



Submission Guidelines for **Interim** Assessment Reports (assessment results from AY 2013-14)

Guidelines:

- 1) *Submission deadline: **September 26, 2014**, early submissions are encouraged*
- 2) *Submit electronically to Yvonne Kirby (Director of OIRA) as an email attachment (ykirby@ccsu.edu)*
- 3) *Provide a SEPARATE REPORT for each academic program, **all certificate and degree programs are required to be assessed per NEASC***
- 4) *An Interim report consists of the Completed Overview report for the academic program and General Education Overview, if appropriate.*

Reminder: Assessment reporting is on a 5 year cycle, consisting of a full report in year one followed with interim reports for years 2, 3, 4, and 5. The assessment cycle is aligned with the Program Review Cycle such that the full assessment report is due the year prior to the year that the department will submit their program review report. Departments are not required to submit an assessment report for that program in the year that they prepare a program review report (see [Program Review Policy](#) and [Assessment Calendar](#)). For example, if your program is scheduled for program review in Spring 2017 or Fall 2017 then only a Summary assessment report will be due for that program in Fall 2017 (report covering AY 2016-17 activities); this is necessary to comply with BOR requirements. Departments that are accredited by an outside agency, and thus exempt from the Program Review Policy, should follow the same guidelines as outlined for departments preparing for their Program Review—in the year the self-study is written, they complete the Summary report. Please remember that an annual update to an accrediting agency is not analogous to a self-study.

Interim reports: complete ONLY the Overview for the program, complete with contribution to general education, using the table format below. URL to Assessment website resources: <http://www.ccsu.edu/page.cfm?p=3454>

Overview: The following questions are required by the Connecticut State Colleges and University Board of Regents, NEASC and the CCSU Academic Assessment Committee. These questions must be completed annually for all academic programs (all degree and certificate programs) as well as all departments offering courses in general education. Submit a separate table for each program and for each general education learning outcome the department teaches.

- You may use a bulleted list for each of the questions—full details should be included within the text of the full report when it is due, not in the Overview.
- **Interim reports:** the Overview should append clearly labeled data tables as appropriate - for both the academic program as well as general education.

Overview

Department: Art

Report Preparer: Dr. Cassandra Broadus-Garcia

Program Name and Level: BSEd in Art Education

Program Assessment Question	Response
1) URL: Provide the URL where the learning outcomes (LO) can be viewed.	http://www.art.ccsu.edu/learning_outcomes_1.htm
2) LO Changes: Identify any changes to the LO and briefly describe why they were changed (e.g., LO more discrete, LO aligned with findings)	No changes
3) Strengths: What about your assessment process is working well?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course-Embedded assignments provide opportunities for easier data collection and assessment of student progress. • Course-embedded assessments serve as a formative means of monitoring student learning throughout the BS program and provides opportunities for accommodating student learning needs. • New Student Teaching Evaluation instrument (EDSC 428 and EDSC 429) provides for a four-point performance level assessment vs. a three-point performance level assessment – a more realistic means of reporting student progress. • New means of assessing LO#5: Reflective Practitioner was added this year. Results of this new assessment - Final Art Student Teaching Evaluation, Spring 2013 – Section VIII: Self-Evaluation and Reflection (Criteria 31-33) – is reported.
4) Improvements: What about your assessment process needs to improve? (a brief summary of changes to assessment plan should be reported here)	The requirement for new separate Graduate Certification Art Education program assessment means that strategies for collecting separate data for Post-Baccs – separate from the BS in Art Education UG students – must be designed and implemented.
<p>For Each Learning Outcome (LO) complete questions 5, 6 and 7 (you may add more rows if you have more than 5 LOs): LO #1) <i>Content: Art Making - Art teacher candidates will demonstrate knowledge of appropriate techniques and processes in a variety of visual media.</i></p>	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated	<p>Learning Outcome #1 Assessment Methods/Tasks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Foundations-Level Art Portfolio Review B. Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review (Conducted in Art 403: Art Education and Technology)

<p>outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review and scoring rubric, licensure examination, , etc.)</p>	<p>C. Praxis II: Content and Analysis (Test 0135) Results (2011-2012) Praxis II: Art Making (Test 0131) Results (2004-2011)</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Associate Professor Dr. Cassandra Broadus Garcia Assistant Professor Brian Flinn</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion and Data Analysis: Foundations-Level Portfolio Review: Prior to the 2011-2012 report, Sophomore-Level Portfolio Review data did not differentiate between the B.S. in Art Education and B.A. in Art results (viz., 2009-2010). Starting in Fall 2010, data have now been separated and results are recorded in each Program’s Assessment report, respectively.</p> <p>Portfolio results from 2013-2014 indicate that 13 students submitted Foundations-Level Portfolios – 2 failed the review and 1 was incomplete and not reviewed. Both students failed Section I: Spatial Relationships and 1 student additionally failed Section III: Tonal Values.</p> <p>In previous years, including 2011-2012 and 2012-2013, students did not do well on the Section 3: Tonal Values; again in 2013-2014, one student failed this section, as well. The description for this section reads:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Student has at least two (2) tonal drawings in pencil, charcoal, and/or ink that depict figure, landscape, or still life. Rendering of tonal drawing in pencil, ink, or charcoal [required] or color works of art [optional] clearly describes the illusion of light defining 3D volume.</i></p> <p>As a result, the Department created a course-embedded assessment for all Drawing I classes in which Tonal Value content was the focus. The implementation of this assessment in foundation level courses appears to positively affected student performance in the 2012-2013 Portfolio Review. Based on current data, it appears that this assignment/assessment was successful in helping students with this drawing skill. Data suggest that a similar assignment – one which focuses on Spatial Relationships – is needed. Faculty will continue to review data to determine if a Spatial Relationships assignment will be created for implementation.</p> <p>Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review: Beginning data from the Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review were first collected 2011-2012. All B.S. in Art Education and post-bac Art Education Certification Graduate students’ digital portfolios met the minimum expectation of a score of “C” or higher. Continued use and refinement of the assessment rubric, based upon evidence collected in future portfolio reviews, will further strengthen this assessment. Data include both B.S. in Art Education and post-bac Art Education Certification Graduate students enrolled in <i>Art 403: Art Education and Technology</i> who have all been admitted to the Professional Program. Through Spring 2014, Digital Art Portfolios were scored solely by Art 403 course instructor, Dr. Jerry Butler.</p>

Praxis II: Content and Analysis (Test 0135) Results (2011-2012)

Praxis II: Art Making (Test 0131) Results (2004-2011): Overall, CCSU Art Education students are meeting Content Knowledge expectations as evidenced by the following:

- Appropriate average pass rate on Sophomore-Level Portfolio Reviews;
- 100% pass rate of “C” or higher on the Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review; and
- Pass rates between 90-100% on Praxis II from 2004-2012 and 85% 2012-13 pass rate on the new Art: Content and Analysis (0135) test.

Outcomes of these assessments over a multi-year period indicate that art education candidates have a “thorough understanding of the visual arts” in the areas of media and personal art-making as well as their knowledge of concepts, including art historical subject matter, considered central to the subject matter of art.

Art faculty continue to discuss, develop and implement programmatic changes that would continue to strengthen the CCSU Art Education program, as it relates to Art Content Knowledge. For example, faculty concerns about students’ inability to grasp tonal drawing concepts, as evidenced on the Sophomore-Level Portfolio Review, led to the development of a Drawing I course-embedded assessment task – one which will focus on the key concept of describing the illusion of light and depiction of 3-dimensional volume in a 2-d drawing using traditional drawing materials. Implementation of this course-embedded assessment task began in Fall 2013 in select art-majors-only sections of Drawing I – a course that students must take prior to their Sophomore-level Portfolio Review. Continuation of data collection and analysis of semester Portfolio Review outcomes have provide additional information valuable to faculty as they adjust drawing curricula to better meet the art-making needs of art education students. Results from the 2012-2013 Academic year have shown student difficulty with Section 1, Spatial Relationships. This new information is currently being reviewed by Art Department faculty.

The new 2012-2013 Praxis II exam (Test 0135) resulted in a greatly reduced pass rate (85%) from previous years. *Art 491: Aesthetic and Critical Dialogue about Art* is a course which focuses upon teaching Responding to Art processes. While past course content has primarily focused on verbal responses to art, strategies for strengthening students’ written responses to art are being considered. In lieu of select textbook written responses, written responses to artworks, artifacts and/or objects should be emphasized, thus further strengthening students’ ability to analyze works in written form. To further strengthen their ability to analyze art, resources, such as Sylvan Barnet’s *A Short Guide to Writing About Art*, might be considered as a reference for all art education students.

	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See APPENDIX A
	Changes: Continued collection and review of Digital Portfolio submissions.
LO #2) Content: Art in Context - Art teacher candidates will demonstrate knowledge of art forms, artists, and art works from diverse historical and contemporary contexts.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	Learning Outcome #2 Assessment Method: Praxis II: Art Content Knowledge (Test 0133)
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	Associate Professor Dr. Cassandra Broadus Garcia Assistant Professor Brian Flinn
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	Conclusion and Data Analysis: High pass rates on the Praxis II: Art Content Knowledge between 2004-2011 are evident both with CCSU students and statewide. Overall, Art Education students are meeting Content Knowledge standards, as evidenced by the following: Between 96% - 100% pass rate on Praxis II tests 0133) from 2004-2011.
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See APPENDIX A FOR ALL PRAXIS II SCORES WHICH INCLUDES TEST #0133.
	Changes: Because Praxis II (#0133) is no longer given, Praxis II (#0135) will be used for LO#2 data collection in the future.
LO #3) Pedagogy: Planning – Art teacher candidates will design comprehensive, sequential art curriculum that incorporates a variety of teaching strategies and considers the developmental appropriateness of K-12 students.	
5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)	Learning Outcome #3 Assessment Methods/Tasks: A. Development of an Elementary Thematic Unit of Instruction (Art 301 Course-Embedded Assessment) B. Development of a Secondary Media-Based Unit of Instruction (Art 400 Course-Embedded Assessment)
6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn.	Associate Professor Dr. Cassandra Broadus Garcia Assistant Professor Brian Flinn

assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.	
7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).	<p data-bbox="598 170 1967 544">Conclusion and Data Analysis: Course-embedded assignments/assessments, such as the Elementary Thematic Unit of Instruction, the Secondary Media-Based Unit of Instruction, and the Secondary Classroom Aesthetic/Critical Inquiry Activity, are the three, primary means by which students' ability to effectively plan instruction is assessed during their program. These key assessments are a large percentage of each respective course grade. Therefore, when a student doesn't score a "C" or higher on these course-embedded assessments, it typically means that the student does not pass the course. In the Secondary Methods Course (Art 400), if the student is having difficulty with his/her media-based unit but is passing the course in all other areas, the professor will typically work to help the student determine problematic areas and subsequently offer an opportunity to revise and resubmit his/her media-based unit. This option is offered in this course because it is the semester prior to student teaching and every effort is made to ensure that students are prepared for student teaching. Data show that students' ability to plan media-based instruction met target performance. On a 4.0 scale, mean scores ranged from 2.00 (Spring 2012) to a high of 3.39 (Spring 2008).</p> <p data-bbox="598 544 1967 609">Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See APPENDIX B</p> <p data-bbox="598 609 1967 721">Changes: Continued review of rubrics used when assessing the Elementary and Secondary Units of Study are important to check for needed revisions and/or changes in performance expectations.</p>

LO #4) Pedagogy: Applying – Art teacher candidates will use a variety of teaching and assessment strategies to promote students’ conceptual learning and artistic achievement during select field and student teaching experiences.

<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>Learning Outcome #4 Assessment Method/Task:</p> <p>A. Development and Implementation of a Secondary Classroom Aesthetic/Critical Inquiry Activity (Art 491 Course-embedded assessment)</p> <p>B. Student Teaching Evaluations - Section IV: Assessing for Learning</p> <p>During the elementary and secondary 8-week student teaching placements, the teacher candidates are assessed on their ability to assess student learning. Data are collected in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Learning, instruction and Data Collection (Item #19 – Student Teacher Evaluation Form) • Monitoring Students’ Understanding (includes Adjustments while teaching) (Item #20 – Student Teacher Evaluation Form) • Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving Their Performance (Item #21 – Student Teacher Evaluation Form)
---	--

<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Associate Professor Dr. Cassandra Broadus Garcia Assistant Professor Brian Flinn</p>
---	--

<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion and Data Analysis: All students completing the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 Aesthetic/Critical Inquiry course-embedded Assessment scored “B-” or higher with the exception of one Fall 2013 student who did not hand in this assessment and, subsequently, transferred out of the Art Education program. The 2013-2014 Mean Score Average was 3.15 and was probably due to the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students enrolled in Art 491 have been admitted to the SEPS Professional Program; and • Students have had one previous semester in which pedagogical course content included Planning Instruction and Curriculum; and • Since Implementation of the Assignment/Course-embedded Assessment takes place in a public school classroom, students are anxious to present themselves and outstanding work in a professional manner. <p>Data from Final Student Teaching Evaluations-<i>Assessing for Learning</i> indicates that candidates have demonstrated an ability to assess student learning, meeting the Target Level Performance, as evidenced by the following mean scores of University Supervisors:</p> <p>F2012-S2013 – Mean Score 2.80 F2011-S2012 – Mean Score 2.84 F2010-S2011 – Mean Score 2.80</p> <p>Because candidates do not have access to K-12 students in order to demonstrate their effect on students’ learning, these are the primary means by which we measure our candidates ability to Assess their K-12 students’ Learning.</p>
--	--

	<p>Evidence(e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See APPENDIX C</p> <p>Changes: Art education faculty periodically meet to discuss possible revisions and/or adjustments to these assessments. Means for acquiring feedback from participating co-op teachers in the field, namely for the Art 491 course-embedded assessment task, is needed and should be considered in the future.</p>
<p>LO #5) Reflective Practitioner - Art teacher candidates will engage in self-reflection and analysis of their field and teaching experiences to identify areas for personal growth.</p>	
<p>5) Assessment Instruments: For each LO, what is the source of the data/evidence, other than GPA, that is used to assess the stated outcomes? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination, etc.)</p>	<p>Learning Outcome #5 Assessment Method/Tasks:</p> <p>A. Elementary and Secondary Art Student Teaching Reflection Journal Essays (Art 401 Course-Embedded Assessment)</p> <p>B. Final Art Student Teaching Evaluation, Spring 2013 – Section VIII: Self-Evaluation and Reflection (Criteria 31-33)</p>
<p>6) Interpretation: Who interprets the evidence? (e.g., faculty, Admn. assistant, etc.). If this differs by LO, provide information by LO.</p>	<p>Associate Professor Dr. Cassandra Broadus Garcia Adjunct Professor – Judith Phelps</p>
<p>7) Results: Since the most recent full report, state the conclusion(s) drawn, what evidence or supporting data led to the conclusion(s), and what changes have been made as a result of the conclusion(s).</p>	<p>Conclusion and Data Analysis: While reflective papers and/or reports are incorporated into all art education courses, assessing the levels by which students are reflecting on their practice and field experiences is limited and needs to be expanded throughout the program. As part of Art 401- Student Teaching Seminar, Professor Judy Phelps requires that student teachers complete two reflective papers – one from their elementary student teaching experience and a second one from their secondary student teaching. These course-embedded reflective essays now serve as a means by which Learning Outcome #5: Reflective Practitioner is measured.</p> <p>Each semester, benchmark Art 401 student essays are gathered and used to review established grading standards. Rubric performance descriptors are reviewed and revised, if needed, based on current student work. New benchmarks are collected which replace collected student work from the past.</p> <p>Since Spring 2008, mean scores for assessments of candidates' reflections on their practice ranged from 2.92 low to a 3.5 high score (Fall 2009), indicating students are doing well in this area.</p> <p>Final student teaching evaluations, conducted collaboratively between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, encourage conversations between the cooperating teacher, student teacher and supervisor. The student teacher is expected to self-assess, reflect upon their performance, and be ready to share his/her evaluation at both the midterm and final conferences.</p> <p>Student teaching evaluations document the performance of teacher candidates at the “capstone” semester – their final teaching experience. Mid-Term evaluations provide an opportunity for the university supervisor, cooperating teacher and the student teacher to identify areas for continued growth and make note of professional accomplishments thus far. The focus of this assessment is in instruction and effective applied practice in a real classroom setting where, for the most part, they are</p>

	responsible for content delivery. Section VIII of this student teaching evaluation measures the candidate's ability to self-evaluate and reflect upon his/her practice.
	Evidence (e.g., conclusion based on data in table x): See APPENDIX D for data charts.
	Changes: Strategies for helping students to effectively reflect upon their practice is a continued focus throughout the last semester of their enrollment in the art education program.

Interim reports: append clearly labeled supporting data tables, organized by LO

APPENDIX A

Learning Outcome #1 and #2 Evidence

- A. Foundations-Level Art Portfolio Review**
- B. Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review (Conducted in Art 403: Art Education and Technology)**
- C. Praxis II: Content and Analysis (Test 0135) Results (2011-2012)**
Praxis II: Art Making (Test 0131) Results (2004-2011)
- D. Praxis II: Art Content Knowledge (Test 0133) – Evidence for LO#2**

Evidence for A. Foundations-Level Art Portfolio Review

B.S.Ed in Art Education Portfolio Review Analysis of Pass/Fail:

Academic year 2013-2014

Semester	Total	Pass	Fail	%Pass	%Fail
Spring 2014	11	9	2	82%	18%
Fall 2013	2	1	1*	50%	50%
TOTAL	13	10	3	77%	23%

*Portfolio was incomplete and was not reviewed

Academic year 2012-2013

Semester	Total	Pass	Fail	%Pass	%Fail
Spring 2013	12*	9	3	75%	25%
Fall 2012	6	3	3	50%	50%
TOTAL	18	12	6	67%	33%

*One submitted portfolio was not reviewed as it was incomplete; it is not included in these figures.

Academic year 2011-2012

Semester	Total	Pass	Fail	%Pass	%Fail
Spring 2012	9	8	1	89%	11%
Fall 2011	10	10	0	100%	0%
TOTAL	19	18	1	95%	5%

Academic year 2010-2011

Semester	Total	Pass	Fail	%Pass	%Fail
Spring 2011	15	14	1	93%	7%
Fall 2010	14	12	2	86%	14%
TOTAL	29	26	3	90%	10%

B.A. in Art and B.S.Ed in Art Education combined results from Academic year 2009-2010*

Spring 2010 (both)	24	19	5	79%	21%
Spring 2010	24	13	11	54%	46%
Spring 2010 (resubmit)	8	6	2	75%	25%
Fall 2009	29	17	12	59%	41%
TOTAL	53	36	17	68%	32%

*Data collected prior to the 2009-2010 academic year did not differentiate between B.A. in Art and B.S. in Art Education programs .

Portfolio Review Analysis of BSEd students Pass/Fail by Rubric Section:

		SECTION FAILED	% of TOTAL STUDENTS
Section 1	Spatial Relation		
	2013-2014 (n=2)	2	100%
	2012-2013 (n=6)	5	83%
	2011-2012 (n=1)	0	0%
Section 2	Elem/Principles		
	2013-2014 (n=2)	0	0%
	2012-2013 (n=6)	3	50%
	2011-2012 (n=1)	0	0%
Section 3	Tonal Values		
	2013-2014 (n=2)	1	50%
	2012-2013 (n=6)	3	50%
	2011-2012 (n=1)	1	100%
Section 4	Craftsmanship		
	2013-2014 (n=2)	0	0%
	2012-2013 (n=6)	0	0%
	2011-2012 (n=1)	0	0%

Evidence for B. Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review (Conducted in Art 403: Art Education and Technology)

**Pre-Student Teaching Digital Art Portfolio Review
Assignment/Assessment Scores**

Semester (N=Number of Enrolled Students)	Mean Score	A (4.0)	A- (3.5)	B+ (3.0)	B (2.5)	B- (2.0)	C+ (1.5)	C (1.0)	C- or below (0.0)
Spring 2014 Data Not Available									
Fall 2013 (n= 9)	2.56	2	1	1	5	0	0	0	0
Spring 2013 (n=11)	2.55	0	1	1	7	2	0	0	0
Fall 2012 (n=8)	2.31	0	0	1	4	2	1	0	0
Spring 2012 (n = 11)	3.18	4	1	2	3	1	0	0	0
Fall 2011 (n = 12)	3.46	4	4	3	1	0	0	0	0



Institution Name	CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIV									
Institution Code	3898									
State	Connecticut								February 28, 2013	
							Statewide			
Assessment Information¹	Group	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Institutional Average Scaled Score	Assessment Cut Score²	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Average Scaled Score
ART CONTENT AND ANALYSIS (0135)	<i>All enrolled students who have completed all nonclinical courses, 2011-12</i>									
Test Company: ETS	<i>Other enrolled students, 2011-12</i>	2				167	22	9	41%	166
Score Range: 100-200	<i>All program completers, 2011-12</i>	13	11	85%	172	167	21	18	86%	173
	<i>All program completers, 2010-11</i>									
	<i>All program completers, 2009-10</i>									

ART CONTENT KNOWLEDGE (0133)	<i>All enrolled students who have completed all nonclinical courses, 2011-12</i>									
Test Company: ETS	<i>Other enrolled students, 2011-12</i>	6				157	14	12	86%	172
Score Range: 100-200	<i>All program completers, 2011-12</i>	4				157	14	14	100%	177
	<i>All program completers, 2010-11</i>	13	13	100%	180	157	26	26	100%	174
	<i>All program completers, 2009-10</i>	19	19	100%	176	157	39	39	100%	173
ART CONTENT TRAD CRITIC AESTHETICS (0132)	<i>All enrolled students who have completed all nonclinical courses, 2011-12</i>									
Test Company: ETS	<i>Other enrolled students, 2011-12</i>	6				130	14	14	100%	151
Score Range: 100-200	<i>All program completers, 2011-12</i>	4				130	14	14	100%	152
	<i>All program completers, 2010-11</i>	13	13	100%	152	130	26	26	100%	150
	<i>All program completers, 2009-10</i>	19	19	100%	151	130	39	39	100%	148
ART MAKING (0131)	<i>All enrolled students who have completed all nonclinical courses, 2011-12</i>									
Test Company: ETS	<i>Other enrolled students, 2011-12</i>	6				148	13	12	92%	160

Score Range: 100-200	All program completers, 2011-12	4				148	14	14	100%	162
	All program completers, 2010-11	13	13	100%	165	148	26	26	100%	164
	All program completers, 2009-10	19	19	100%	164	148	39	39	100%	164
¹Tests with multiple delivery options (computer, paper, etc.) will be noted with the assessment code for the paper format only.										
²Cut scores may vary for groups depending upon when the cut scores are established by the state and when each group completed their teacher certification or licensure assessment.										
*Questions regarding tests listed by this testing company must be addressed to your state Title II Coordinator.										

FINDINGS: PRAXIS II ART-MAKING (TEST 131) RESULTS – 2004 THROUGH 2011

<i>Assessment Information¹</i>	<i>CCSU Group</i>	CCSU Number Taking Assessment	CCSU Number Passing Assessment	CCSU Institutional Pass Rate	Institutional Average Scaled Score	Assessment Cut Score²	Statewide Number Taking Assessment	Statewide Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Average Scaled Score
<i>ART MAKING (0131) Test Company: ETS Score Range: 100-200</i>	Students who are enrolled in the program and have not completed student teaching, 2010-2011.	10	9	90%	162	148	31	30	97%	161
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2010-11.	13	13	100%	165	148	26	26	100%	164
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2009-2010.	19	19	100%	164	148	39	39	100%	164
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2008-2009.	27	27	100%	171	148	52	52	100%	166
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2007-08	26	26	100%	166	148	58	58	100%	163
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2006-2007	26	26	100%						
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2005-2006	26	26	100%						
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2004-2005	20	20	100%						
¹ Tests with multiple delivery options (computer, paper, etc.) will be noted with the assessment code for the paper format only. ² Cut scores may vary for groups depending upon when the cut scores are established by the state and when each group completed their teacher certification or licensure assessment.										

Praxis II: ART CONTENT TRAD CRITICISM AND AESTHETICS (Test 0132) Results

Description of Praxis II (0132) Test: The Praxis II Art Content Traditions: Criticism and Aesthetics exam was previously required of all B.S. and Art Education Certification Graduate students who were applying for CSDE Visual Arts Certification. CCSU always recommended that this exam, administered through ETS, be taken the semester before a student's final student teaching semester. The test was given two separate sections: (A) Criticism and Aesthetics - This portion focused on one given work of art and tested students on their art criticism understandings about the various works using art terminology; and (B) The Global Traditions in Art, Architecture, and Design - This section focused on either a piece of art or a work of architecture. Students were asked to successfully link the work's elements, style influences, and themes to its social, political, and cultural milieu. Results below indicate latest 2010-2011 results from ETS.

Assessment Information ¹	CCSU Art Education Group	CCSU Number Taking Assessment	CCSU Number Passing Assessment	CCSU Institutional Pass Rate	Institutional Average Scaled Score	Assessment Cut Score ²	Statewide Number Taking Assessment	Statewide Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Average Scaled Score
ART CONTENT TRAD CRITIC AESTHETICS (0132) Test Company: ETS Score Range: 100-200	All enrolled students who have completed all nonclinical courses, 2010-11									
	Other enrolled students, 2010-11	10	10	100%	154	130	31	31	100%	150
	All program completers, 2010-11	13	13	100%	152	130	26	26	100%	150

	All program completers, 2009-10	19	19	100%	151	130	39	39	100%	148
	All program completers, 2008-09	27	27	100%	150	130	52	52	100%	150

Praxis II: Art Content Knowledge (Test 0133)

Description of Praxis II (0133) Test: Content Knowledge was a multiple-choice test that focused on those concepts considered central to the subject matter of art. The test, administered through ETS, measured knowledge of the traditions in art and art forms, architecture, design, and the making of artifacts; art criticism and aesthetics; and the making of art. Note: Results below indicate latest 2010-2011 results from ETS.

Praxis II: Art Content Knowledge (Test 0133) RESULTS – 2004 THROUGH 2011

CCSU ART EDUCATION							Statewide			
Assessment Information ¹	Group	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Institutional Pass Rate	Institutional Average Scaled Score	Assessment Cut Score ²	Number Taking Assessment	Number Passing Assessment	Statewide Pass Rate	Statewide Average Scaled Score
	Students who are enrolled in the program and have not completed student teaching, 2010-2011.	10	10	100%	180	157	32	29	91%	173
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2010-11.	13	13	100%	180	157	26	26	100%	174
	Students who are enrolled in the program and have not completed student teaching, 2009-10	8				157	18	13	72%	167
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2009-2010.	19	19	100%	176	157	39	39	100%	173
	Students who completed the program, including student teaching, 2008-2009.	28	27	96%	181	157	53	52	98%	176
	Students who have completed the program,	26	26	100%	178	157	58	58	100%	174

Test Company: ETS Score Range: 100-200	including student teaching , 2007-08									
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2006-2007	26	26	100%						
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2005-2006	26	26	100%						
	Students who have completed the program, including student teaching , 2004-2005	20	20	100%						

¹Tests with multiple delivery options (computer, paper, etc.) will be noted with the assessment code for the paper format only.

²Cut scores may vary for groups depending upon when the cut scores are established by the state and when each group completed their teacher certification or licensure assessment.

Praxis II: Art: Content and Analysis (Test 0135 which replaced tests 0131, 0132, 0133)

Description of Praxis II (0135) Art Test: Content and Analysis measures whether entry-level art teachers have the standards-relevant knowledge, skills, and abilities deemed necessary for beginning professional practice. The test questions focus on concepts that are considered central to the study of art, measuring knowledge of art making and the historical and theoretical foundations of art.

PRAXIS II: (Test 0135) 2011-2012

Program: CCSU Art Education

Test Code	Test Name	Number Taking Test	Average Test Score	Number Passing Test	Pass Rate	
0135	Art: Content and Analysis (0135)	18	171	15	83.33%	
	Test Category Detail	Average Score	Average Raw Points*	Average 25TH Raw Norm**	Average 75TH Raw Norm***	Score Range
	I. ART MAKING	43.38	54.69	34.23	43.23	33 - 48
	II. HISTORICAL AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF ART	21	29.69	17.85	23.46	14 - 25
	III. ART ANALYSIS	10.31	18	7.85	12.31	4 - 16

* Average category raw points available (highest points for the category)

** Average scores earned by the first 25% of the group of examinees

** Average scores earned by the first 75% of the group of examinees

APPENDIX B

Learning Outcome #3 Evidence

- A. Development of an Elementary Thematic Unit of Instruction (Art 301 Course-Embedded Assessment)
- B. Development of a Secondary Media-Based Unit of Instruction (Art 400 Course-Embedded Assessment)

**Elementary Thematic Unit of Instruction
Assignment/Assessment Scores**

Semester (N=Number of Enrolled Students)	Mean Score	Percent Passed	A (4.0)	A- (3.5)	B+ (3.0)	B (2.5)	B- (2.0)	C+ (1.5)	C (1.0)	C- or below (0.0)
Spring 2014 (n=7)	2.79	86%	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	1
Fall 2013 (n=9)	2.83	89%	2	3	0	2	1	0	0	1
Spring 2013 (n= 9)	2.77	89%	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	1
Fall 2012 (n=9)	2.77	100%	2	2	0	2	2	0	1	0
Spring 2012 (n=7)	3.14	100%	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
Fall 2011 (n = 14)	2.96	100%	2	5	1	3	2	1	0	0
Spring 2011 (n = 8)	2.44	100%	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	0
Fall 2010 (n = 20)	2.4	85%	3	5	1	3	2	2	1	3
Spring 2010 (n = 18)	1.92	78%	4	0	2	3	2	1	2	4
Fall 2009 (n=15)	2.67	100%	2	3	2	3	2	2	1	0
Spring 2009 (n = 0)	Art 301 course was not offered.									
Fall 2008 (n = 16)	2.44	87%	2	2	3	3	3	1	0	2
Spring 2008 (n = 13)	1.88	85%	2	0	2	1	2	0	4	2
Fall 2007 (n = 19)	2.92	95%	5	5	2	2	3	0	1	1

**Secondary Media-Based Unit of Instruction
Assignment/Assessment Scores**

Semester (N=Number of Enrolled Students)	Mean Score	Percent Passed	A (4.0)	A- (3.5)	B+ (3.0)	B (2.5)	B- (2.0)	C+ (1.5)	C (1.0)	C- or below (0.0)
Fall 2013 (n=4)	3.00	100%	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0
Spring 2013 (n=10)	3.05	100%	4	1	1	2	1	0	1	0
Fall 2012 (n=10)	3.05	100%	4	0	1	4	0	1	0	0
Spring 2012 (n = 9)	2.00	89%	2	1	0	4	0	1	0	1
Fall 2011 (n = 16)	2.38	94%	6	1	0	4	1	1	2	1
Spring 2011 (n = 7)	3.07	100%	3	1	0	2	0	0	1	0
Fall 2010 (n = 12)	2.96	92%	5	0	2	3	1	0	0	1
Spring 2010 (n = *)	*	*								
Fall 2009 (n = 13)	2.62	100%	1	3	2	3	2	0	2	0
Spring 2009 (n = *)	*	*								
Fall 2008 (n = *)	*	*								
Spring 2008 (n = 9)	3.39	100%	5	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Fall 2007 (n = 14)	3.11	86%	8	1	1	2	0	0	0	2
Spring 2007 (n = 14)	2.89	93%	5	2	3	0	1	1	1	1
Fall 2006 (n = 13)	3.12	100%	3	2	4	3	1	0	0	0
Spring	3.03	100%	5	3	2	2	1	0	2	0

2006
(n = 15)
Fall 2005
(n = 18)

2.86 **94%** 4 4 1 3 2 0 3 1

***Data not available.**

APPENDIX C

Learning Outcome #4 Evidence

- A. Development and Implementation of a Secondary Classroom Aesthetic/Critical Inquiry Activity
(Art 491 Course-embedded assessment)**
- B. Student Teaching Evaluations - Section IV: Assessing for Learning**

**Secondary Classroom Aesthetic/Critical Inquiry
Activity Assignment/Assessment Scores**

Semester (N=Number of Enrolled Students)	Mean Score	Percent Passed	A (4.0)	A- (3.5)	B+ (3.0)	B (2.5)	B- (2.0)	C+ (1.5)	C (1.0)	C- or below (0.0)
Spring 2014 (n=5)	3.5	100%	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 2013 (n=10)	2.8	90%	3	2	1	0	3	0	0	1
Spring 2013 (n=5)	3.7	100%	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 2012 (n=11)	3.5	100%	6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0
Spring 2012 (n = 8)	3.5	100%	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 2011 (n = 9)	3.72	100%	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2011 (n = 18)	3.19	100%	2	9	2	4	1	0	0	0
Fall 2010 (n = 9)	2.89	89%	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	1
Spring 2010 (n = 15)	3.57	100%	8	3	3	0	1	0	0	0
Fall 2009 (n = 0)	Art 491 was not offered.									
Spring 2009 (n = 12)	3.46	100%	3	6	2	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2008 (n = 9)	3.33	100%	3	3	1	1	1	0	0	0
Spring 2008 (n = 20)	3.48	100%	8	8	0	3	1	0	0	0
Fall 2007 (n = 14)	3.86	100%	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0

Teaching Evaluation Statistical Report: Assessing for Learning

The following data were gathered during art education candidates' student teaching experiences to measure their effects on student learning.

Evaluation

Term: Academic Year: Fall 2012-Spring 2013
Student Level: Undergraduates and Post-Bac Certification Graduate Students
Certification
Program: All Level (PK/K-12)
Major: Art Education
Number of students: 37

How does the ST use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction?

Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST consistently and effectively analyzed student work on a regular basis, developed and used varied assessment techniques and maintained accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	17	45.9%	18	48.6%	16	43.2%
Acceptable	With support, ST demonstrated the ability to analyze student work on a regular basis, develop and use varied assessment techniques and maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	4	10.8%	5	13.5%	6	16.2%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited an inability to analyze student work on a regular basis. ST failed to develop and/or use varied assessment techniques and/or maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		16	43.2%	14	37.8%	15	40.5%
Score:	Mean Item	2.81		2.78		2.73	
Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%

Target	ST's monitoring focused on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	20	54.1%	19	51.4%	19	51.4%
Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	1	2.7%	4	10.8%	3	8.1%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST did not make adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		16	43.2%	14	37.8%	15	40.5%
Score:		Mean Item		2.95		2.83	
Score:				2.86			
Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST consistently and independently provided feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	19	51.4%	19	51.4%	18	48.6%
Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to provide feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided adequate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	2	5.4%	4	10.8%	4	10.8%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to provide feedback to students which included appropriate and/or accurate comments about the content knowledge and/or skills and/or provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and/or weaknesses.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		16	43.2%	14	37.8%	15	40.5%
Score:		Mean Item		2.90		2.83	
Score:				2.82			
TOTAL MEAN SCORE FOR ASSESSING FOR LEARNING FACTOR: (2012-2013 Academic Year)				2.89		2.81	
				2.80			

Academic Year: Fall 2011 - Spring 2012

Evaluation Term:

Student Level: Undergraduates and Post-Bac Certification Graduate Students

Certification Program: All Level (PK/K-12)

Major: Art Education

Number of students: 32

Assessing for Learning

How does the ST use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction?

19. Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST consistently and effectively analyzed student work on a regular basis, developed and used varied assessment techniques and maintained accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	22	68.8%	26	81.3%	25	78.1%
Acceptable	With support, ST demonstrated the ability to analyze student work on a regular basis, develop and use varied assessment techniques and maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	4	12.5%	5	15.6%	5	15.6%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited an inability to analyze student work on a regular basis. ST failed to develop and/or use varied assessment techniques and/or maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	1	3.1%	0	0.0%	1	3.1%
No Response		5	15.6%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%

Item Score:		Mean	2.80	2.85	2.81		
20. Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST's monitoring focused on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	23	71.9%	26	81.3%	26	81.3%
Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	4	12.5%	5	15.6%	5	15.6%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST did not make adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		5	15.6%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%
Item Score:		Mean	2.93	2.85	2.85		
21. Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%

Target	ST consistently and independently provided feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	26	81.3%	27	84.4%	27	84.4%
Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to provide feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided adequate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	2	6.3%	4	12.5%	4	12.5%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to provide feedback to students which included appropriate and/or accurate comments about the content knowledge and/or skills and/or provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and/or weaknesses.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		4	12.5%	1	3.1%	1	3.1%
Item Score:		Mean	<u>2.87</u>	<u>2.85</u>	<u>2.85</u>	<u>2.85</u>	
TOTAL MEAN SCORE FOR ASSESSING FOR LEARNING FACTOR: (2011-2013 Academic Year)			<u>2.87</u>	<u>2.85</u>	<u>2.84</u>		

Evaluation Term: Academic Year: Fall 2010- Spring 2011
Student Level: Undergraduate and Post-Bacc Certification Graduate Students
Certification Program: All Level (PK/K-12)
Major: Art Education
Number of students: 29

Assessing for Learning

How does the ST use multiple measures to analyze student performance and to inform subsequent planning and instruction?

19. Student Learning, Instruction, and Data Collection 5.2, 5.3, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST consistently and effectively analyzed student work on a regular basis, developed and used varied assessment techniques and maintained accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	17	58.6%	22	75.9%	21	72.4%
Acceptable	With support, ST demonstrated the ability to analyze student work on a regular basis, develop and use varied assessment techniques and maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	1	3.4%	1	3.4%	2	6.9%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited an inability to analyze student work on a regular basis. ST failed to develop and/or use varied assessment techniques and/or maintain accurate records that led to appropriate instructional inferences about student learning and subsequent instruction.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		11	37.9%	6	20.7%	6	20.7%
Mean Item Score:		<u>3.00</u>		<u>2.82</u>		<u>2.77</u>	
20. Monitoring Students' Understanding 4.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST's monitoring focused on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	17	58.6%	23	79.3%	23	79.3%

Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST made adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	0	0.0%	2	6.9%	2	6.9%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to focus on students' strengths and weaknesses related to the learning objective. ST did not make adjustments while teaching that addressed students' content misunderstanding through the use of instructional strategies.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		12	41.4%	7	24.1%	7	24.1%
Mean Item Score:		<u>3.00</u>		<u>2.91</u>		<u>2.91</u>	
21. Providing Feedback that Focuses on Content and Assists Students in Improving their Performance 5.5, 5.6, (II D), (4.0)							
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST consistently and independently provided feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	15	51.7%	20	69%	19	65.5%
Acceptable	ST demonstrated growing ability to provide feedback to students which included general and specific comments about the content knowledge or skills and provided adequate information about their learning strengths and weaknesses.	3	10.3%	3	10.3%	4	13.8%
Unacceptable	ST exhibited inability to provide feedback to students which included appropriate and/or accurate comments about the content knowledge and/or skills and/or provided appropriate information about their learning strengths and/or weaknesses.	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
No Response		11	37.9%	6	20.7%	6	20.7%
Mean Item Score:		<u>2.50</u>		<u>2.77</u>		<u>2.73</u>	
TOTAL MEAN SCORE FOR ASSESSING FOR LEARNING FACTOR (2010-2011 Academic Year):		<u>2.83</u>		<u>2.83</u>		<u>2.80</u>	

APPENDIX D

Learning Outcome #5 Evidence

- A. Elementary and Secondary Art Student Teaching Reflection Journal Essays (Art 401 Course-Embedded Assessment)
- B. Final Art Student Teaching Evaluation, Spring 2013 – Section VIII: Self-Evaluation and Reflection (Criteria 31-33)

Findings and Data Analysis: Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Reflection Essays Assignment/Assessment Scores

The data below include both B.S. in Art Education undergraduate and post-bac Art Education Certification Graduate students enrolled in the Art 401: Seminar course from Spring 2008 – Spring 2014. Course-Embedded Reflection Journal Essays are scored by course instructor, Judith Phelps.

All students completing the Fall 2013 and Spring 2014 Art 401 course-embedded Reflection Essays Assignment/Assessment scored “B-” or higher with the exception of one student who failed to submit this assessment. The 2013-2014 Mean Score Average was 3.24. The Mean Score range between Spring 2008 and Spring 2014 for this Assignment/Assessment (between 2.92 – 3.5) is probably due to a number of factors:

- All students enrolled in Art 401 – last semester practicum taken during student teaching - have been admitted to the SEPS Professional Program; and
- Since the Assignment/Course-embedded Assessment takes place during the time in which they’re student teaching in a public school classroom, students are anxious to present themselves in a professional manner.

Overall, Professor Phelps reported that the Elementary Reflection Essays were stronger and Secondary Reflection Essays were weaker. Professor Phelps presents past sample student writing samples to clarify assessment/assignment, set expectations, and show how work is aligned with rubric performances/descriptors. The Reflection Essay Assessment Rubric is thoroughly discussed in Art 401 with clarifications provided for students by Prof. Phelps.

			Elementary and Secondary Student Teaching Reflection Essays Assignment/Assessment Scores															
			E. = Elementary Teaching Reflection Essay Score S. = Secondary Teaching Reflection Essay Score															
			E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.	E.	S.
Semester (N=Number of Enrolled Students)	Mean Score	Percent Passed	A (4.0)		A- (3.5)		B+ (3.0)		B (2.5)		B- (2.0)		C+ (1.5)		C (1.0)		C- or below (0.0)	
Spring 2014 (n=4)	3.13	100%	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 2013 (n=11) (Not reported: n=2 in elem.)	3.35	91%	6	1	3	6	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Spring 2013 (n = 11)	3.00	91%	4	3	5	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Fall 2012 (n = 7)	3.18	100%	2	0	2	3	3	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2012 (n = 16)	3.45	100%	8	5	3	5	3	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fall 2011 (n = 4)	3.44	100%	1	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2011 (n = 11)	3.11	100%	3	3	2	1	4	4	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2010 (n = 3)	2.92	100%	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2010 (n = 12)	3.21	100%	6	3	2	2	1	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

Fall 2009 (n = 6)	3.50	100%	4	2	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Spring 2009 (n = 18)	3.03	94%	4	10	6	1	0	0	2	3	3	2	2	2	0	0	1	0
Fall 2008 (n = 12)	3.10	100%	6	2	0	5	2	1	3	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0
Spring 2008 (n = 13)	3.13	100%	4	5	1	3	4	2	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0

PILOT Student Teaching Evaluation Statistical Report – Spring 2013

Professor: Judith Phelps

31. Continuous Self-evaluation 6.1, (III B), (5.1)										
					ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
					Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST independently made accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, reflected, and initiated positive changes based on these appraisals.				11	78.6%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%
Satisfactory	With limited prompts related to self-reflection, ST made accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, reflected, and initiated positive changes based on these appraisals.									
Developing	With prompts related to self-reflection, ST demonstrated beginning ability to make accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, and/or to reflect and/or initiate positive changes based on these appraisals.									
Unsatisfactory	ST exhibited inability to make accurate appraisals of his/her effectiveness, and/or to reflect and/or initiate positive changes based on these appraisals.									
No Response					3	21.4%				
Mean Item Score:					-		-		-	
32. Integration of Feedback 6.1, (II B), (5.1)										
					ST		Co-op		Supervisor	
					Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Target	ST immediately integrated the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor in order to improve his/her practice.				11	78.6%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%
Satisfactory	ST accepted the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor and generally integrated most feedback in order to improve his/her instructional practice.									
Developing	ST demonstrated beginning ability to accept the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor and listened but did not always integrate that feedback to improve his/her instructional practice.									
Unsatisfactory	ST exhibited inability or unwillingness to accept and/or integrate the feedback provided by the cooperating teacher and/or university supervisor to improve his/her instructional practice.									

No Response		3	21.4%								
Mean Item Score:		-		-		-					
33. Professional Growth 6.2, (III C & D), (5.1)											
		ST		Co-op		Supervisor					
		Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%				
Target	ST participated in relevant and/or appropriate professional development opportunities offered to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students (department meetings, staff meetings, conferences, etc.)	11	78.6%	14	100.0%	14	100.0%				
Unacceptable	ST did not or inconsistently participated in relevant and/or appropriate professional development opportunities offered to enhance skills related to teaching and meeting the needs of all students (department meetings, staff meetings, conferences, etc.)										
No Response		3	21.4%								
TOTAL MEAN SCORE FOR SELF-EVALUATION AND REFLECTION FACTOR:					<u>2.97</u>	<u>2.91</u>	<u>2.91</u>				

