

**FALL 2011-2012-Assessment Report for Department of Teacher Education Programs:
B.S. Elementary Education Certification**

BACCALAUREATE PROGRAM, ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

The baccalaureate program leading to certification in elementary education is accredited by the Connecticut State Department of Education and NCATE-ACEI specialty professional association (SPA). Assessments required for accreditation by these entities is based on professional and national standards. The Elementary Education program is committed to developing teacher leaders with 21st century skills necessary for success in a global society and a complex world. Additionally, the Department of Teacher Education is supporting the Elementary Education Division's new CCSU School Apprenticeship (SAP) Program, which is currently being piloted during the Fall 2012 semester. S.A.P will ensure that our elementary education candidates are immersed in diverse community settings and authentic learning experiences and problem-solving projects. The Elementary Education Division will review and assess initial learning outcomes and results of the S.A.P on the professional development of our teacher candidates.

1. LEARNING OUTCOMES

The elementary education program at CCSU meets several sets of professional standards including those established by the state of Connecticut, the general standards of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), specific elementary education standards set by the Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), and institutional standards set by the education program at CCSU. Learning outcomes for teacher candidates are identified by ACEI standards (*see Attachment A*). The Elementary Education preparation program was nationally recognized by ACEI in July 2009 as having met all standards with distinction.

2. ASSESSMENTS AND FINDINGS

This report includes data and analysis that has been updated for fall 2011 and spring 2012 for elementary education preparation program assessments.

These assessments include; *Praxis II-(Unit-Wide), Content Knowledge Course Rubric, Midpoint Planning Task, Student Teaching Evaluation, Student Teaching Exit Portfolio, Practicum Course Field Evaluations, and Progress Roster and Professional Disposition Rubric.*

| |
|---|
| <p>ASSESSMENT 1: PRAXIS II-(UNIT-WIDE) CONTENT KNOWLEDGE COURSE RUBRIC (Interdepartmental)</p> |
|---|

Passing scores on Praxis II, measure of knowledge in specific subjects and general teaching practices, is not a program completion requirement. The State requires Praxis II be passed for licensure. Candidates typically take Praxis II during the third sequence prior to student teaching.

Findings and Analysis

Examination of scores for eight (2003-2011) years for elementary education graduates reveals an average 98.78% institutional pass rate. From 2003-2011, 1,101 teacher candidates took the exam and 1,093 passed, with a mean pass rate of 98%.

An interpretation of how that data provides evidence for meeting standards

Analysis of these data indicates that a large percentage of candidates reached competency in the areas measured by the Praxis II exam. Overall, 99% of elementary education candidates met ACEI standards associated with the test. Since Praxis II is aligned with all the ACEI standards there is a high probability that those who passed the test met ACEI standards in all categories. For the elementary education curriculum and instruction assessment, over this eight-year period, 98.7% of the candidates met the standard. **See Attachment B: Praxis II Results 2003-2011.**

ASSESSMENT 2: CONTENT KNOWLEDGE COURSE RUBRIC (Interdepartmental)

Each of the content disciplines (social studies, mathematics, science, literacy, fine arts) and the Department of Teacher Education, designed a content specific rubric to assess candidates' ability to make cross-curricular content connections, procedures, and applications, to motivate elementary students, build understanding, and encourage application of knowledge, skills, and ideas to real world issues. Aggregated data are analyzed for program improvement. Instructors meet to discuss candidate performances, align curriculum, and ensure the rubric is valid and aligned with program goals, the conceptual framework, and ACEI Standard 2.7.

1 & 2 – Findings and Analysis:

Data analysis conducted for the rubric results of fall 2011 and spring 2012 reveals that the majority of teacher candidates in elementary education met the content standards measured by the individual rubrics for each content area. Target and acceptable scores for the 2011-2012 semesters were aggregated for means in each category below:

For knowledge in **Social Studies**, analysis for all candidates (n= 82) reveals that 100% of candidates met standards for content knowledge, authenticity, disciplinary process, and creativity; 100% met standards for collaboration; and 100% of candidates met standard for reflection. An aggregated mean of 100.00% was found for candidates meeting standards in Social Studies.

For knowledge in **Math**, analysis for all candidates (n= 82) reveals that standard was met by 98.78% for content knowledge; 100% for authenticity; 98.79% for disciplinary process; 100% for creativity; and 100% for collaboration and reflection. An aggregated mean of 99.59% was found for candidates meeting standards in Math.

For knowledge in **Literacy**, analysis for all candidates (n= 53) reveals that standard was met by 100% for content knowledge; authenticity; disciplinary process; creativity; collaboration, and reflection. An aggregated mean of 100% was found for candidates meeting standards in Literacy.

For knowledge in **Fine Arts**, analysis for all candidates (n= 52) reveals that standard was met by 100% for content knowledge; authenticity; disciplinary process; creativity; collaboration, and reflection. An aggregated mean of 100% was found for candidates meeting standards in Fine Arts.

Note: The Elementary Science Assessment is in the process of being filled out for fall 2011 and spring 2012 by the instructors.

ASSESSMENT 2: COURSE CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

| Analysis of data sets | 2010-2011 Met Standard | 2011-2012 Met Standard |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Knowledge in Social Studies | 85 candidates | 82 students |
| Content knowledge | 97.6% | 100% |
| Authenticity | 97.6% | 100% |
| Disciplinary process | 97.6% | 100% |
| Creativity | 97.6% | 100% |
| Collaboration | 98.8% | 100% |
| Reflection | 97.0% | 100% |
| Aggregated mean | 97.8% | 100% |
| Knowledge in Science | 59 candidates | 82 students |
| Content knowledge | 98.3% | (being filled out by instructors) |
| Authenticity | 98.3% | |
| Disciplinary process | 98.3% | |
| Creativity | 98.3% | |
| Collaboration | 98.3% | |
| Reflection | 98.3% | |
| Aggregated mean | 98.0% | |
| Knowledge in Math | 69 candidates | 82 students |
| Content knowledge | 95.6% | 98.78% |
| Authenticity | 95.6% | 100% |
| Disciplinary process | 97.0% | 98.79% |
| Creativity | 96.0% | 100% |
| Collaboration | 95.6% | 100% |

| | | |
|------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Reflection | 95.6% | 100% |
| Aggregated mean | 98.6% | 99.59% |
| Knowledge in Literacy | 52 candidates | 53 candidates |
| Content knowledge | 100% | 100% |
| Authenticity | 100% | 100% |
| Disciplinary process | 100% | 100% |
| Creativity | 100% | 100% |
| Collaboration | 100% | 100% |
| Reflection | 100% | 100% |
| Aggregated mean | 100% | 100% |
| Knowledge in Fine Arts | 126 candidates | 52 candidates |
| Content knowledge | 100% | 100% |
| Authenticity | 100% | 100% |
| Disciplinary process | 100% | 100% |
| Creativity | 100% | 100% |
| Collaboration | 100% | 100% |
| Reflection | 100% | 100% |
| Aggregated mean | 100% | 100% |

3- How results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

The data provides evidence that candidates continue to meet ACEI standards for content knowledge and associated subsets at a high level. This is reflected by means greater than 97%. Divisional faculty meet periodically to discuss how to increase overall scores in particular target areas (eg, social studies for disciplinary process, and creativity).

We continue incorporating the Understanding by Design (UbD) model in methods courses to address areas in need of strengthening. Continuous improvement is important to the Elementary Education Division. Faculty reviews assessment results across departments in SPED, Reading and Language Arts, and Teacher Education. Faculty continues to meet several times during the academic year to discuss and develop developmental lesson plan templates including areas for differentiation and accommodations/modifications. Faculty is currently incorporating the state

sanctioned RTI (Response to Intervention) supported by the SRBI (Scientific Research-Based Interventions) model and Common Core Standards into methods pedagogy. Faculty have expressed a desire to continue conversations regarding interdisciplinary themes for an integrated content unit between cohort instructors (math, science, fine arts, literacy, social studies, practicum) to ensure that candidates develop skills and knowledge around global topics. Conversations have continued investigating interdisciplinary approaches to domain areas.

ASSESSMENT 3: MIDPOINT PLANNING TASK (UNIT-WIDE)

Completed during the semester during which candidates take EDTE 420 Practicum II and science, math, literacy, fine arts, and social studies methods courses (SCI 412, MATH 412, RDG 412, FA 412, EDEL 415 respectively) this assessment requires analysis of contextual information, consideration of a previous day's lesson plan, and specific information about two students including work samples. Candidates respond to prompts and develop an appropriate next lesson. The timed task is blind scored by trained Department faculty and Supervisor raters with scores electronically reported to candidates, coordinators, and supervisors.

1. Findings

The scores from 2011 – 2012 reveal standards were met by 83% of teacher candidates on contextual information analysis; 91.41% met the standard for lesson objectives and rationale; 80.37% met the standard for initiation and closure, 90.79% met standard for lesson development; 95.70% met the standard for use of materials, equipment & technology; 92.03% met standard for establishing a safe learning environment; 74.23% met standard for modifications and accommodations; and for 88.95% met standard for assessing student learning. Overall with the exception of the area, *modifications and accommodations*, there has been an overall increase in scores including a significant increase in learning objectives and lesson development on the midpoint planning task. Specific areas that need to improve include modifications and accommodations however 74.23% met standard in that area of the midpoint. The total percentage of students who passed the midpoint assessment during the 2011-2012 year was 83.33% a 13% improvement over past passing percentages. It is interesting to note that in the end those participating in the scoring process scored 84.52% of the candidates as passing using the pass/fail standard of the instrument, but in their professional judgement scored 83.33% of the candidate's performance as passing.

ASSESSMENT 3: MIDPOINT PLANNING TASK (UNIT-WIDE)

| | 2010-2011 Met Standard | 2011-2012 Met Standard |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Passed the midpoint assessment | 69.70% | 83.33% |
| Contextual Information Analysis | | 83.00% |

| | | |
|--|--|--------|
| Lesson objectives and rationale | | 91.41% |
| Initiation and closure | | 80.37% |
| Lesson development | | 90.79% |
| Use of materials, equipment and technology | | 95.70% |
| Establishing a safe learning environment | | 92.03% |
| Modifications and accommodations | | 74.23% |
| Assessing student learning | | 88.95% |

| | | |
|---|--------|--------|
| Scorers scored the candidates passed using the pass/fail standard of the instrument | 69.70% | 84.52% |
| Scorers professional judgment scored of the candidates performance as passing | 74.70% | 83.33% |

2. Analysis

The pass rate of 83.33.7% is a significant improvement on the midpoint-planning task over previous semesters. Data analysis indicates that candidates in our program have content *knowledge to analyze student performance and develop a lesson appropriate for student needs* (ACEI 1.0). Their responses on this task indicate the ability to *sequence tasks to facilitate success and to structure the learning environment* in a manner that creates a positive atmosphere for learning (ACEI 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4). In their planning they *select materials and use technology to meet the lesson objectives* (ACEI 3.5). Candidates have shown continued improvement in their ability to provide *specific modifications and accommodations* to meet specific student needs (ACEI 3.2); and in *assessing student learning* within a lesson (ACEI 4.0).

3. How results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

Although candidates in our program demonstrate a relatively strong foundation in these standards as they progress toward student teaching, the faculty will be looking carefully at how to increase the passing rate for this assessment. During the fall 2012 semester, a committee made up of full-time and adjunct members of the Division of Elementary Education reviewed the current assessment prompts and rubric and will make recommendations that we expect to pilot during spring 2013. Currently we are implementing a growth plan for all teacher candidates in EDTE 420. Teacher candidates will discuss and reflect on their midpoint task test results with peers and faculty and write a growth plan outlining areas of strength and areas of challenge. The growth plan will be given to the university supervisors and the student teaching seminar instructor. The future intention of the Elementary Education Division is to revise this assessment

so that it aligns more effectively with contextual classroom tasks and better reflects real classroom practice.

ASSESSMENT 4: FINAL STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION (UNIT-WIDE)

Based on the CT Common Core of Teaching (CCT) and the SEPS Conceptual Framework this evaluation provides information on student teacher performance. All student teaching team members (candidate, cooperating teacher, supervisor) utilize the document. A form directly aligned to this instrument is used for observations and items aligned with ACEI standards.

1.Findings

Data sets examined for supervisor scores in each category of the instrument for the 2011-2012 academic year show that a vast majority of students are performing at the target level:

ASSESSMENT 4: FINAL STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

| Fall 2010-Spring 2011 | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Area | Target | Acceptable |
| Classroom Management | 90% | 8.4% |
| Planning | 87% | 12.0% |
| Instruction | 91% | 7.4% |
| Assessing & Adjusting | 86% | 18.0% |
| Communication | 95% | 4.0% |
| Professionalism | 94% | 4.0% |
| Student Diversity | 88% | 10.0% |
| Self-Evaluation & Reflection | 95% | 5.0% |
| ELED Supplemental (content knowledge & integration) | 91.8% | 6.8% |

| Fall 2011-Spring 2012 | | |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| Area | Target | Acceptable |
| Classroom Management | 97.4% | 1.3% |
| Planning | 84.4% | 13.0% |
| Instruction | 96.1% | 2.6% |
| Assessing & Adjusting | 85.7% | 13.0% |
| Communication | 96.1% | 2.6% |
| Professionalism | 90.9% | 7.8% |
| Student Diversity | 97.4% | 0% |
| Self-Evaluation & Reflection | 93.5% | 5.2% |
| ELED Supplemental (content knowledge & integration) | 92.2% | 3.9% |

2. Analysis

Candidates meet and exceed both state and ACEI standards as reflected by consistently high supervisory ratings on the student teaching final evaluation instrument. Means calculated for target ratings for each category range from 96% instructional competency to 90% for professionalism. This is followed by 96% for communication targets, 93% for self evaluation and reflection dispositions; 97% for student diversity targets; 97% for classroom management targets; 84% for planning competencies; 85% for assessing and adjusting competencies; and 96% for instructional targets. These data demonstrate relatively high stability for student teacher competence and in some cases improvement in some categories over past years in all categories assessed on the instrument. Candidates demonstrate particular strengths in areas of professionalism, communication, self-evaluation and reflection, instruction, and classroom management (means ranging from 85% to 96%). Areas which are relatively high (means range from 84%-97%) and can continue to be strengthened are planning, assessing and adjusting, and student diversity.

These data are also evidence for how student teachers can operationalize the major concepts, principles and theories and research related to child development to construct motivational learning (1.0). They also demonstrate competence in candidate knowledge and skills related to facilitating learning for students in areas of reading, writing and oral language, science, mathematics, social studies, the arts and health education (2.1-2.5). Furthermore, student teachers show competence in planning and implementing instruction based on knowledge of students, theories, curricular connections, goals and community (3.1); they can actively engage diverse learners by differentiating instruction, using varieties of communication techniques, and utilizing critical thinking and problem solving pedagogies (3.2-3.5). Student teacher ratings also demonstrate their ability to use responsive assessment strategies (4.0), to deeply reflect and appropriately respond to their practice (5.1) and to work professionally with a variety of high stake constituencies in support of student learning (5.2).

3. How these results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

Currently the Elementary Education Division is planning to review the developmental sequence of our courses including the Student Teaching Seminar. New topics have been introduced in the student teaching seminar since the spring of 2012. The topics include introducing data team concept with students analyzing their actual student data and discussing SMART goals; there is an increase focus on pre-assessment strategies to design unit/instruction and analyzing this data to support future instruction; teacher candidates are required to provide **specific** feedback as a way to promote students' achievement; and teacher candidates are assessing teacher performance using videos of classroom lessons.

We are continuing to review and evaluate the re-design of our Teacher Education Program at all levels to comply with proposed state regulations.

| |
|--|
| ASSESSMENT 5: STUDENT TEACHING EXIT PORTFOLIO (DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC) |
|--|

The Student Teaching Exit Portfolio documents impact on K-6 student learning and reflects the conceptual framework, ACEI standards, and elements the Connecticut State Department of Education's Common Core of Teaching (CCT). Candidates plan, implement, analyze and document a sequence of assessment driven lessons, student learning and work. They also differentiate planning, and reflect on instructional efficacy. A tape analysis reveals impact of instruction on selected subgroups' learning. Feedback is provided to faculty and candidates.

1.Findings

Analysis of data sets for the 2011-2012 academic year for 92 student teachers reveal that:

- 80.43% scored in the acceptable and target ranges for rubric item 6: *Provide Student Feedback*
- 92.39% scored in target or acceptable ranges for rubric item 9: *Analyzes/Reflects on Video Data to Adjust Practice*.
- 100% scored in the acceptable or target range for rubric item 3: *Use of technology and resources*;
- 100% scored in the target or acceptable ranges for the rubric items 5: *Monitoring and adjusting*, and 10: *Reflection and Adjustment for future*.
- 100% scored in the target and acceptable ranges for item 2: *Planning for learning*;
- 100% scored in target and acceptable ranges for three items: 4: *Differentiated strategies*,
- 100% scored in target and acceptable ranges for 7: *Documents and analyzes relevant data to evaluate data and communicate progress*,
- 89.13% scored in target and acceptable ranges for 8: *Design/Analysis of Summative Assessment*.

ASSESSMENT 5: STUDENT TEACHING EXIT PORTFOLIO

| Analysis of data sets | 2010-2011 Met Standard | 2011-2012 Met Standard |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Number of Student Teachers | 93 | 92 |
| Rubric Item 6: Provide Student Feedback | 82.8% | 80.43% |
| Rubric Item 9: Analyzes/Reflects on Video Data to Adjust Practice | 100% | 92.39% |
| Rubric Item 3: Use of technology and resources | 100% | 100% |
| Rubric Item 5: Monitoring and adjusting | 100% | 100% |
| Rubric Item 10: Reflection and Adjustment for future | 100% | 100% |
| Rubric Item 2: Planning for learning | 96% | 100% |

| | | |
|--|-----|--------|
| Rubric Item 4: Differentiated strategies | 97% | 100% |
| Rubric Item 7: Documents and analyzes relevant data to evaluate and communicate progress | 97% | 100% |
| Rubric Item 8: Design/Analysis of Summative Assessment | 97% | 89.13% |

2. Analysis

Data analysis reveals that student teachers have not only performed extremely well on the majority of items assessed in the portfolio, but the percentage scoring in target and acceptable ranges has improved from previous years. Providing student feedback and analyzing data are areas of growth for which the faculty would like to see candidates make progress. The faculty has been responding to these data by designing additional interventions in prior methods courses to facilitate candidate growth particularly in these areas. However, analysis of the portfolio data overall is strong evidence that teacher candidates are meeting ACEI standards.

3. How these results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

Given the changes in the certification requirement for Connecticut teachers the Student Teaching Exit Portfolio is aligned with the Teacher Education and Mentoring Program and the revised Connecticut Common Core of Teaching. In addition the Student Teaching Seminar course is addressing the exit portfolio areas with sessions on new topics. The topics include data team concepts as related to SMART goals, a focus on pre-assessment strategies to design unit/instruction and analyzing this data to support future instruction.

ASSESSMENT 6: PRACTICUM COURSE FIELD EVALUATIONS (DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC)

These assessments gauge mastery of particular competencies for three methods course practica. These adhere to standards critical for candidates at each level, and are aligned with the expanded version of the conceptual framework. The Department aggregates and analyzes data for program improvement.

1. Findings

As candidates progress through the program they maintain fairly high scores on the teacher evaluations. Final ratings of how classroom teachers feel about the candidate proceeding in the program reveal a recommendation to proceed without concern for a mean of 94.3% of candidates in EDTE 315 sections, 87.6.3% of candidates in EDTE 320 sections, and 91.8% of candidates in EDTE 420 sections. These recommendations about proceeding have improved significantly over the past years. The Department has been able to respond to the needs of individual candidates in areas of concern as they proceed in the program.

2. Analysis

Data analyses reveal that field teachers generally rate candidates highly on the field evaluation items for all three practicums in the program preceding student teaching. This is evidence that candidates have developed and demonstrated content knowledge, skills, and abilities in key areas of child development, management, instruction, assessment and professionalism.

3. How these results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

Overall, these evaluations provide strong evidence for how the program helps candidates meet ACEI standards related to *development, learning and motivation* (1.0), *integrating and applying knowledge for instruction* (3.1), *adaptation to diverse students* (3.2), *development of critical thinking and problem solving* (3.3), *active engagement in learning* (3.4), *communication to foster collaboration* (3.5), *assessment for instruction* (4.0), and *professional growth, reflection, and evaluation* (5.1). At this point, adjustments are not necessary.

| |
|---|
| <h2>ASSESSMENT 7: PROGRESS ROSTER AND PROFESSIONAL DISPOSITION RUBRIC (UNIT-WIDE)</h2> |
|---|

The data from the Progress Roster and Professional Disposition Rubric provides teacher candidates with formative feedback to support their development. It is completed online each semester with improvements enacted based on faculty feedback. Faculty recommend *Progress, Review, or Dismiss* based on Content Knowledge and Pedagogy Skills. Dispositions (habits of thinking and action evident in professional interactions) are scored as Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable.

1. Findings

Data from the Professional Disposition rubric are collected, compiled, and summarized by the SEPS Assessment committee. If a candidate receives two or more Review or Dismiss ratings from two or more faculty members, he or she is invited to meet with the Committee on Retention in Education (CORE) to help strategize and develop a plan to ensure future success in the program.

Disaggregated data for each of the dispositional areas over this period indicates the following:

- *Learning*, 96% (979) rated positively (58.85% acceptable, 39.64% target) and 1.51% (15) rated unacceptable.
- *Teaching*, 99.60% (990) rated positively (57.65% acceptable, 41.95% target) with .40% (4) rated unacceptable.
- *Professional Conduct*, 97.78% (972) rated positively (55.73% acceptable, 42.05% target), and 2.21% (22) rated unacceptable.
- *Interpersonal Relationships*, 99.19% (986) rated positively (55.63% acceptable, 43.56% target) with .80% (8) rated unacceptable.
- *Communication*, 99.19% (986) rated positively (63.38% acceptable, 35.81% target),

and .80% (8) were rated unacceptable.

- *For Self-Reflection*, 98.09% (995) rated positively (57.75% acceptable, 40.34% target), and 1.91% (19) were rated unacceptable.

**ASSESSMENT 7: PROGRESS
ROSTER AND PROFESSIONAL**

**DISPOSITION RUBRIC (UNIT-
WIDE)**

| 2010-2011 Disaggregated data for each of the dispositional areas | Rated Positively | Acceptable | Target | Unacceptable |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Learning | 96% (1,118) | 54.00% | 42.00% | 3.7% (44) |
| Teaching | 97.9% (1,138) | 56.90% | 40.90% | 2% (24) |
| Professional Conduct | 95.8% (1,114) | 53.70% | 42.10% | 4.1% (48) |
| Interpersonal Relationships | 98.4% (1,144) | 57.00% | 41.00% | 1.5% (18) |
| Communication | 97% (1,134) | 58.40% | 39.10% | 2.4% (28) |
| For Self-Reflection | 96.3% (1,120) | 58.30% | 38.00% | 3.6% (42) |

| 2011-2012 Disaggregated data for each of the dispositional areas | Rated Positively | Acceptable | Target | Unacceptable |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Learning | 96% (979) | 58.85% | 39.64% | 1.51% (15) |
| Teaching | 99.6% (990) | 57.65% | 41.95% | .40% (4) |
| Professional Conduct | 97.78% (972) | 55.73% | 42.05% | 2.21% (22) |
| Interpersonal Relationships | 99.19% (986) | 55.63% | 43.56% | .80% (8) |
| Communication | 99.19% (986) | 63.38% | 35.81% | .80% (8) |
| For Self-Reflection | 98.09% (995) | 57.75% | 40.34% | 1.91% (19) |

2. Analysis

Analysis of data for the 2011-2012 academic year indicates that 90.04% (994 candidates reviewed) were recommended for progression in the Elementary Education professional

program. Five percent (50 candidates) were recommended for review and .80% (8 candidates) were recommended for dismissal.

Elementary education candidates in the CCSU program are mostly displaying dispositions that are appropriate for those studying to be teachers. Data analysis indicates that candidates who met or exceeded expectations on the six dispositional standards over the academic year, ranged from a low of 96% for meeting the standard for *Learning* to a high of 99.6% for meeting the *Teaching* standard.

The Department uses these data to determine how to elevate candidates' dispositions particularly around *Professional Conduct*, *Self-Reflection*, and *Communication*. Additionally, 90.04% of candidates were recommended for progression in the professional program, 5% were recommended for progression in the professional program after review and .8% were recommended for dismissal.

3. How these results have been used to make curricular or programmatic adjustments

These data indicate that the CORE committee structure intervention continues to work well to facilitate growth and support for those candidates who need to be alerted to behaviors they display that may not be conducive to successful growth in the professional program. At this time, we are not making changes to this process since it is working very well.

Summary

I. Content Knowledge

Data analyzed for this report replicate findings for the previous year (2010-2011) in that candidates in the Elementary Education Program possess a solid foundation in content knowledge that directly influences their ability to plan, organize, and assess the efficacy of instruction for a variety of students.

All pre-BS candidates declare a major that is either single subject matter or interdisciplinary and must successfully complete a range of 33-45 credits (depending on the major) in these courses. Ten out of the eleven approved majors require a minimum of 39 credits. The Department's continued collaborations over the last few years with Arts and Science faculty have ensured that candidates are offered appropriate content knowledge course and elective options related to teaching. Furthermore, to ensure candidates increase their knowledge of the English language arts, the Department of Reading and Language Arts has made significant changes in their three required literacy courses particularly in ensuring candidate knowledge and competence in areas of comprehension, phonics, phonemic awareness, content area literacy and integration, and writing. The results for the 2011 Foundations of Reading Test reveal a pass rate of 92% for first-time takers, which is 10% higher than the state average, and a 99% pass rate for all completers of our program.

Additionally, data analyzed from the content knowledge course rubrics for the last two semesters 2011-2012 that assesses candidate knowledge in the areas of mathematics, science, fine arts, social studies, and literacy demonstrates high proficiency in candidate content knowledge. Finally, evidence for candidate content knowledge can be seen from their overall high scores on Praxis II (see Attachment B).

Faculty Interpretation of the Findings:

Candidates in this program have had relatively strong preparation in the content areas, however with the criterion of a 2.70 GPA for admission, the faculty have deferred 7 candidates during 2010 and 2011 and 5 candidates into the program during 2011-2012 due to having lower GPAs at time of admission application. These candidates are deferred until such time as they attain the GPA criterion standard.

Based on rubrics filled out by methods instructors coupled with high scores on Praxis II, the faculty see this area of candidate content knowledge as relatively strong with likely increases in the near future.

Changes made in (or planned for) the program as a result

The faculty will discuss the best plan to continue to meet at least once a semester with all those who teach the content methods courses to improve articulation and ensure standards are being met across curriculums.

The curriculum in the Department of Teacher Education is currently reviewing the program for purposes of addressing the new Connecticut teacher certification requirements. As a result we expect that some of the current assessment instruments will be revised and that the data collected for future years will differ somewhat from what is currently collected.

ATTACHMENT A

B.S. ELED CERTIFICATION FALL 2010-SPRING 2011 ASSESSMENT REPORT Department of Teacher Education

| ACEI STANDARD |
|---|
| DEVELOPMENT, LEARNING AND MOTIVATION |
| 1.0 Development, Learning, and Motivation --Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts, principles, theories, and research related to development of children and young adolescents to construct learning opportunities that support individual students' development, acquisition of knowledge, and motivation. |
| CURRICULUM STANDARDS |
| 2.1 Reading, Writing, and Oral Language --Candidates demonstrate a high level of competence in use of English language arts and they know, understand, and use concepts from reading, language and child development, to teach reading, writing, speaking, viewing, listening, and thinking skills and to help students successfully apply their developing skills to many different situations, materials, and ideas. |

| |
|---|
| <p>2.2 Science--Candidates know, understand, and use fundamental concepts of physical, life, and earth/space sciences. Candidates can design and implement age-appropriate inquiry lessons to teach science, to build student understanding for personal and social applications, and to convey the nature of science.</p> |
| <p>2.3 Mathematics--Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and procedures that define number and operations, algebra, geometry, measurement, and data analysis and probability. In doing so they consistently engage problem solving, reasoning and proof, communication, connections, and representation.</p> |
| <p>2.4 Social studies--Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts and modes of inquiry from the social studies—the integrated study of history, geography, the social sciences, and other related areas—to promote elementary students’ abilities to make informed decisions as citizens of a culturally diverse democratic society and interdependent world.</p> |
| <p>2.5 The arts--Candidates know, understand, and use – as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—the content, functions, and achievements of the performing arts (dance, music, theater) and the visual arts as primary media for communication, inquiry, and engagement among elementary students.</p> |
| <p>2.6 Health education--Candidates know, understand, and use the major concepts in the subject matter of health education to create opportunities for student development and practice of skills that contribute to good health.</p> |
| <p>2.7 Physical education--Candidates know, understand, and use—as appropriate to their own understanding and skills—human movement and physical activity as central elements to foster active, healthy life styles and enhanced quality of life for elementary students.</p> |
| <p>INSTRUCTION STANDARDS</p> |
| <p>3.1 Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction—Candidates plan and implement instruction based on knowledge of students, learning theory, connections across the curriculum, curricular goals, and community.</p> |
| <p>3.2 Adaptation to diverse students--Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students.</p> |

| |
|---|
| <p>ACEI STANDARD</p> |
| <p>3.3 Development of critical thinking and problem solving--Candidates understand and use a variety of teaching strategies that encourage elementary students’ development of critical thinking and problem solving.</p> |
| <p>3.4 Active engagement in learning--Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior among students at the K-6 level to foster active engagement in learning, self-motivation, and positive social interaction and to create supportive learning environments.</p> |
| <p>3.5 Communication to foster collaboration--Candidates use their knowledge and understanding of effective verbal, nonverbal, and media communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the elementary classroom.</p> |
| <p>ASSESSMENT STANDARDS</p> |
| <p>4.0 Assessment for instruction--Candidates know, understand, and use formal and informal assessment strategies to plan, evaluate and strengthen instruction that will promote continuous intellectual, social, emotional, and physical development of each elementary student.</p> |

PROFESSIONALISM STANDARDS

5.1 Professional growth, reflection and evaluation—Candidates are aware of and reflect on their practice in light of research on teaching, professional ethics, and resources available for professional learning; they continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students, families and other professionals in the learning community and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally.

5.2 Collaboration with families, colleagues, and community agencies--Candidates know the importance of establishing and maintaining a positive collaborative relationship with families, school colleagues, and agencies in the larger community to promote the intellectual, social, emotional, physical growth and well-being of children.

ATTACHMENT B
Praxis II Results 2003-2011

ATTACHMENT B:

ASSESSMENT 1: PRAXIS II
(2003-2011)

CANDIDATE DATA DERIVED
FROM THE PRAXIS 2
ASSESSMENT

| Name | Test Code | Cohort Yr | Institutional Pass Rate | Number Taking Assessment | Number Passing Assessment |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2003- 04 | 100% | 46 | 46 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA EXERCISES | 012 | 2003- 04 | 100% | 47 | 47 |
| ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2004- 05 | 99% | 85 | 84 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA EXERCISES | 012 | 2004- 05 | 99% | 85 | 84 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|-------------|------|-----|-----|
| ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2005- 06 | 99% | 99 | 98 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA EXERCISES | 012 | 2005- 06 | 100% | 99 | 99 |
| ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2006- 07 | 97% | 101 | 98 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA EXERCISES | 012 | 2006- 07 | 99% | 101 | 100 |
| ELEM ED CURR INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2007- 08 | 99% | 118 | 117 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA EXERCISES | 012 | 2007- 08 | 100% | 118 | 118 |
| ELEM ED CURRICULUM INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2008- 09 | 98% | 84 | 82 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA ASSESSMENT | 012 | 2008- 09 | 99% | 84 | 83 |
| ELEM ED CURRICULUM INSTRUC ASSESSMENT | 011 | 2010- 11 | 98% | 82 | 81 |
| ELEM ED CONTENT AREA ASSESSMENT | 012 | 2010- 11 | 100% | 93 | 93 |