | UGA1 | 0% | 0% | 70% | 30% | | UGA2 | 0% | 10% | 20% | 70% | | UGA3 | 0% | 20% | 20% | 60% | | DI1 | 0% | 0% | 70% | 30% | | DI2 | 0% | 0% | 40% | 60% | | DI3 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | | DI4 | 0% | 0% | 50% | 50% | | DI5 | 0% | 10% | 50% | 40% | | ASL1 | 0% | 0% | 40% | 60% | | ASL2 | 0% | 0% | 10% | 90% | | ASL3 | 0% | 0% | 10% | 90% | | ASL4 | 0% | 0% | 20% | 80% | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | Students must pass in order to receive teaching credentials. A passing score is an overall score of 85% or higher on the Teacher Work Sample.  The overall success rate for success rate for all students on holistic score the Teacher Work Sample will be 100% scoring 2 or above and, at least 70% of the students scoring 3 or higher out of 4 possible points on the rubric; the target success rate is 80% or higher for students to score no less than 3 of 4 points on each of the 12 Teacher Work Sample indicators. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 95% of students will score no lower than an average of 2 out of 4 holistic rubric points on the Key Assessment rubric and the individual rubric dimension indicators average score across all students will be 3 out of 4 at a rate 70% or higher. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **MET: 12 of the 12 indicators had at or above a 3 of 4 for 80% or more of the student population.** | |
| **Methods** | This capstone project is a requirement of the EDU 489 course, which all students take during their student teaching semester, their final semester. All students will design a unit of instruction including pre- & post-test, lessons, formative assessments, differentiated instruction, and analysis of student learning. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | |
| Design for Instruction: Formative Assessment and Differentiation are 2 of the 5 indicators that our students were not at the success level for 2023-2024. We will continue to monitor this progress of Design for instruction to see more increase in performance. More explicit instruction in formative assessment and differentiation in SPED 480. The approach to teaching students about Design for Instruction is in constant reflection. | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | |
| Our follow-up will begin immediately, Fall 2024, as we are using these assessments in our courses and need to enact measures to better prepare our students. We will pay special attention to indicators:   |  | | --- | |  | | DI 4: Formative Assessment | | DI 5: Differentiation | | Students did not meet the target in DI 4 & 5 in Fall 2023, however did meet this in Spring 2024. |   We have also revised the Teacher Work Sample and the 2023-2024 data reflect these revisions. | | | | | | | |
| |  | | --- | | **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note *when* it will be assessed again.  Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.  This will be assessed again each semester – Fall 2024 and Spring 2025. SPED 480, ELED 405 and EDU 489 are contributing courses to the dataa collection in this assessment cycle plan. The artifacts that will be collected are the rubric scores. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Students will analyze assessment data to drive instruction and improve student outcomes. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | Direct: Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment  This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to set learning targets and design assessments that align to the content standards.    Fall 2023:  N=9   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | UGA1 | 0% | 0% | 55.56% | 44.44% | | UGA2 | 0% | 0% | 55.56% | 44.44% | | UGA3 | 0% | 11.11% | 44.44% | 44.44% |   Spring 2024:  N=9   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | UGA1 | 0% | 0% | 33.33% | 66.67% | | UGA2 | 0% | 0% | 22.22% | 77.78% | | UGA3 | 0% | 22.22% | 77.78% | 0% | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall success rate for all students on the Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment will be no less 80% scoring  a 3 of 4 points on each of rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | 80% of students will score a 3 or 4 of 4 points on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **NOT MET**  **Spring 2024 UGA 3 only 77% scored 3 or 4.** | |
| **Methods** | Data are collected each semester as part of ELED 465/SPED 480. Faculty evaluate this instrument, which requires students to create two learning goals aligned to state standards that reflect the needs of the students in the classroom and the content to be taught. They will also create a summative assessment to give to students prior to instruction and after instruction of lessons. This assessment includes a variety of question types and aims to give the best picture of the students’ understanding of the content. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | Direct: Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning  This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to analyze assessment data to measure student learning.  Fall 2023:  N=9   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | ASL1 | 11.11% | 0% | 44.44% | 44.44% | | ASL2 | 0.00% | 11.11% | 44.44% | 44.44% | | ASL3 | 0.00% | 22.22% | 22.22% | 55.56% | | ASL4 | 0.00% | 0% | 55.56% | 44.44% |   Spring 2024:  N=9   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | ASL1 | 0% | 11.11% | 0% | 88.89% | | ASL2 | 0% | 11.11% | 22.22% | 66.67% | | ASL3 | 0% | 11.11% | 22.22% | 66.67% | | ASL4 | 11.11% | 0% | 33.33% | 55.56% | | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall success rate for success rate for all students on Analysis of Student Learning will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0. | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 80% of students will score a 3 or 4 on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0. | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **NOT MET:**  **ASL 3 less than 80% in Fall 2023** | |
| **Methods** | Data are collected each semester as part of ELED 405.  As part of the unit of instruction, students use their assessment data from pre- and post-assessments and formative assessments to evaluate student learning. This is the culmination of a semester-long unit instruction project. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** |  | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | |
| ASL3: Instructional implications from data/conclusions is the area in which we will continue to focus on the preparation in our formative instruction in SPED 480/ELED 465 and ELED 405 for both of the assessments to prepare for the Teacher Work Sample and skills assessed in this large assessment. | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | |
| **We will meet in early Fall 23 to discuss areas of strength and weakness and determine how to better instruct our studens.**   |  | | --- | |  | | **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note *when* it will be assessed again.  Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.  This area is assessed every semester. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3** | | | | | | | |
| **Student Learning Outcome** | Students willdemonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 1** | **DIRECT measure: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) K–6**  This standardized test measures teacher candidates’ knowledge of the foundation of teaching required of beginning educators. It is usually completed near the end of the undergraduate program to reflect pedagogical understanding gained through their educator preparation program. Teacher candidates must pass the PLT before teacher certification is granted by the State. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall success rate for all students on the Praxis PLT K-6 Exam will be no less than 95%, and on each Praxis Content Category, students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.  The Content Categories are:   * Students as Learners 69.78 * Instructional Process 74.45% * Assessment 72.41% * Professional Development, Leadership, and Community 79.34% * Analysis of Instructional Scenarios 76.65% | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | | The 2022-2023 data show that 97.78% of student test takers passed the Praxis PLT K-6 exam. On each Content Category, the percentage target 70% of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:   * Students as Learners 69% * Instructional Process 75% * Assessment 72% * Professional Development, Leadership and Community 79.34% * Analysis of Instructional Scenarios 76.75% | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | **NOT MET:**  **97.78% of students passed PLT exam**  **AND**  **ALL but one of the indicators had greater than 70% success rate** | |
| **Methods** | Teacher candidates complete the PLT at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. This is a timed, computer-based standardized test. It includes both grade- specific and general knowledge about teaching questions. Not all questions are scored as several are used for norming to develop future questions. Scores are reported directly to WKU. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 2** | **DIRECT measure: Praxis Subject Assessments**  Teacher candidates must pass standardized subject assessments for all content areas they will be certified to teach. Certification does not occur until all assessments are passed. These exams are completed near the completion of the undergraduate program to ensure teacher candidates have the necessary content knowledge to successfully improve student learning outcomes. | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** | The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Social Studies, Math, Reading/Language Arts, and Science will be no less than 70%, and on each Praxis Content Category, students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.  The categories are:  Social Studies:   1. US History, Government, Citizenship 2. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology 3. World History, Economics   Mathematics:   1. Numbers and Operations 2. Algebraic Thinking 3. Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability   Reading/Language Arts:   1. Reading 2. Writing, Speaking, Listening   Science:   1. Earth Science 2. Life Science 3. Physical Science   **Social Studies**  The overall passing score rate across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Social Studies (target of 70%) was 81.5% (N=173), and on each Praxis Content Category, and (compared to the targeted 70%) the following percentage level of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:   1. US History, Government, Citizenship – 63% 2. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology – 66% 3. World History, Economics – 59%   **Mathematics:**  The overall passing score rate across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Mathematics (target of 70%) was 90.8% (N=163), and on each Praxis Content Category, and (compared to the targeted 70%) the following percentage level of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:   1. Numbers and Operations – 79.63% 2. Algebraic Thinking – 65% 3. Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability – 61.42%   **Reading/Language Arts:**  The overall passing score rate across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Reading/Language Arts (target of 70%) was 93.98% (N=166), and on each Praxis Content Category, and (compared to the targeted 70%) the following percentage level of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:   1. Reading – 71.1% 2. Writing, Speaking, Listening – 71%   **Science:**  The overall passing score rate all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Science (target of 70%) was 85.63% (N=167), and on each Praxis Content Category, and (compared to the targeted 70%) the following percentage level of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:   1. Earth Science – 65.81% 2. Life Science – 73.53% 3. Physical Science – 69.18% | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | | 70% overall on each of the 4 content areas;  70% of points available on each content category | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | | **3 of the 4 content areas had at or above 70% success rate;**  **NOT MET: 7 of the 11 content categories did not have 70% or higher percentage of points scores** | |
| **Methods** | Similar to the other Praxis exams, teacher candidates must complete the subject assessments at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. These are timed, computer-based standardized tests. The elementary education certification requirement includes subject assessments in math, reading and language arts, science, and social studies. | | | | | | |
| **Measurement Instrument 3** | **N/A** | | | | | | |
| **Criteria for Student Success** |  | | | | | | |
| **Program Success Target for this Measurement** | |  | | **Percent of Program Achieving Target** | |  | |
| **Methods** |  | | | | | | |
| **Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.** | | | | | | **Met** | **Not Met** |
| **Actions** (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.) | | | | | | | |
| We will continue to work with our students to prepare them in the areas of content that they need to be more robust in their content areas:  Social Studies continues to need attention as it is the lowest performance content area overall for our students and in the break-down of content areas as well:   1. US History, Government, Citizenship – 63% 2. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology – 66% 3. World History, Economics – 59%   A way that we are going to work on this is to hone our focus in our SS Methods course to bring our overall pass rate up as well.  We also recognize that we have areas of concern that we plan to educate our colleagues beyond our college about so that our efforts to help our preservice teachers broaden beyond our walls. For example, the mathematics department has been determined to continue with the requirement for our students to take the three content courses for elementary teachers in mathematics, but in turn, needs to help us with drilling down in preparing our students for passing this content exam.  For Science and SS content beyond our college, and for our students in their program pathways, it gets trickier as they do not have devoted faculty and courses designed for elementary teachers. Therefore, we continue to have to seek to find our own ways to prepare Preservice teachers in these content areas. | | | | | | | |
| **Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.) | | | | | | | |
| We will talk with Jeremy Logsdon about coordinating with the Center for Literacy for supporting students in prepping for Praxis II. | | | | | | | |
| |  | | --- | | **Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome) | | When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note *when* it will be assessed again.  Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.  This will be assessed again in Fall-Spring-Summer 2024-2025. Collect Praxis II data. | | | | | | | | |

New SLO Curriculum and Assessment Structure to roll out 2022-2023:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **School of Teacher Education Student Learning Outcomes** | | | | | | | | |
| **Graduates of the WKU School of Teacher Education Initial Preparation Programs are able to:** | | | | | | | | |
| **Courses** | **1. Demonstrate content knowledge in the academic disciplines** | **2. Apply the foundational principles of learning and teaching** | **3. Exhibit teaching competence in a clinical environment** | **4. Select, administer, and analyze results of formative and summative assessments** | **5. Identify, evaluate, and implement individualized instruction** | **6. Apply content knowledge, pedagogical skills, and technology to instructional practice** | **7. Identify, evaluate, and implement literacy practices** | **8. Display the dispositions of a professional educator** |
| [**EDU 250**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1QevpREUI0nxk30y_42HzV8ATmx-jOJiX/view?usp=sharing) |  | I (assess) |  | I | I | I | I | I |
| [**EDU 260**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1qe_vW26sMcA6alcKeOamzUbjBfYZcRgA/view?usp=sharing) |  | I |  | R (assess) | I | I (assess) | I | I |
| [**PSY 310**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1KIyk0PCo8ndQUmP-lgBf6lbzcGHOQjP_5UE4Jg4ewSs/edit?usp=sharing) |  | I (assess) |  |  |  |  | I | I |
| [**EDU 350**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/15tkUq8Djcf-SAVAaarUgDN1T7omNI_9K/view?usp=sharing) |  | I |  | R/D | R (assess) | R | I (assess) | I (assess) |
| [**EDU 360**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_8Yog2UM0S7gUTKngYaqyLsS5ACZkNFi/view?usp=sharing) |  | I (assess) |  | R/D | R | R | R | R |
| [**ELED 345**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1CW1nO-_KFAfxNjCfFtpRS4bq4dIqwqZ7/view?usp=sharing) |  | R (assess) | I | R |  | R (assess) | R | R |
| [**LTCY 320**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1XgsCywEB0mPVCIMn7NHHN7k6sjyxhyNZ/view?usp=sharing) |  |  |  | R | R |  | R (assess) |  |
| [**SPED 335**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1dgZ5kOlIMlso1HxsC5ukHtYP2pR8-3Q-90YzBLnkNwY/edit?usp=sharing) |  | R |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [**SPED 340**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1vvlZj1_jhzkuxgA0gPXCoBCJxih_nAnr/view?usp=sharing)**/** [**ELED 365**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1_EE_8jpS0SRku6LobfPxT5zErzSaUl21/view?usp=sharing) | I | I | I | R | I | R (Assess) | R | R |
| [**ELED 407**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/10Y627O86L13Lu-WlpnzTgQsZPKF1kIFi/view?usp=sharing) | R (assess) |  | R | R |  | R (assess) | R |  |
| [**LTCY 420**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bcLK0BRMJZPVDSitvQTUEukjBKzKZwTu/view?usp=sharing) |  |  |  | D | D |  | D |  |
| **SPED 350** |  |  |  | D (assess) |  |  |  |  |
| [**ELED 405**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nMu-O32EL4o5PmRKTKvT2L9Z8xAXFLR2/view?usp=sharing) | R | D | D | D (assess) |  | R | R |  |
| [**ELED 406**](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1skgQlOC1Xu5EHV0N6z5OmLPyhdT8bVeB2LMjk4tGCyg/edit?usp=sharing) | R (assess) | R | D | R |  | R (assess) | R | R |
| [**ELED 465**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1oPWO_TjmQ18mn0VM3i7XAW_X4MSrwduJ/view?usp=sharing)**/** [**SPED 480**](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1tgEKUOpzj55dUr9N2WUZdxP9BncTaRq0/view?usp=sharing) | R | D | D (assess) | D | D (assess) | R | R |  |
| **SPED 425** | D (assess) | D |  |  | D | D (assess) | D (assess) |  |
| **SPED 345** | D | D | D |  | D | D | D |  |
| **SPED 400** |  | D (assess) |  |  |  |  |  | D |
| **SPED 346** | D | D |  |  | D | D | D | D (assess) |
| **EDU 489** | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) |
| **ELED 490** | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) | M:assess (TWS) |

Rubrics:

**Key Assessment 5A and TWS Rubric for Key Assessment 7 for Section 1:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary\*** |
| **UGA 1: Unit Goals**  KTPS: 1, 4, 5 | More than one item is incomplete. | One item is incomplete. | Unit goals are clear with learning outcomes stated in behavioral terms, challenging Bloom’s levels, and appropriate for standards and the consideration of students and learners at different levels. | Cites sources to support the appropriateness of learning goals. |
| **UGA 2:  Contextual Factors**  KTPS: 2, 7, 8 | Contextual factors are briefly described with minimal implications. | Contextual factors are thoroughly described with 1 important implication per factor. | Thoroughly described contextual factors and implications.  Each section has 2 or more important implications for the unit. | Cites data and sources to support contextual factor information and implications. |
| **UGA 3: Pre/Post Assessment**  KTPS: 1, 4, 5, 6 | More than one item is incomplete. | One item is incomplete. | Pre/post assessment aligned to learning goals, standards, and Bloom’s level.  Appropriate for the grade level. Includes 2 or more assessment types, mastery levels, and scoring tools. | Provides thorough written justification with evidence that the assessment design is reliable and valid.  Insert your justification below your pre/post-test table. |

**Key Assessment 6 and TWS Rubric for Key Assessment 7 for Section 2:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary\*** |
| **DI 1:  Alignment**  KTPS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 | Misalignment in more than 1 area. | Misalignment in 1 area.  Some omissions or errors. | Unit goals, lesson objectives, targets, Bloom’s levels, strategies, and assessments are in complete alignment. | Visual created that demonstrates complete alignment among all instructional parts. |
| **DI 2: Content**  KTPS 4,5,7,8 | Activity-driven instruction;  included minimal content. | Content included but not the focus of lessons;  some omissions or errors. | Content-driven instruction; content is accurate,  adequately defined, and scaffolds learners toward attainment of the Unit Goals. | Content-driven instruction; content is in-depth, accurate, clearly defined,  and skillfully scaffolded learners toward attainment of the Unit Goals.  Cite research-based sources. |
| **DI 3:  Cognitive Engagement**  KTPS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 | Not fully addressing more than 1 area of engagement | Not fully addressing 1 area of engagement in daily plans | Students are actively involved in high-level thinking tasks, real-world learning, using technology, and a variety of tasks and assessments, as appropriate. Appropriate transitions among strategies. | Engagement tasks are defended by explaining and citing multiple sources of research-based strategies and assessments. Smooth transitions among strategies. |
| **DI 4: Formative Assessment**  KTPS 6,7 | Formative assessments included but do not meet validity and reliability standards. | Noted formative assessments; limited variety; most assessments are valid and/or reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals. | Included and adequately described the use of multiple formative assessments; sufficient variety across lessons; assessments are valid and reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals. | Included and fully described the use of multiple formative assessments; significantly variety across lessons; all assessments are valid and reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals.  Cite research-based sources. |
| **DI 5:  Differentiation**  KTPS 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 | Minimal efforts to differentiate | Several examples of differentiation | Pre-assessment data and contextual factors are utilized to effectively differentiate daily lesson plans by considering student interests, learning preferences, readiness, and learning environment. | Differentiation methods are defended by explaining and citing multiple sources of research-based techniques. |

**Key Assessment 5B and TWS Rubric for Key Assessment 7 for Section 3:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Analysis of Student Performance and Reflection of Teaching** | | | | |
| **Criteria** | **Beginning** | **Developing** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary** |
| **ASL 1**  **Visual Representation of Student Performance**    KTPS 1, 2, 6 | Missing 2 or more visual representations or visuals  do not clearly or accurately communicate data | All graphs included with minor errors. | Sophisticated use of technology tools to create all 6 graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately. | Developing a unique chart or graph to enhance analysis. |
| **ASL 2**  **Analysis of Student**  **Performance Data**    KTPS 1, 2, 6 | Minimal or unclear analysis of student performance data. | Some analysis of student performance data | Accurate and logical analysis of the data results to determine the progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals. | Thorough elaboration citing specific and meaningful data beyond the required graphs, data, and student performance. |
| **ASL 3**  **Instructional Implications from Data/Conclusions**   KTPS 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 | Inaccurate conclusions and instructional implications drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions. | Some or unclear conclusions and instructional implications drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data. | Accurate and meaningful conclusions and instructional implications are drawn from data referencing trends and patterns in student performance and misconceptions of content. | Thorough elaboration and meaningful implications/conclusions drawn beyond the required criteria, referencing a plan for improving instruction. |
| **ASL 4**  **Identify Teaching Strength and Improvements**  KTPS: 1, 2,  9 | Minimal or inaccurate discussions of strengths and improvements. | Some discussion of teacher’s strengths and improvements | Appropriate, logical, and detailed discussion of 1 of the teacher's strengths and 2 improvements as related to student learning. | Includes extra video clip and/or instructional  examples showing thorough elaboration and meaningful understanding of strengths and how to improve as a teacher. |