

Changes Based on Data

PROGRAM: Elementary Education w/ Special Education (Teacher of Students with Disabilities)

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Foundation Exam #1	Fall '09 & Sp '10 Undergraduate- 94% passed at T or A levels Graduate- 87% passed at T or A levels Exam needed to better assess CEC Standards 1, 2, & 6	A more comprehensive exam created New exam piloted summer 2010		Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results. An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned. Discussions during foundations class
	Summer 2010 Yielded the highest scores in CEC Standard 1 77% correct CEC Standard 6 87% correct Greatest weakness in CEC Standard 2 53%	2010-2011 Add instruction in the development and characteristics of learners to foundations course 2010-2011 Meet with faculty to ensure characteristics of learners are covered 2011 Eliminate items that evaluate CEC Standard 6	Fall 2011-Exam eliminated items that evaluate CEC Standard 6 Fall 2011-New CA added for CEC Standard 6 2010-2011-Need additional administrations Fall 2011-Administer exam later in the program Fall 2011- Each adjunct faculty member teaching a course in the department will receive, at the beginning of the semester, via e-mail the revised course of study, the description of the critical assessment and scoring rubric, directions for submitting critical assessment data, and a deadline for submitting critical assessment data.	

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Special Education Course Grades #2	100% of both undergraduate and graduate teacher candidates meet the minimum course grade requirement of C or higher in each of the special education courses.	Summer 2011-Specific courses were linked to individual CEC Standards so that not all grades are used to evaluate all standards Example: CEC Standard #1 SPC 2550 and 5550 only	No additional changes planned	Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results. An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned.
		2009-2010-Special Education faculty engaged in curriculum mapping in order to design sequential coursework, decrease overlap of content between courses, and ensure that CEC standards were built in to each course		
		Only candidates who score below 80% will be allowed to resubmit assignments and assessments. The adjusted grade cannot be higher than a B. This will determine if initial instruction is providing the elements needed for success on assignments.		

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Lesson Plans for Diverse Learners #3	2009-2010 data for both undergraduate and graduate teacher candidates indicated 93.59% of candidates scored at T or A levels in all areas.	The same scoring rubric will be used for undergraduate and graduate teacher candidates	Additional administrations Inter-rater reliability training regarding scoring rubric needed for both full-time and adjunct faculty	Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results. An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned.
	2009-2010 a preponderance of graduate teacher candidates score T because faculty members work with teacher candidate in an on-going fashion until T is achieved		2011-obtain an original score when the lesson plan is first submitted. Maintain records of sub-elements that may be in need of improvement.	
	Data reflects that teacher candidates can effectively write their planning decisions in a structured format.	The lesson plan assignment and rubric were revised to more accurately measure essential skills and CEC Standards 3, 4, 7 & 8	Fall 2011- Each adjunct faculty member teaching a course in the department will receive, at the beginning of the semester, via e-mail the revised course of study, the description of the critical assessment and scoring rubric, directions for submitting critical assessment data, and a deadline for submitting critical assessment data.	

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Student and Demonstration Teaching Competencies Evaluation Report #4	<p>Fall 2008- Graduate 74% at T level, 25.8 at A level</p> <p>Spring 2009- Undergraduate 80% at T level, 20 % at A level</p> <p>Graduate 90% at T level, 10% at A level</p> <p>Spring 2010- Undergraduate 86% at T level, 13% at A level</p> <p>Graduate 77% at T level, 23% at A level</p> <p>An overwhelming major of teacher candidates achieved or exceeded proficiency in all areas assessed by the completion of the Student Teaching Final Report.</p>	<p>2010 The Final Student Teaching Report was revised to more accurately reflect the CEC Standards 4, 7, 8, & 10.</p> <p>Summer 2011- The rating criteria on the final Student Teaching Report was rewritten to clarify each rating.</p>	<p>Additional administrations with revised form. Inter-rater reliability training regarding scoring is needed for both full-time and adjunct faculty</p>	<p>Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results.</p> <p>An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned.</p>

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Elements of Teacher Work Sample #5	<p>Spring 2009- A majority of teacher candidates meet target or acceptable levels.</p> <p>Undergraduate 77% scored A & T Graduate 82% scored A & T for Contextual Factors</p> <p>Undergraduate 89% scored A & T Graduate 87% scored A & T for Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>Undergraduate 77% scored A & T Graduate 56% scored A & T in Reflection</p>	<p>2009-2010 professors used revised courses of study that included elements of the TWS in preparatory classes.</p>	<p>Inter-rater reliability training regarding scoring is needed for both full-time and adjunct faculty</p>	<p>Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results.</p> <p>An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned.</p>
	<p>2010-Undergraduate 87%, Graduate 98% scored acceptable or above on Contextual Factors</p> <p>Undergraduate 89% scored acceptable or above in Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>Undergraduate 87% and Graduate 100% scored acceptable or above in reflection</p> <p>2010 was the first full cohort of candidates who completed the clinical seminar classes after plans to use the rubrics had been fully implemented.</p>	<p>2010-2011 Seminar instructors are given copies of the rubrics, CEC Standards and instructions prior to the beginning of the semester. A meeting is held with all candidates prior to the clinical placement where the clinical assignment and CEC standards are reviewed. Seminar instructors and the university supervisors also attend. Seminar instructors completed data charts of the rubrics for their classes.</p>	<p>Fall 2011- Each adjunct faculty member teaching a course in the department will receive, at the beginning of the semester, via e-mail the revised course of study, the description of the critical assessment and scoring rubric, directions for submitting critical assessment data, and a deadline for submitting critical assessment data.</p>	

Name of Assessment	Results/ Data	Changes Made Date	Changes Planned Date	How data is shared with faculty, candidates, and professional community
Functional Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan #6	Most candidates achieved at target or acceptable levels in CEC Standards 2, 3, 5 and 8.		Inter-rater reliability training regarding scoring is needed for both full-time and adjunct faculty	Monthly meetings at the unit level were held to discuss both data collection and results. An adjunct faculty meeting was held in August, 2011 to discuss critical assessments and the needed to establish uniform directions to students, rubric completion and data submission. Additional adjunct meetings are being planned. Discussions during foundations class
	Spring 2009 data indicated that 96% of teacher candidates scored at target or acceptable levels on all standards areas. Two candidates in the graduate program and one undergraduate candidate scored at unacceptable levels on part of the assessment. Spring 2010 data indicated that 100% of graduate candidates and 91 % of undergraduate candidates scored at target or acceptable levels in all areas.	Candidates who do not reach acceptable levels on all standards are advised and may re-do the assignment.	Fall 2011- Each adjunct faculty member teaching a course in the department will receive, at the beginning of the semester, via e-mail the revised course of study, the description of the critical assessment and scoring rubric, directions for submitting critical assessment data, and a deadline for submitting critical assessment data.	
		2011- Description of the assignment was revised to be more reflective of key competencies and CEC Standards. Rubric was revised to more accurately reflect key competencies and CEC Standards,		
	Several data points indicate that candidates are unclear in their ability to interpret and analyze data on behavior in a useful way. Undergraduate candidates	Revisions in the behavior management class include required analysis charts.		

	struggled with designing behavioral interventions that are designed to increase self-determination for students with disabilities.			
--	--	--	--	--