**2015-16 Annual Report**

**Department of Reading and Elementary Education**

**College of Education**

|  |
| --- |
| A. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR |
| Major accomplishments (including student accomplishments) of unit/department/college during the year reported by Academic Affairs Goal. |

To educate a diverse student body through an integrated academic experience that positions graduates for personal success and civic responsibility in the global environment of the 21st century:

* The department continued to actively send candidates into the field to gain authentic experiences working with children in urban contexts. Over 100 undergraduate elementary education majors completed 10 hours of tutoring (each) in high need, low performing schools in the area. All sections of ELED 3120 required the course clinical experience to be conducted in a high minority, high poverty, high risk, urban elementary school. Finally, within the Integrated Methods Block, students spent two full weeks working in urban schools, including Title 1 schools, across the Charlotte area.
* The department has collaborated extensively with Dr. Laura Hart to begin implementation of the Niner Clinical Immersion School model in four districts (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Cabarrus, Iredell-Statesville, and Union County). Graduate certificate students enrolling in coursework this summer will be able to complete all clinical experiences in schools or programs that are in close proximity to their geographic location, creating a potential opportunity to find employment in the community they currently reside.
* The department continues to offer candidates opportunities to study abroad. Students can now travel to South Africa, Germany, and Brazil to engage in cross-cultural experiences with students and teachers, developing valuable knowledge about working with diverse populations.

To expand the frontiers of knowledge and leverage discovery for the public benefit through innovative programs that span the disciplines in research, creative activities, and graduate education:

* An article published in Reading Psychology highlighted the scholarly productivity of the READ faculty. Notably, the faculty was the only Research III (doctoral/research institution) in the top 25 institutions referenced in the article, as ranked by scholarly productivity in nine literacy journals from 2005-2012.
* The faculty in the department engaged in a variety of research with international partners. For example, six faculty members have ongoing partnerships with colleagues at the Ludwigsburg University of Education. Three faculty members have engaged with additional partners in projects in India, South Africa, and South Korea. The department also hosted a Fulbright Scholar from a partner institution, Stellenbosch University, from October through January. Various REEL faculty assisted with the scholar’s research as they facilitated visits to 6 different schools, resulting in the collection of the student and teacher-level data necessary to address the research questions associated with the Fulbright proposal. The visit also enabled the department chair and the Associate Provost of International Programs to initiate discussions around an exchange program between UNC Charlotte and Stellenbosch University.
* Candidates in each of the department’s graduate programs completed course projects focused on the practical application of research and data analysis in contexts of practice. The results were shared in various formats, including presentations at the state-level reading conference (NCRA) and to local administrators and colleagues within the candidates’ schools. Projects included a behavioral intervention study, an action research investigation, and an in-depth analysis of students’ mathematical thinking.

To engage community partners in mutually beneficial programs that enhance the economic, civic, and cultural vitality of the region:

* Dr. Bruce Taylor was selected for the 2016 Governor’s Volunteer Service Award (Mecklenburg County). He was nominated for this honor by the United Way of Central Carolinas for his long-standing support and engagement with the organization.
* Under the direction of Drs. Bruce Taylor and Erin Miller, the success of America READS as both a community outreach program and as a means to engage students in outreach activities has increased. For example, the number of tutors has quadrupled, with over 50 federal work study tutors working with children at three different elementary schools sites. Recently, one tutor was also nominated for a university-wide student employee award for his leadership of tutors at Hidden Valley Elementary School.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | B. EXAMPLES OF DATA-BASED IMPROVEMENTS DURING THE YEAR | | Describe 3 examples of how the unit/department/college has used assessment data for the purpose of improvement during the year. |  * Data from the administration of practice versions of the North Carolina Foundations tests to 148 undergraduate and graduate certificate students revealed that 23%, 22%, and 5% of the candidates scored at levels the Department deemed “passing” on the Multi-Subject, Reading, and Mathematics subtests, respectively. Of note, to reach this passing score, the candidate’s score had to be more than 10% higher than the score established by North Carolina. Based on this data, the Department of Reading and Elementary Education engaged in several activities aimed at improving pass rates. One of the first steps was taken collaboratively as faculty in the department agreed to schedule and conduct one-on-one conferences to provide individualized remediation activities for students who received low scores on the practice test. The performance trends in the data on the Foundations of Reading test led to revisions in READ 3224 and READ 3226 to better align course content with tested material. Additionally, the revised courses will include a final exam that specifically addresses the content from the Foundations of Reading test. Within general coursework, including core courses in Elementary Education, faculty implemented various course level activities, e.g., administration of a practice test and review of test items, at each level of the program (pre-major, Foundations semester, Integrated Methods Block, and Year-Long Internship) to review information aligned with test content. With respect to the Multi-Subject subtest, Dr. Amy Good created and delivered four workshops to review material in social studies, science, and language arts. The department is also currently preparing a new sequence of coursework focused on bolstering general content knowledge in lieu of a minor for students who are unable to pass this subtest. It is anticipated that this will be completed this summer and submitted for approval by the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee in the fall. Finally, the department hired a clinical faculty member with expertise in mathematics and identified a tenured professor with expertise in reading to conduct teaching and remediation workshops for math and reading, respectively, on an ongoing basis. * The tables below represent candidates’ performance on the edTPA tasks required within the Department of Reading and Elementary. This data, as well as data from previous semesters, was shown to the Reading and Elementary Education faculty during several faculty meetings over the course of the academic year. As a result, the faculty collaborated to modify edTPA student teaching workshops to emphasize and specifically target the areas and aspects of the various tasks where our candidates needed additional support. For example, candidates were provided with a completed Task 1 artifact and were requested to dissect the work sample and the rubric with reference to the rubric progression document. Candidates scored the sample and developed a rationale for their score, which was then checked against the content of the rubric progression document. Faculty administering the workshop supported the candidates within the process and provided relevant feedback as necessary.   Looking across the data, average scores and percentage of candidates scoring Proficient increased for Task 1. Averages scores increased for Tasks 2 and 4, although with larger numbers of candidates completing the assessment, the percentage scoring Proficient did decrease. Additional analyses will occur over the next year to address the decreases associated with Task 3.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Program** | **Teaching Certificate in ELED** | | | **Undergraduate Program** | | | **edTPA** | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** | **Fall 2015** | | **Spring 2015** | |  | **Count** | **14** | **29** | **47** | | **102** | | edTPA Task 1: Planning for Planning for Instruction and Assessment | **Average for Group** | 3.15 | 3.24 | 3.00 | | 3.04 | | **% Proficient** | 85.71% | 93.10% | 85.71% | | 89.22% | | edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning | **Average for Group** | 3.19 | 3.20 | 2.97 | | 3.03 | | **% Proficient** | 100.00% | 93.10% | 90.48% | | 90.20% | | edTPA Task 3: Assessing Student Learning | **Average for Group** | 2.99 | 2.96 | 2.96 | | 2.89 | | **% Proficient** | 85.71% | 82.76% | 88.10% | | 85.29% | | edTPA Task 4: Elementary Mathematics | **Average for Group** | 3.08 | 3.33 | 2.86 | | 2.87 | | **% Proficient** | 85.71% | 89.66% | 80.95% | | 71.57% |  * An additional change to the program was made as a result of edTPA data referenced in the chart above. Noting the performance of the undergraduate candidates on edTPA Task 4 was significantly lower than those enrolled in the Graduate Certificate program, the practice task was moved from MAED 3224 to MAED 3222 to incorporate the practice work into a more natural examination of children's understanding of number sense concepts and to more comprehensively address assessment and differentiation across the program. This is more aligned with how the process is conducted in the Graduate Certificate program. This modification was done concurrently with changes to ELED 3111, which most candidates complete during the same semester as MAED 3222. Notably, ELED 3111 was modified to include a more intensive learning segment (unit) planning, formative assessment, and differentiation strategies focused on the mathematical concepts introduced in MAED 3222. |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  | | --- | | REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS TO 2015-16 ANNUAL REPORT | |  | | **ANNUAL PROGRESS ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE OUTCOMES FOR 2015-2020 STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS**: After completing sections III H and III I of your 2015-2020 Strategic Plan, attach the entire 2015-2020 Strategic Plan to the annual report.  Goal #1: The College of Education’s undergraduate and pre-service teacher preparation programs will produce highly effective and engaged professionals for all settings, including urban and high needs areas.   * To increase the success rate of Elementary Education students who take the North Carolina Foundations of Reading teacher licensure exam, revisions to the content and alignment of READ 3224 and READ 3226 were made, adding an emphasis on assessment across the content of the two courses. Students also now have access to a curriculum library, housed in Moodle, which includes activities and videos. * Through collaboration with Dr. Laura Hart, the Department is proceeding with implementation of the Niner Clinical Immersion School model in four districts (Charlotte-Mecklenburg, Cabarrus, Iredell-Statesville, and Union Counties). * Students observed and participated in K-12 schools across all content areas beginning with their EDUC 1100 and EDUC 2100 classes, which are typically completed in their freshman or sophomore year. * Undergraduate students served low performing partnership schools through a series of tutoring and small group teaching experiences. * All sections of ELED 3120 required the course clinical experience to be conducted in a high minority, high poverty, high risk, urban elementary school. * Within the Integrated Methods Block, students were placed in urban schools, including Title 1 schools, across the Charlotte area. * Dr. Adriana Medina’s students visited the iNeuvolution! Exhibit at the Levine Museum of the New South. * As part of a Chancellor’s Diversity Fund Project, Drs. Good, Kissel, Rock, Miller and Byker integrated undergraduate language arts and social studies instruction around the topic of the language of Latino immigration in North Carolina. * Dr. Erik Byker is mentoring undergraduate students who will present research projects at the Undergraduate Research Conference in April 2016. * Multiple faculty members are collaborating on development of the Applied Understandings in Global Education Minor. * In ELED 4121, senior-level candidates assessed authentic student work (K-5) donated by teachers from rural, suburban, and urban classrooms in and around the Charlotte area. Using data from the assessments, students made recommendations regarding how to group these students for instruction, examine error patterns, and determine next steps for instruction. * In ELED 5401, students specifically examined how topics in history and social studies can be taught in urban schools.   Goal #2: To expand the frontiers of knowledge and leverage discovery for the public benefit through innovative programs of graduate education (MEd, EdD, PhD) that span the disciplines.   * READ M.Ed. candidates completed a capstone project that is focused on developing a presentation for the NCRA Conference. * Drs. Miller and Glass developed a new concentration, Anti-Racism in Urban Education, for the M.Ed. in Elementary Education. * Dr. Medina developed a new study abroad trip to Brazil for the graduate students in the Department of Reading and Elementary Education. * The Elementary Education Doctoral Specialization course of study focuses on problems of teaching and learning in urban schools. Examinations of content specific to these contexts, including critical issues of professional development of teachers in urban contexts and the analysis of inquiry teaching and learning in schools, are integrated within the course of study. * Dr. Good is currently collaborating with Dr. Petty, Department of Middle, Secondary, and K-12 Education, to develop a National Board Certificate Program that will be delivered to graduate students. * All students enrolled in the M.A.T. in Elementary Education and M.Ed. in Elementary Education programs complete a behavior management intervention and an action research study that involves the collection and analysis of data prior to graduation. As part of course requirements, results are disseminated to colleagues and administrators in their respective schools. * Graduate students in the Elementary Mathematics Graduate Certificate program complete a learning cycle project in ELED 6311, which requires them to examine the impact of their teaching by planning research-based instruction, teaching it, and analyzing students' learning.   Goal #3: The College of Education will expand the frontiers of knowledge and leverage discovery for the public benefit through innovative programs of research that span the disciplines.   * The five faculty members who received funding from Chancellor’s Diversity Challenge Fund collected data on the outcomes related to the integration of instruction in language arts and social studies. The group has submitted a proposal to extend their work to encompass practicing teachers. * Dr. Erin Miller is conducting pioneering research around white female teachers in urban settings and has incorporated a study on de-colonizing children’s play into her research agenda. * Drs. Elli Rathgeb-Schnierer and Michael Green continue to conduct cross-disciplinary research on German and American elementary students’ cognitive flexibility in mental math. * Dr. Bruce VanSledright is conducting research that focuses on the problems of teaching history in ways that will better help traditionally underserved students raise understanding and achievement levels, including the nature of epistemic cognition among history teachers. The objective of the work is to generate interventions that assist teachers in better understanding what history is as a discipline-based study. * Dr. Michael Putman has developed an instrument, the Survey of Online Reading Attitudes and Behaviors, that has been used in cross-cultural comparisons of students from the United States with students in South Korea and Germany. * Through a Mathematics Science Partnership Grant, Drs. Polly (REEL), Pugalee, Stephan (COED), Cifarelli (MATH), and Lambert and Wang (Ed Leadership) found professional development on mathematics formative assessment was associated with gains on curriculum-based assessments compared to a control group of students in matched schools.   Goal #4: The College of Education will engage community partners in mutually beneficial programs that enhance the economic, civic, and cultural vitality of the region.   * Dr. Maryann Mraz serves as a Program Committee Member for the Augustine Literacy Project. * Dr. Bruce VanSledright has conducted multiple professional development sessions at West Charlotte High School, helping teachers link ELA Common Core standards to history instruction. * America READS has quadrupled in size, with over 50 federal work study tutors working with children at three different elementary schools sites. Recently, one tutor was nominated for a university-wide student employee award for his leadership of tutors at Hidden Valley Elementary School. * Dr. Ian Binns remains the Director of the Summer Ventures in Science and Mathematics program, a state-funded program for students interested in pursuing careers in science and mathematics. * Drs. Marvin Chapman and Drew Polly, Co-Directors of the UNC Charlotte Professional Development Network, are working with the PDS Revisioning Task Force to update and improve procedures and practices in the College Professional Development Schools Network. As part of this work, the committee is taking a comprehensive approach to defining "partnerships" and trying to determine what ideal partnerships should encompass. Over the past two years, the COED Professional Development School network provided $42,000 of funds to support innovative projects in 14 PDS schools, involved 20 university faculty, 50 PK-12 school teachers, and over 100 UNC Charlotte future educators. * Dr. Amy Good is helping David Cox Road Elementary School, a school in the UNC Charlotte Professional Development Network, to enact Project Supervisor. * Dr. Mitch Eisner has partnered with teachers, many of whom are program graduates, to present information to his candidates on data collection, progress monitoring, and the use of formal and informal data to guide instruction in their urban and rural school settings. * Multiple READ faculty are actively involved in the development of programming at the Center for Health, Education, and Opportunity, which will be delivered at Aldersgate Retirement Community this summer.   Goal #5: The College of Education will increase visibility and connectedness within the College of Education and across communities.   * Dr. Erin Miller has worked with Race Matters for Juvenile Justice, providing visibility for the College with different entities in the Charlotte community, including law enforcement, court systems, and foster care systems. * As part of the Integrated Methods Block each semester, faculty members in the department engage with multiple schools in the Charlotte Mecklenburg School District as well as districts in surrounding counties. Within the process of placing candidates in the schools, faculty engage with stakeholders at each, cultivating and growing relationships with principals and teachers and increasing the College’s visibility in the region. * Dr. Amy Good has worked closely with Dr. Chuck Nusinov, Director of Teaching and Learning for CMS Schools, to hold an Aspiring Teacher Content Showcase on April 13, 2016. During this showcase, CMS Directors of Teaching and Learning will present information to teacher candidates regarding what it means to be a teacher in CMS. Additional collaborative events are currently in the planning phases. * Per Dr. Erik Byker, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte and the College of Education have been recognized by Pratham International and the Annual Status of Education Report in India as a globally minded university. Pratham University has expressed the desire to build a stronger relationship with the College of Education. * Dr. Bruce VanSledright has represented the College of Education in New York City Public Schools while working with history teachers to conduct performance assessments. Additionally, he has engaged with a group of public middle school history teachers (all teaching in Title I schools) who are trying to link ELA Common Core standards to the way they teach history in Athens, GA. | |  | |  | |

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT DATA:** Attacha 2015Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan and Reportfor each undergraduate and graduate degree program and certificate program, stand alone minor, and distance education program offered online only by each department. **Colleges that do not submit the required *Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plans and Reports* will be contacted by the Office of Academic Affairs.**

**Undergraduate Programs**

**College: \_\_\_College of Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_Reading and Elementary Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program: B.A. in Elementary Education**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| In 2014, a new assessment, edTPA, was adopted by COED initial licensure programs. EdTPA is a portfolio based assessment that is externally scored; we anticipate that this data source will provide faculty a more robust and meaningful source of candidate outcomes to guide and inform our programs moving forward. See SLO 2 for additional information. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1 (revised 2015 report): Candidates demonstrate proficiency in the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, three existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the university supervisor on the Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012); 2) candidate ratings by the cooperating teacher on the Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012); and 3) candidate PRAXIS II scores . The STAR 2012 ratings were selected as data sources for this SLO because the STAR is aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and the PRAXIS II was selected because it is designed as a measure of pedagogical content knowledge. Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012) is directly aligned to the 10 InTASC standards. These standards are nationally recognized standards for assessing content and pedagogical knowledge for teachers. In addition, our accrediting body, CAEP, also uses the InTASC standards as their framework for assessing candidate content and pedagogical knowledge at an initial licensure level. The STAR 2012 is a common observation instrument used with every student teacher at the end of his or her academic program. The final (fourth) administration of the STAR instrument is used specifically to measure SLO 1. The rubric has a 4-point scale.  PRAXIS II is a standardized test of educator pedagogical content knowledge. It is administered by the Educational Testing Service. A passing score on this test is currently part of our required program blueprint on file with the North Carolina Department for Public Instruction (NCDPI) for all candidates seeking licensure in their content area. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed with the STAR 2012 rubric by the university supervisor and by the cooperating teacher in ELED 4420**,** which is the culminating student teaching internship course. While the candidate receives four observations on the rubric throughout the student teaching experience, only the final (fourth) observation scores will be used for SLO 1. There are 8 major areas assessed on the STAR 2012, and these areas are also aligned to our Conceptual Framework for educator preparation programs: 1) K1: Learner Development and Learning Differences; 2) K2: Content Knowledge; 3) E1: Learning Environments; 4) E2: Application of Content; 4) E3: Assessment; 5) E4: Planning for Instruction; 6) E5: Instructional Strategies; 7) C1: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; 8) C2: Leadership and Collaboration. These areas collectively represent the content knowledge and pedagogical skills that candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for licensure at the end of their programs. For each major area, multiple subscores are collected. The subscores for each major area are averaged to determine the final major area score. The rubric is on a 4-point scale: 0=Not Observed, 1=Developing, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished.  PRAXIS II is a standardized test offered year-round via the Educational Testing Service. While candidates may take the test whenever they feel prepared to do so, most candidates typically wait until the end of their respective programs. Passing scores for the PRAXIS II test are established by the North Carolina State Board of Education.  For the STAR 2012, university supervisor and cooperating teacher scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. For PRAXIS II, scores are accessed via secure ETS login by the COED Licensure Officer. Both STAR 2012 data and PRAXIS II scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects **80% or higher** of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the STAR 2012 rubric, which has a 4-point scale (0-3).  In regard to the PRAXIS II, it is the program expectation that all teacher candidates will obtain a passing score. In the state of North Carolina a passing score for a candidate seeking an initial license to teach Elementary Education, is 227. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **88** | **56** |
| STAR 2012: K2a Demonstrates Knowledge of Content | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: K1b Implements Interdisciplinary Approaches and Multiple Perspectives for Teaching Content | 99% | 95% |
| STAR 2012: E4a Develops plans that are Aligned with the State and District Curriculum | 100% | 98% |
| **Semester** | **2013-2014** |  |
| **Count** | 213 |  |
| PRAXIS II | 99% |  |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | | **Spring 2015** | |
|  | **Count** | **48** | **48** | **104** | **95** |
| **STAR 2012** |  | **US STAR 2012** | **CT STAR 2012** | **US STAR 2012** | **CT STAR 2012** |
| K1 AVERAGE: Learner Development & Learning Differences | **Average for Group** | 2.42 | 2.48 | 2.47 | 2.58 |
| **% Proficient** | 98.96% | 98.96% | 99.52% | 98.99% |
| K2 AVERAGE: Content Knowledge | **Average for Group** | 2.38 | 2.44 | 2.56 | 2.59 |
| **% Proficient** | 97.92% | 97.92% | 100% | 99.24% |
| E1 AVERAGE: Learning Environments | **Average for Group** | 2.54 | 2.54 | 2.63 | 2.64 |
| **% Proficient** | 98.96% | 98.44% | 99.28% | 97.22% |
| E2 AVERAGE: Application of Content | **Average for Group** | 2.38 | 2.42 | 2.55 | 2.58 |
| **% Proficient** | 98.96% | 97.92% | 99.28% | 99.49% |
| E3 AVERAGE: Assessment | **Average for Group** | 2.32 | 2.35 | 2.48 | 2.52 |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 97.92% | 99.76% | 97.98% |
| E4 AVERAGE: Planning for Instruction | **Average for Group** | 2.48 | 2.55 | 2.63 | 2.61 |
| **% Proficient** | 99.31% | 99.31% | 99.36% | 98.99% |
| E5 AVERAGE: Instructional Strategies | **Average for Group** | 2.38 | 2.43 | 2.54 | 2.58 |
| **% Proficient** | 97.08% | 96.67% | 99.23% | 98.99% |
| C1 AVERAGE: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | **Average for Group** | 2.65 | 2.71 | 2.76 | 2.76 |
| **% Proficient** | 98.44% | 99.48% | 99.52% | 99.49% |
| C2 AVERAGE: Leadership and Collaboration | **Average for Group** | 2.19 | 2.29 | 2.31 | 2.36 |
| **% Proficient** | 97.92% | 97.92% | 97.60% | 96.97% |
| **PRAXIS II** | **Count** | 37 | | | |
| PRAXIS II | **% Passing** | 94.5% | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Undergraduate ELED program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review any area where the overall candidate average is 2.3. For 2015 data, this would include K2 AVERAGE: Content Knowledge, E2 AVERAGE: Application of Content, E3 AVERAGE: Assessment, E5 AVERAGE: Instructional Strategies, and C2 AVERAGE: Leadership and Collaboration. The faculty will also review other SLO data results to determine if trends emerge across multiple semesters. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 2: Candidates use domain-specific research and theory to design, implement, assess, and reflect on student learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, a new data source was identified. In 2014, edTPA was piloted by targeted COED initial licensure programs. EdTPA is a nationally normed and validated portfolio assessment authored by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). As of fall 2015, edTPA is fully implemented in all UNC Charlotte initial teacher licensure programs. It is anticipated that this data source will provide faculty with a robust and meaningful source of candidate outcomes to guide and inform our programs moving forward. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| EdTPA is a portfolio project that serves as the culminating capstone project for initial licensure programs. It is content-specific. Candidates complete three tasks aligned with specific domains of teaching practice: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1), Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2) and Assessing Student Learning (Task 3). It is summative in nature and is intended to answer the question, “Is the candidate ready to teach?” Candidates create and submit teaching artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, video clips of teaching, assessment data results) along with written justification and analysis of their decision-making processes. The decision-making rationale must also be aligned to research-based theory and best practice for the specific content area. For these reasons, edTPA scores serve as an effective measure for the revised SLO 2. Task 4 is related to Assessing student knowledge in mathematics. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates complete edTPA during the student teaching internship **ELED 4420,** which is the final course in the program of study. At UNC Charlotte, all edTPA products are currently externally scored by trained and calibrated scorers who have undergone 30+ hours of scorer protocol training. Utilizing external scorers provides faculty with valid and reliable edTPA data. External scoring is managed by SCALE in partnership with Pearson, Inc. For edTPA Tasks 1-3, five (5) rubrics are scored. In Task 4, three rubrics are scored**.** Each rubric has 5 levels: Level 3 is “Target/Acceptable Level to Begin Teaching.” Candidates receive a score report approximately three weeks after submission. Scores are also sent directly to the COED edTPA Coordinator. The COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation de-identifies these data and disaggregates findings by term at the college and program levels to faculty in the professional education programs. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. Results of edTPA data are also regularly discussed at TPALs meetings; “TPALs” is an acronym for “edTPA Liaisons.” This group consists of faculty from all our educator preparation programs, including faculty from the College of Arts + Architecture and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. TPALs meets four times annually for the specific purpose of discussing edTPA results and processes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| For three edTPA tasks, five rubrics are assessed. In Task 4, 3 rubrics are assessed. To determine an overall rating for each task, an average of the five rubrics is calculated. The program expects **80% or higher** of its candidates to score an average of 2.4 or better on each of the three primary edTPA tasks: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1), Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2) and Assessing Student Learning (Task 3). This equates to at least three ratings of 2 and two ratings of 3 on the task rubrics. The target score average of 2.4 per task is in keeping with SCALE recommendations for programs when first adopting edTPA. We anticipate raising this score incrementally over time. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **88** | **56** |
| STAR 2012: E5b Develops Higher Order Thinking Skills in Students | 99% | 95% |
| STAR 2012: E5c Uses a Variety of Instructional Methods | 99% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: E5d Integrates Technology with Instruction | 99% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E5e Varies the Instructional Role | 99% | 96% |
| STAR 2012: E2a Teachers connect content | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: K2b Implements Interdisciplinary Approaches and Multiple Perspectives for Teaching Content | 99% | 95% |
|  |  |  |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **edTPA** | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
|  | **Count** | **47** | **102** |
| edTPA Task 1: Planning for Planning for Instruction and Assessment | **Average for Group** | 3.00 | 3.04 |
| **% Proficient** | 85.71% | 89.22% |
| edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning | **Average for Group** | 2.97 | 3.03 |
| **% Proficient** | 90.48% | 90.20% |
| edTPA Task 3: Assessing Student Learning | **Average for Group** | 2.96 | 2.89 |
| **% Proficient** | 88.10% | 85.29% |
| edTPA Task 4: Assessing Students Mathematics Learning | **Average for Group**  **% Proficient** | 2.86 | 2.87 |
| 80.95% | 71.57% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Undergraduate ELED program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 2. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review other SLO data results to determine if trends emerge across multiple semesters regarding how well candidates are Instructing and Engaging candidates in learning. The program will focus on planning and assessment in all methods courses. No specific changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the university supervisor on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate ratings by the cooperating teacher on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills and commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor are used. These evaluations occur during the student teaching internship, ELED 4420, which is the final course in the program of study. Using both university supervisor ratings and cooperating teacher ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings (supervisors) compare to that of our P12 partners (cooperating teachers), who actively mentor our candidates in classrooms during the student teaching experience. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, university supervisor and cooperating teacher scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects **80% or higher** of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Meets Expectations”) or better on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, which has a 4-point scale (0-3). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **88** | **56** |
| STAR 2012: E1a Manages time and materials | 99% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E1c Monitors and responds to student behavior | 100% | 96% |
| STAR 2012: E2b Communicates effectively with students | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: E2c Encourages students to articulate understanding of content | 100% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E2d Embraces diversity in the school community and in the world | 99% | 96% |
| STAR 2012: E3c Creates opportunities for learner response | 100% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E4a Develops plans that are aligned with state and district curriculum | 100% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E4b Monitors and adjusts lesson plans (to meet and enhance student progress towards goals) | 100% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E5a Poses quality questions | 99% | 96% |
| STAR 2012: C1d Self-evaluates teaching and professional role | 100% | 98% |
| **Count** | **90** | **-** |
| ISL: 2d.1 Cooperates with specialists and uses resources | 100% | - |
| ISL: 4b.1 Collaborates with colleagues on student performance and to respond to cultural differences | 100% | - |
|  |  |  |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | | **Spring 2015** | |
|  | **Count** | **48** | **46** | **103** | **97** |
| **Assessment of Professional Educator Dispositions** |  | **US Dispo** | **CT Dispo\*** | **US Dispo** | **CT Dispo\*** |
| APED: Impact | **Count of 1** | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| **% Score of 1** | 2.08% | 4.35% | 0.97% | 2.06% |
| **Count of 2** | 24 | 12 | 26 | 29 |
| **% Score of 2** | 50.00% | 26.09% | 25.24% | 29.90% |
| **Count of 3** | 23 | 32 | 76 | 66 |
| **% Score of 3** | 47.92% | 69.57% | 73.79% | 68.04% |
| APED: Professional Identity and Continuous Growth | **Count of 1** | 5 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| **% Score of 1** | 10.42% | 6.52% | 0.97% | 13.79% |
| **Count of 2** | 13 | 10 | 29 | 28 |
| **% Score of 2** | 27.08% | 21.74% | 28.16% | 26.67% |
| **Count of 3** | 30 | 33 | 72 | 65 |
| **% Score of 3** | 62.50% | 71.74% | 69.90% | 61.90% |
| APED: Leadership | **Count of 1** | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| **% Score of 1** | 2.08% | 4.35% | 1.94% | 20.69% |
| **Count of 2** | 35 | 25 | 54 | 49 |
| **% Score of 2** | 72.92% | 54.33% | 52.43% | 46.67% |
| **Count of 3** | 12 | 19 | 47 | 42 |
| **% Score of 3** | 25.00% | 41.30% | 45.63%% | 40.00% |
| APED: Advocacy | **Count of 1** | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 2.17% | 0.97% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 29 | 22 | 34 | 51 |
| **% Score of 2** | 60.42% | 47.83% | 33.01% | 48.57% |
| **Count of 3** | 19 | 23 | 68 | 46 |
| **% Score of 3** | 39.58% | 50.00% | 66.02% | 43.81% |
| APED: Collaboration | **Count of 1** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 1** | 2.08% | 2.17% | 0.97% | 10.34% |
| **Count of 2** | 16 | 17 | 32 | 35 |
| **% Score of 2** | 33.33% | 36.96% | 31.07% | 33.33% |
| **Count of 3** | 31 | 28 | 70 | 59 |
| **% Score of 3** | 64.58% | 60.87% | 67.96% | 56.19% |
| APED: Ethics | **Count of 1** | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 2.17% | 0.00% | 3.45% |
| **Count of 2** | 15 | 13 | 18 | 25 |
| **% Score of 2** | 31.25% | 28.26% | 17.48% | 23.81% |
| **Count of 3** | 33 | 32 | 85 | 71 |
| **% Score of 3** | 68.75% | 69.57% | 82.52% | 67.62% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Undergraduate ELED program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 3. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, it appears program candidates are performing well as assessed by faculty and P12 partners. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 4: Candidates model and apply technology standards to design, implement, and assess developmentally‐appropriate learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, a new data source is currently being developed. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The data source for SLO 4 is currently in development. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **88** | **56** |
| STAR 2012: K1bSets Expectations for Learning and Achievement | 99% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: E1d Establishes and Maintains a Positive Climate | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: C1a Assumes the Professional Role and Maintains High Ethical Standards | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **47** | **56** |
| APED: D1  Impact | 96% | 96% |
| APED: D2 Professional Identity & Growth | 92% | 96% |
| APED: D3 Leadership | 89% | 96% |
| APED: D4  Advocacy | 94% | 100% |
| APED: D5 Collaboration | 94% | 98% |
| APED: D6  Ethics | 94% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year.

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 5**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 5: Candidates demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication skills appropriate for educators. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In accordance with requirements for developing Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) established by the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment, an SLO was needed for undergraduate programs that specifically addresses proficiency in oral and written communication. This revised SLO was part of a larger process to review all the College of Education SLOs to ensure that faculty are accurately assessing student learning. As a result, SLO 5 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 5, a new data source was identified. In 2014, edTPA was piloted by targeted COED initial licensure programs. EdTPA is a nationally normed and validated portfolio assessment authored by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). As of fall 2015, edTPA is fully implemented in all UNC Charlotte initial teacher licensure programs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| EdTPA is a portfolio project that serves as the culminating capstone project for initial licensure programs. It is content-specific. Candidates complete three tasks aligned with specific domains of teaching practice: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1), Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2) and Assessing Student Learning (Task 3). Candidates create and submit teaching artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, video clips of teaching, assessment data results) along with written justification and analysis of their decision-making processes. While the entire edTPA project requires an intensive level of professional writing appropriate for educators, Task 1 in particular requires candidates to display effective written communication via both artifacts (lesson plans) and decision-making rationale (commentary). Task 2 of edTPA requires each candidate to submit video clips of instructional practice (teaching), thereby providing evidence of oral communication skills. For these reasons, Task 1 and Task 2 edTPA scores serve as evidence of the revised SLO 5. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates complete edTPA during the student teaching internship **ELED 4420,** which is the final course in the program of study. At UNC Charlotte, all edTPA products are currently externally scored by trained and calibrated scorers who have undergone 30+ hours of scorer protocol training. Utilizing external scorers provides faculty with valid and reliable edTPA data. External scoring is managed by SCALE in partnership with Pearson, Inc. For edTPA Tasks 1-3, five (5) rubrics are scored. For edTPA Task 4, three rubrics are scored. Each rubric has 5 levels: Level 3 is “Target/Acceptable Level to Begin Teaching.” Candidates receive a score report approximately three weeks after submission. Scores are also sent directly to the COED edTPA Coordinator. The COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation de-identifies these data and disaggregates findings by term at the college and program levels to faculty in the professional education programs. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. Results of edTPA data are also regularly discussed at TPALs meetings; “TPALs” is an acronym for “edTPA Liaisons.” This group consists of faculty from all our educator preparation programs, including faculty from the College of Arts + Architecture and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. TPALs meets four times annually for the specific purpose of discussing edTPA results and processes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| For three edTPA tasks, five rubrics are assessed and Task 4 has 3 rubrics.To determine an overall rating for each task, an average of the five rubrics is calculated. The program expects **80% or higher** of its candidates to score an average of 2.4 or better on the edTPA tasks designated to measure effective writing and oral communication skills: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1) and Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2). This equates to at least three ratings of 2 and two ratings of 3 on the task rubrics. The target score average of 2.4 per task is in keeping with SCALE recommendations for programs when first adopting edTPA. We anticipate raising this score incrementally over time. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **88** | **56** |
| STAR 2012: K1a Individualizes the Instructional Environment | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 2012: E3a Uses a Variety of Formal and Informal Assessment Strategies | 99% | 95% |
| STAR 2012: E3b Establishes Criteria and Provides Assessment Feedback | 100% | 96% |
| STAR 2012: E3d Uses, Monitors, and Records Assessment Data | 100% | 95% |
| STAR 2012: E4b Monitors and Adjusts Lesson Plans (to meet and enhance student progress towards goals) | 100% | 98% |
| STAR 2012: E4c Collaborates and Plans with Others Professionals | 100% | 98% |
| **Count** | 90 | - |
| ISL (NCPTS 1a.1) Evaluates the progress of students toward graduation using a variety of assessment data. | 100% | - |
| ISL (NCPTS 1a.2) Draws on appropriate data to develop classroom and instructional plans. | 100% | - |
| ISL (NCPTS 4h.1) Uses multiple indicators, formative and summative, to monitor and evaluate students’ progress and to inform instruction. | 100% | - |
| ISL (NCPTS 4h.2): Provides evidence for student attainment of 21st century skills | 100% | - |
| ISL (NCPTS 5a.1) Uses data to provide ideas about what can be done to improve students’ learning. | 100% | - |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate ELED** | |
| **edTPA – Written and Oral Communication** | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
|  | **Count** | **42** | **102** |
| edTPA Task 1: Planning for Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Written Communication | **Average for Group** | 3.00 | 3.04 |
| **% Proficient** | 85.71% | 89.22% |
| edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning  (Oral Communication) | **Average for Group** | 2.97 | 3.03 |
| **% Proficient** | 90.48% | 90.20% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Undergraduate ELED program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 5. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, it appears program candidates may need additional focus on written and oral communication for edTPA Tasks 1 and 2. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

**College: \_\_\_College of Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_Reading and Elementary Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program: Graduate Certificate in Elementary Education (K-6)**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| In 2014, a new assessment, edTPA, was adopted by COED initial licensure programs. EdTPA is a portfolio based assessment that is externally scored; we anticipate that this data source will provide faculty a more robust and meaningful source of candidate outcomes to guide and inform our programs moving forward. See SLO 2 for additional information.  Based on the 2014 report no other program changes were made. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1 (revised 2015 report): Candidates demonstrate proficiency in the 10 InTASC standards at the appropriate progression level(s) in the following categories: the learner and learning; content; instructional practice; and professional responsibility. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, three existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the university supervisor on the Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012); 2) candidate ratings by the cooperating teacher on the Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012); and 3) candidate PRAXIS II scores. The STAR 2012 ratings were selected as data sources for this SLO because the STAR is aligned to the 10 InTASC standards and the PRAXIS II was selected because it is designed as a measure of pedagogical content knowledge. Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Student Teaching Assessment Rubric (STAR 2012) is directly aligned to the 10 InTASC standards. These standards are nationally recognized standards for assessing content and pedagogical knowledge for teachers. In addition, our accrediting body, CAEP, also uses the InTASC standards as their framework for assessing candidate content and pedagogical knowledge at an initial licensure level. The STAR 2012 is a common observation instrument used with every student teacher at the end of his or her academic program. The final (fourth) administration of the STAR instrument is used specifically to measure SLO 1. The rubric has a 4-point scale.  PRAXIS II is a standardized test of educator pedagogical content knowledge. It is administered by the Educational Testing Service. For 2015, a passing score on this test was part of our required program blueprint on file with the North Carolina Department for Public Instruction (NCDPI) for all candidates seeking licensure in elementary education. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed with the STAR 2012 rubric by the university supervisor and by the cooperating teacher in ELED 6470: Student Teaching, which is the culminating student teaching internship course. While the candidate receives four observations on the rubric throughout the student teaching experience, only the final (fourth) observation scores will be used for SLO 1. There are 8 major areas assessed on the STAR 2012, and these areas are also aligned to our Conceptual Framework for educator preparation programs: 1) K1: Learner Development and Learning Differences; 2) K2: Content Knowledge; 3) E1: Learning Environments; 4) E2: Application of Content; 4) E3: Assessment; 5) E4: Planning for Instruction; 6) E5: Instructional Strategies; 7) C1: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice; 8) C2: Leadership and Collaboration. These areas collectively represent the content knowledge and pedagogical skills that candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for licensure at the end of their programs. For each major area, multiple subscores are collected. The subscores for each major area are averaged to determine the final major area score. The rubric is on a 4-point scale: 0=Not Observed, 1=Developing, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished.  PRAXIS II is a standardized test offered year-round via the Educational Testing Service. While candidates may take the test whenever they feel prepared to do so, most candidates typically wait until the end of their respective programs. Passing scores for the PRAXIS II test are established by the North Carolina State Board of Education.  For the STAR 2012, university supervisor and cooperating teacher scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. For PRAXIS II, scores are accessed via secure ETS login by the COED Licensure Officer. Both STAR 2012 data and PRAXIS II scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the STAR 2012 rubric, which has a 4-point scale (0-3).  In regard to the PRAXIS II, it is the program expectation that all teacher candidates will obtain a passing score. In the state of North Carolina a passing score for a candidate seeking an initial license to teach Elementary Education is 227. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| STAR 12 Scores |  |  |  |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Summer 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | 54 | 0 | 21 |
| STAR (US) K2a Demonstrates Knowledge of Content | 100% |  | 95.2% |
| STAR (US) K2c Demonstrates Awareness of Literacy Instruction Across All Content Areas | 100% |  | 95.2% |
| STAR US) K2d Makes content relevant and accessible to all learners | 100% |  | 100% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Praxis II: Elementary Education Scores | 2013-2014 |
| Count | 213 |
| Percent | 99% |
|  |  |

\*Please note that the 213 represents both the Undergraduate B.A. in Elementary Education program and the Elementary Graduate Certificate in Teaching Program.

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Teaching Graduate Certificate  ELED** | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015**  **Traditional** | | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | | | **Spring 2015**  **Traditional** | | **Spring 2015**  **Distance Ed** | |
|  | **Count** | **19** | **13** | **0** | **0** | | **29** | **24** | **0** | **0** |
| **STAR 2012** |  | **US STAR** | **CT STAR** | **US STAR**  **DE** | | **CT**  **STAR**  **DE** | **US STAR** | **CT STAR** | **US STAR**  **DE** | **CT**  **STAR**  **DE** |
| K1 AVERAGE: Learner Development & Learning Differences | **Average for Group** | 2.37 | 2.46 |  | |  | 2.59 | 2.65 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 96.15% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| K2 AVERAGE: Content Knowledge | **Average for Group** | 2.45 | 2.48 |  | |  | 2.66 | 2.59 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 100% |  | |  | 100% | 98.96% |  |  |
| E1 AVERAGE: Learning Environments | **Average for Group** | 2.49 | 2.46 |  | |  | 2.71 | 2.70 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 94.23% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| E2 AVERAGE: Application of Content | **Average for Group** | 2.38 | 2.48 |  | |  | 2.65 | 2.67 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 100% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| E3 AVERAGE: Assessment | **Average for Group** | 2.25 | 2.33 |  | |  | 2.59 | 2.67 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 98.68% | 96.15% |  | |  | 99.14% | 98.96% |  |  |
| E4 AVERAGE: Planning for Instruction | **Average for Group** | 2.47 | 2.46 |  | |  | 2.67 | 2.69% |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 100% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| E5 AVERAGE: Instructional Strategies | **Average for Group** | 2.25 | 2.29 |  | |  | 2.63 | 2.59 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 97.89% | 96.92% |  | |  | 98.62% | 99.17% |  |  |
| C1 AVERAGE: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice | **Average for Group** | 2.51 | 2.56 |  | |  | 2.73 | 2.78 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100% | 98.08% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
| C2 AVERAGE: Leadership and Collaboration | **Average for Group** | 2.13 | 2.08 |  | |  | 2.45 | 2.54 |  |  |
| **% Proficient** | 97.37% | 92.31% |  | |  | 100% | 100% |  |  |
|  | **Count** | 30 | | | | | | | | |
| PRAXIS II | **% Passing** | 100% | | | | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the ELED Graduate Certificate program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review other SLO data results to determine if trends emerge across multiple semesters regarding SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 2: Candidates use domain-specific research and theory to design, implement, assess, and reflect on student learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, a new data source was identified. In 2014, edTPA was piloted by targeted COED initial licensure programs. EdTPA is a nationally normed and validated portfolio assessment authored by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity (SCALE). As of fall 2015, edTPA is fully implemented in all UNC Charlotte initial teacher licensure programs. It is anticipated that this data source will provide faculty with a robust and meaningful source of candidate outcomes to guide and inform our programs moving forward. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| EdTPA is a portfolio project that serves as the culminating capstone project for initial licensure programs. It is content-specific. Candidates complete three tasks aligned with specific domains of teaching practice: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1), Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2) and Assessing Student Learning (Task 3). It is summative in nature and is intended to answer the question, “Is the candidate ready to teach?” Candidates create and submit teaching artifacts (e.g., lesson plans, video clips of teaching, assessment data results) along with written justification and analysis of their decision-making processes. The decision-making rationale must also be aligned to research-based theory and best practice for the specific content area. For these reasons, edTPA scores serve as an effective measure for the revised SLO 2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates complete edTPA during the student teaching internship ELED 6470: Student Teaching, which is the final course in the program of study. At UNC Charlotte, all edTPA products are currently externally scored by trained and calibrated scorers who have undergone 30+ hours of scorer protocol training. Utilizing external scorers provides faculty with valid and reliable edTPA data. External scoring is managed by SCALE in partnership with Pearson, Inc. Elementary Education candidates have 18 rubrics for edTPA, 5 for Task 1, 5 for Task 2, 5 for Task 3, and 3 for Task 4. Each rubric has 5 levels: Level 3 is “Target/Acceptable Level to Begin Teaching.”  Candidates receive a score report approximately three weeks after submission. Scores are also sent directly to the COED edTPA Coordinator. The COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation de-identifies these data and disaggregates findings by term at the college and program levels to faculty in the professional education programs. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. Results of edTPA data are also regularly discussed at TPALs meetings; “TPALs” is an acronym for “edTPA Liaisons.” This group consists of faculty from all our educator preparation programs, including faculty from the College of Arts + Architecture and the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. TPALs meets four times annually for the specific purpose of discussing edTPA results and processes. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| Elementary Education candidates have 18 rubrics for edTPA, 5 for Task 1, 5 for Task 2, 5 for Task 3, and 3 for Task 4. Each rubric has 5 levels: Level 3 is “Target/Acceptable Level to Begin Teaching.”  To determine an overall rating for each task, an average of the five rubrics is calculated. The program expects 80% of its candidates to score an average of 2.4 or better on each of the three primary edTPA tasks: Planning for Instruction and Assessment (Task 1), Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning (Task 2) and Assessing Student Learning (Task 3). This equates to at least three ratings of 2 and two ratings of 3 on the task rubrics. The target score average of 2.4 per task is in keeping with SCALE recommendations for programs when first adopting edTPA. We anticipate raising this score incrementally over time. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **54** | **21** |
| STAR (US) E5b Develops Higher Order Thinking Skills in Students | 94.4% | 90.5% |
| STAR (US) E5c Uses a Variety of Instructional Methods | 100% | 95.2% |
| STAR (US) E5d Integrates Technology with Instruction | 100% | 100% |
| STAR (US) E5e Varies the Instructional Role | 100% | 95.2% |
| STAR (US) E2a Teachers connect content | 100% | 100% |
| STAR (US) K2b Implements Interdisciplinary Approaches and Multiple Perspectives for Teaching Content | 100% | 90.5% |
| **Count** | **54** | **2** |
| ISL: 4A.2 Assesses and uses resources | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Teaching Certificate in ELED** | | | |
| **edTPA** | **Semester** | **Fall 2015**  **Traditional** | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | **Spring 2015 Traditional** | **Spring 2015 Distance Ed** |
|  | **Count** | **14** | **0** | **29** | **0** |
| edTPA Task 1: Planning for Planning for Instruction and Assessment | **Average for Group** | 3.15 |  | 3.24 |  |
| **% Proficient** | 85.71% |  | 93.10% |  |
| edTPA Task 2: Instructing and Engaging Students in Learning | **Average for Group** | 3.19 |  | 3.20 |  |
| **% Proficient** | 100.00% |  | 93.10% |  |
| edTPA Task 3: Assessing Student Learning | **Average for Group** | 2.99 |  | 2.96 |  |
| **% Proficient** | 85.71% |  | 82.76% |  |
| edTPA Task 4: Elementary Mathematics | **Average for Group** | 3.08 |  | 3.33 |  |
| **% Proficient** | 85.71% |  | 89.66% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the ELED Grad Cert program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 2. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review other SLO data results to determine if trends emerge across multiple semesters regarding how well candidates Assess Student Learning (Task 3). No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Candidates demonstrate skills and commitment that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the university supervisor on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate ratings by the cooperating teacher on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills and a commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor are used. These evaluations occur during the student teaching internship**,** ELED 6470: Student Teaching, which is the final course in the program of study. Using both university supervisor ratings and cooperating teacher ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings (supervisors) compare to that of our P12 partners (cooperating teachers), who actively mentor our candidates in classrooms during the student teaching experience. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, university supervisor and cooperating teacher scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Meets Expectations”) or better on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, which has a 4-point scale (0-3). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **54** | **21** |
| STAR 12 (US)E1A Manages Time and Materials | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E1C Monitors and Responds to Student Behavior | 98.1% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E2b Communicate Effectively with Students | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E2c Encourages Students to Articulate Understanding of Content | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E2d Embraces Diversity in the School Community and in the World | 100% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E3C Creates Opportunities for Learner Response | 98.1% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E4A Develops Plans that are Aligned with State and District Curriculum | 100% | 95.2% |
| STAR 12 (US) E4B Monitors and Adjusts Lesson Plans | 100% | 90.5% |
| STAR 12 (US) E5A Poses Quality Questions | 96.3% | 95.2% |
| STAR 12 (US) C1d Self-evaluates Teaching and Professional Role | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **54** | **2** |
| ISL: 2d.1: Cooperates with specialists and uses resources | 100% | 100% |
| ISL: 4b.1 Collaborates with colleagues on student performance and to respond to cultural differences | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **112** | **21** |
| PDP: 2e.1: Communicates and collaborates with home and community | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Teaching Grad Cert ELED** | | | | | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | | **Fall 2015 Distance Ed** | | **Spring 2015** | | **Spring 2015**  **Distance Ed** | |
|  | **Count** | **18** | **3** | **0** | **0** | **29** | **1** | **0** | **0** |
| **Assessment of Professional Educator Dispositions** |  | **US Dispo** | **CT Dispo\*** | **US Dispo**  **DE** | **CT**  **Dispo**  **DE** | **US Dispo** | **CT Dispo\*** | **US Dispo**  **DE** | **CT**  **Dispo**  **DE** |
| APED: Impact | **Count of 1** | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 5.56% | 5.56% |  |  | 0.00% | 4.35% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 7 | 9 |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 38.89% | 50.00% |  |  | 20.69% | 26.09% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 10 | 8 |  |  | 23 | 16 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 55.56% | 44.44% |  |  | 79.31% | 69.57% |  |  |
| APED: Professional Identity and Continuous Growth | **Count of 1** | 1 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 5.56% | 5.56% |  |  | 3.45% | 13.04% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 7 | 6 |  |  | 4 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 38.89% | 33.33% |  |  | 13.79% | 17.39% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 10 | 11 |  |  | 24 | 16 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 55.56% | 61.11% |  |  | 82.76% | 69.57% |  |  |
| APED: Leadership | **Count of 1** | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 5.56% | 5.56% |  |  | 0.00% | 8.70% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 12 | 11 |  |  | 8 | 10 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 66.67% | 61.11% |  |  | 27.59% | 43.48% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 5 | 6 |  |  | 21 | 11 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 27.78% | 33.33% |  |  | 72.41% | 47.83% |  |  |
| APED: Advocacy | **Count of 1** | 1 | 1 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 5.56% | 5.56% |  |  | 0.00% | 4.35% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 13 | 10 |  |  | 6 | 12 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 72.22% | 55.56% |  |  | 20.69% | 52.17% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 4 | 7 |  |  | 23 | 10 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 22.22% | 38.89% |  |  | 79.31% | 43.48% |  |  |
| APED: Collaboration | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  | 0.00% | 13.04% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 8 | 8 |  |  | 5 | 6 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 44.44% | 44.44% |  |  | 17.24% | 26.09% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 10 | 10 |  |  | 24 | 14 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 55.56% | 55.56% |  |  | 82.76% | 60.87% |  |  |
| APED: Ethics | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  | 1 | 3 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  | 3.45% | 13.04% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 5 | 9 |  |  | 0 | 1 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 27.78% | 50.00% |  |  | 0.00% | 4.35% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 13 | 9 |  |  | 28 | 19 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 72.22% | 50.00% |  |  | 96.55% | 82.61% |  |  |

**\****Note: Lateral entry candidates were evaluated on their dispositions by their principal. Because they are already provisionally employed as teachers when they enter the program, lateral entry teachers complete the student teaching internship in their own classrooms, and therefore do not have an assigned cooperating teacher.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Grad Cert ELED program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 3. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, it appears program candidates are performing well as assessed by faculty and P12 partners. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 4: Candidates model and apply technology standards to design, implement, and assess developmentally‐appropriate learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, a new data source is currently being developed. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The data source for SLO 4 is currently in development. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | 54 | 21 |
| STAR 12 (US) K1b Sets Expectations for Learning and Achievement | 98.1% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) E1d Establishes and Maintains a Positive Climate | 98.1% | 100% |
| STAR 12 (US) C1A Assumes the Professional Role and Maintains High Ethical Standards | 100% | 100% |
|  |  |  |
| **Count:** | **54** | **21** |
| APD: D1 Impact | 100% | 100% |
| APD: D2 Professional Identity and Growth | 96.4% | 90.5% |
| APD: D3 Leadership | 98.2% | 95.2% |
| APD: D4 Advocacy | 98.2% | 100% |
| APD: D5 Collaboration | 100% | 95.2% |
| APD: D6 Ethics | 98.2% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year.

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Since data for this new SLO will not be reported until the 2016 year there are no recommended changes at this time. |

**College: College of Education**

**Department: Reading and Elementary Education**

**Program: Reading Education Minor**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| Last year we did not list any changes or improvements because students had not progressed enough in the program for SLO data to be collected. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| **SLO 1: Reading Education teacher licensure candidates demonstrate knowledge of the important principles and concepts of the content they teach.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO #1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO #1 one data source was identified: Praxis II (5204/0204). The Praxis II Teaching Reading (5204/0204) was selected because it is designed to measure pedagogical content knowledge, as such, this data source aligns to SLO #1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| Reading PRAXIS II is required for licensure in the Reading Minor Program. The PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204) is a norm-referenced, standardized measure of content in a candidate’s field of study. It is administered by the Educational Testing Service. This test assesses emergent literacy, phonological awareness, phonics, comprehension, fluency, vocabulary, and instructional processes. A passing score on this test is currently part of our required program blueprint on file with the North Carolina Department for Public Instruction (NCDPI) for all candidates seeking licensure in their content area. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| After completing their final Reading Education Minor class, students take the PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204) at an ETS approved testing center. The PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204) is administered according to ETS’ testing policies. Passing scores for the PRAXIS II Teaching Reading (5204/0204) test are established by the North Carolina State Board of Education. Scores will automatically be submitted to the State.  For PRAXIS II Teaching Reading (5204/0204), scores are accessed via secure ETS login by the COED Licensure Officer. PRAXIS II Teaching Reading (5204/0204) scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80%of its candidates to obtain a passing score (150 points or above) on the PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204) standardized examination. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** |
| **Count** | No data |
| PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204) Scores | No data |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate Minor in Reading Education** | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
| **PRAXIS II: Teaching Reading (5204/0204)** | **Count** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Passing** | 100% | 0 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Undergraduate FLED Minor program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. Given the small *n*, these results may not accurately provide enough data to make programmatic decisions yet. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| **SLO 2: Reading Education Teacher Candidates are able to identify and explain a difference among learners that can impact literacy learning, and design effective responsive reading strategies addressing that difference using evidence-based research.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO #2, one existing data source was identified: Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper. This assignment was selected because the paper requires students to identify and explain differences among learners that can impact literacy learning and design effective responsive reading strategies addressing that difference using evidence-based research. Therefore, the assignment aligns with SLO #2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| **Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper:** After selecting a difference among learners (i.e., cultural, social, cognitive, etc.) that can impact literacy learning for in-depth study, the candidate will locate and analyze relevant research literature, and then write a paper on their selected topic, including suggestions for designing reading instruction responsive to the identified difference. The **Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper Rubric** will be used to assess the candidates’ learning. The rubric uses a 0-3 point scale and has four criteria that are used to assess this student learning outcome:   1. Candidate identifies and defines a characteristic of learners that may impact literacy learning. 2. Candidate makes connections between the learner characteristics and their impact on literacy learning. 3. Candidate makes recommendations for responsive and appropriate literacy instruction based on established student learning differences. 4. The candidate finds and appropriately uses relevant scholarly literature. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper will be assigned in READ 4161: Assessment, Design, and Implementation of Classroom Reading Instruction. The assessment will be administered and evaluated by the instructor using the Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper Rubric.  Scores will be collected using a data management system, TaskStream. Scores will be analyzed by the Undergraduate Reading Program Coordinator each semester the class is offered. The data will be discussed with the Reading Minor faculty and changes will be determined to address any needs identified by the data. All data reports will be shared at the final Reading and Elementary Education department meeting. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% of candidates to score “2” or better (2 = proficient; 3 = accomplished) on the Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper, which uses a 0-3 point scale. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.  
 **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** | |
|  | **Count** | No data |
| Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper (EE2) 3b.1 | **% Passing** | No data |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Undergraduate Minor in Reading Education** | |
| **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
| **Factors Affecting Literacy Learning Paper Rubric** | **Count** |  | 10 |
| Count at Level 1 |  | 2 |
| % at Level 1 |  | 20% |
| Count at Level 2 |  | 4 |
| %at Level 2 |  | 40% |
| Count at Level 3 |  | 4 |
| % at Level 3 |  | 40% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Reading Education Minor program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO #2. However, given the small *n* and that this is the first semester data are collected; these results may not accurately provide enough data to make programmatic decisions yet. No changes are identified to be made at this time. |

**College: \_\_\_College of Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_Reading and Elementary Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program: Graduate Certificate Program in Elementary School Mathematics**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| Based on the data of last year’s student learning outcomes assessment data there were no changes made to the program. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1 (revised 2015 report): Advanced program candidates are able to demonstrate and apply content knowledge and skills specific to their content area or discipline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, an existing data source was identified: In *ELED 6316:* *Mathematical Modeling: K-5 Leadership*, the capstone course of the program, candidates completes a series of mathematical tasks. This is the same evidence used for SLO 1 in previous reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| In *ELED 6316: Mathematical Modeling: K-5 Leadership*, the capstone course of the program, candidates complete a series of mathematical tasks. For each task, candidates must show their work, provide a detailed explanation of their problem solving process, and also explain how the mathematical concepts in the task relate to each other. These tasks provide evidence of candidates’ mathematics content knowledge.  Courses are offered every 12-24 months based on enrollment/need. Depending on when the courses are offered, data may not be available. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The portfolio of mathematical tasks is graded by the course instructor using the associated rubric. The rubric has 3 levels: Developing (1), Proficient (2), and Accomplished (3). Students’ scores are currently analyzed by the Program Coordinator. Data includes the number of correct items for each candidate as well as the number of candidates who answered each item correctly. This data is shared with both department faculty and the state-wide program design committee at a Department Meeting. This program is administered by the Mathematics Educators and Mathematicians on the State-wide Committee. Thus, changes and improvements to the program are decided by the state-wide program design team. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 90% of its students to score at Level 2 or higher on each Element of the Rubric (out of 3 levels). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Data from 2014 - 2015**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** |  | **Distance Education only for all courses** | | | |
| **Semester** |  | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **0** | **6** | **0** |
| Element 1: Correct Answers | Count at Level 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 1 |  |  | 0% |  |
| Count at Level 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| % at Level 2 |  |  | 100% |  |
| Count at Level 3 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 3 |  |  | 0% |  |
| Element 2: Correct explanations of processes | Count at Level 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 1 |  |  | 0% |  |
| Count at Level 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| % at Level 2 |  |  | 100% |  |
| Count at Level 3 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 3 |  |  | 0% |  |
| Element 3: Thorough connections of mathematics topics | Count at Level 1 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 1 |  |  | 0% |  |
| Count at Level 2 |  |  | 6 |  |
| % at Level 2 |  |  | 100% |  |
| Count at Level 3 |  |  | 0 |  |
| % at Level 3 |  |  | 0% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data is only available from the last time the course was offered, which was spring 2014. The course is currently scheduled to be taught in summer 2016. Data from 2014 indicated that candidates in the Graduate Certificate program in Elementary School Mathematics met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here there is a need to support students’ potential of scoring at Level 3 rather than Level 2; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 2: Advanced program candidates use domain-specific research and evidence to demonstrate leadership in developing high quality learning environments. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, an existing data source was identified: In *ELED 6316:* *Mathematical Modeling: K-5 Leadership*, the capstone course of the program, candidates complete a mentorship project where they mentor and lead a colleague to improve their mathematics instruction. This evidence is different from evidence for SLO 2 in previous reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| In *ELED 6316:* *Mathematical Modeling: K-5 Leadership* candidates lead and mentor a colleague to improve their mathematics instruction. The Mentorship project requires candidates to work with a colleague in their school to identify high-need students. The candidate then examines research and available instructional resources, and then designs an intervention for their colleague to use with students. The candidate meets with their colleague afterwards to examine student learning data and discuss their colleagues’ experiences. Because the candidates use data and research to design the intervention, this measure is aligned with the revised SLO 2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Mentorship project is graded by the course instructor using the associated rubric. The rubric has 3 levels: Developing (1), Proficient (2), and Accomplished (3). Students’ scores are currently analyzed by the Program Coordinator. Data includes the number of correct items for each candidate as well as the number of candidates who answered each item correctly. This data is shared with both department faculty and the state-wide program design committee at a Department Meeting. This program is administered by the Mathematics Educators and Mathematicians on the State-wide Committee. Thus, changes and improvements to the program are decided by the state-wide program design team. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 90% of its students to earn at least Level 2 on Elements 1 and 3 of the Mentorship Project (out of 3 levels). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2014** | **Summer 2014** | **Spring 2014** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **4** | **7** |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 1: Research Based Tasks | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 2: Planned Pedagogies | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 3: Analysis of Student Work | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 4: Reflection | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

**Distance Education ONLY**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **0** |
| Mentorship Project from ELED 6316  Element 1: Mentoring Colleagues | **Count at Level 1** |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  |  |
| **%t at Level 2** |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  |  |
| Mentorship Project from ELED 6316  Element 3: Evidence of Impact | **Count at Level 1** |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  |  |
| **% at Level 2** |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| No data is available for this new SLO from 2015. Data will be collected when this course is taught during Summer, 2016. At this time there are no changes planned. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Advanced program candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, advocacy, and commitment to create supportive environments that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two new data sources were identified that will be collected starting in Summer 2016: 1) candidate ratings by the course instructor on the program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate self- assessment ratings on program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills, advocacy, and commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the course instructor and the candidate during the identified program midpoint course are used. For the Elementary Mathematics Graduate Certificate program, these evaluations occur during ELED 6314: K-5 Rational Numbers which is approximately half way through the program of study. Using both instructor ratings and candidate self-assessment ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings compare to the advanced candidates’ own perceptions of their performance. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, Taskstream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 90% of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Meets Expectations”) or better on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, which has a 4-point scale (0-3). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2014** | **Summer 2014** | **Spring 2014** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **4** | **7** |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 1: Research Based Tasks | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 2: Planned Pedagogies | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 3: Analysis of Student Work | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 4: Reflection | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 | 5 |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 75% | 71.4% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 25% | 28.6% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2015** | **Summer 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
| **Count** |  | **7** | **0** | **0** |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 1: Research Based Tasks | **Count at Level 1** | 0 |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** | 0% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** | 5 |  |  |
| **% at Level 2** | 71.4% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** | 2 |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** | 28.6% |  |  |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 2: Planned Pedagogies | **Count at Level 1** | 0 |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** | 0% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** | 5 |  |  |
| **% at Level 2** | 71.4% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** | 2 |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** | 28.6% |  |  |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 3: Analysis of Student Work | **Count at Level 1** | 0 |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** | 0% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** | 5 |  |  |
| **% at Level 2** | 71.4% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** | 2 |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** | 28.6% |  |  |
| TTLP Project from ELED 6311  Element 4: Reflection | **Count at Level 1** | 0 |  |  |
| **% at Level 1** | 0% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 2** | 5 |  |  |
| **% at Level 2** | 71.4% |  |  |
| **Count at Level 3** | 2 |  |  |
| **% at Level 3** | 28.6% |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Graduate Certificate in Elementary School Mathematics program are meeting expectations. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here there is a need to support students’ potential of scoring at Level 3 rather than Level 2; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 4: Candidates model and apply technology standards to design, implement, and assess developmentally‐appropriate learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, two existing data sources were identified: the Data Analysis project from *ELED 6312: Geometry & Spatial Visualization: K-5 Assessment*. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Data Analysis project from ELED 6312 will be used as the Effectiveness Measure. The Data Analysis project requires candidates to use the *Assessing Number Concepts* mathematics assessment with 3 struggling students from Kindergarten through Grade 3. Part of the project requires candidates use technology for assessment purposes, using it to organize the data, create a graph, analyze the data, and share the findings of the project. Therefore, the assignment aligns with SLO 4. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Data Analysis project, which is completed in ELED 6312: Geometry & Spatial Visualization: K-5 Assessment, requires candidates to use the *Assessing Number Concepts* mathematics assessment with 3 struggling students from Kindergarten through Grade 3. Candidates collect data from each student individually through a series of interview tasks, where students use manipulatives or paper and pencil to solve tasks involving foundational number sense concepts.  The course is taken sometime in the middle of the program. Candidates collect and analyze data and then provide instructional recommendations about how to support each student’s number sense development. Students’ scores are analyzed by the Program Coordinator to determine descriptive statistics. This data will be shared with both Department faculty and the state-wide program design committee. This program is administered by the Mathematics Educators and Mathematicians on the State-wide Committee. Thus, changes and improvements to the program are decided by the state-wide program design team. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 90% of its students to earn at least Level 2 on all of the Elements of the Data Analysis Project (out of 3 levels). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2014** | **Summer 2014** | **Spring 2014** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **7** | **0** |
| Data Analysis Project from ELED 6312  Element 1: Data Analysis | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 5 |  |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 71.4% |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 2 |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 28.6% |  |
| Data Analysis Project from ELED 6312  Element 2: Using Data to Design Instruction | **Count at Level 1** |  | 1 |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 14.3% |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 6 |  |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 85.7% |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 0 |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 0% |  |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

Distance Education ONLY

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Data** |  | **Fall 2015** | **Summer 2015** | **Spring 2015** |
| **Count** |  | **0** | **5** | **0** |
| Data Analysis Project from ELED 6312  Element 1: Data Analysis | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 3 |  |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 60% |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 2 |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 40% |  |
| Data Analysis Project from ELED 6312  Element 2: Using Data to Design Instruction | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 |  |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0% |  |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 1 |  |
| **% at Level 2** |  | 20% |  |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 4 |  |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 80% |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the Graduate Certificate in Elementary School Mathematics program are meeting expectations. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here there is a need to support students’ potential of scoring at Level 3 rather than Level 2; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

**Graduate Programs**

**College: \_\_\_College of Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_Reading and Elementary Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program: MAT in Elementary Education**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| Based on the data collected, achievement continues to be strong and no changes were needed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1 (revised 2015 report): Advanced program candidates are able to demonstrate and apply content knowledge and skills specific to their content area or discipline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, an existing data source was identified: 1) The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project. Specific indicators as aligned with SLO 1 are indicated below. These indicators are different from the 2014 data report. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project is a two part project that collectively is designed to be the capstone experience of this program. The project will be completed in *ELED 6203 Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners* and *ELED 6303 Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis in the Elementary Classroom*, but it will require candidates to synthesize and apply knowledge from other courses (e.g., *ELED 6202 Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners*) taken earlier in the program. Through the Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project (TIP), the candidate will demonstrate content and curriculum expertise by researching a content area. In part A of the project, the candidate will show advanced content area knowledge appropriate for masters’ level teacher candidates by developing content-pedagogy strategies specific to the in the instructional needs of the diverse learners they teach, based on the contextual factors of the classroom and the school. Instruction will be designed to reflect cultural needs, learning differences, behavioral differences, and diversity in learning styles. Instruction will reflect expertise in understanding and instructing using higher order thinking skills (revised Bloom’s taxonomy), effective intervention strategies, and teaching to multiple intelligences. For these reasons, the specific indicators on the TIP Project align with the revised SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project (TIP) Part A (EE 2A) is evaluated using a rubric developed by faculty of the program in *ELED 6203: Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners*. There are eight major areas assessed on the TIP Part A (also known as EE2A). Six of these areas are used to measure candidate content and curriculum expertise: 1) 3A Using Content Knowledge; 2) 3C: Identifying Key Concepts; 3) 3D: Identifying Essential Understandings; 4) 3E: Developing Higher Order Lesson Plans; 5) 3F: Using Appropriate Differentiations; 6) 3H: Reflecting on Practice  These areas collectively represent the advanced content knowledge and pedagogical skills that candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for master’s-level licensure at the end of their programs. The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The rubric is completed by the course instructor.  For the TIP, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the TIP rubric indicators listed above. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **On-Campus** |  |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **2** | **4** |
| TIP, EE2A: 2a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 2c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **14** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **20** | **4** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **2** | **4** |
| PDM, EE1: 1b | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 1c | 100% | 100% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **DE** |  |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **5** | **20** |
| TIP, EE2A: 2a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 2c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **16** | **11** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **15** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **20** |
| PDM, EE1: 1b | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 1c | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **MAT in Elementary Education** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | **Spring 2015** | **Spring 2015 Distance Ed** |
| **ELED TIP Part A (EE 2A)** | **Count** | **0** | **9** | **2** | **14** |
| 3A Using Content Knowledge | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 0.00% | 50.00% | 42.86% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 9 | 1 | 8 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 100.00% | 50.00% | 57.14% |
| 3C: Identifying Key Concepts | **Count at Level 1** |  | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 22.22% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 11.11% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 6 | 2 | 14 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 66.67% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| 3D: Identifying Essential Understandings | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 11.11% | 0.00% | 14.29% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 8 | 2 | 12 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 88.89% | 100.00% | 85.71% |
| 3E: Developing Higher Order Lesson Plans | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 22.22% | 50.00% | 35.71% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 7 | 1 | 9 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 77.78% | 50.00% | 64.29% |
| 3F: Using Appropriate Differentiations | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 22.22% | 50.00% | 35.71% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 7 | 1 | 9 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 77.78% | 50.00% | 64.29% |
| 3H: Reflecting on Practice | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 44.44% | 50.00% | 28.57% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 5 | 1 | 10 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 55.56% | 50.00% | 71.43% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the MAT program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review 3c: Identifying Key Concepts and 3h: Reflecting on Practice. However no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 2: Advanced program candidates use domain-specific research and evidence to demonstrate leadership in developing high quality learning environments. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, an existing data source was identified: 1) The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project. Specific indicators as aligned with SLO 2 are indicated below. These indicators are different from the 2014 data report. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project (TIP) is a two part project that collectively is designed to be the capstone experience of this program. The project will be completed in *ELED 6203 Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners* and *ELED 6303 Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis in the Elementary Classroom*, but it will require candidates to synthesize and apply knowledge from other courses (e.g., *ELED 6202 Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners*) taken earlier in the program. Through the Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project, the candidate will demonstrate content and curriculum expertise by researching a content area. In part A of the project, the candidate will show advanced content area knowledge appropriate for masters’ level teacher candidates by developing content-pedagogy strategies specific to the in the instructional needs of the diverse learners they teach, based on the contextual factors of the classroom and the school. These strategies are based on evidence of best practices as reflected in the research literature, and candidates must include documentation of this in their work. In Part B of the project, candidates will demonstrate their impact on student learning through pre/post-test and formative assessment data. Candidates collect these data within their own classrooms and then share these findings with colleagues. For these reasons, specific indicators on the TIP Project align with the revised SLO 2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project (TIP) Part A (EE 2A) is evaluated using a rubric developed by faculty of the program in *ELED 6203: Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners.*  The TIP Part B (EE 2B) is evaluated in *ELED 6303 Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis in the Elementary Classroom.* There are eight major areas assessed on the TIP Part A (also known as EE2A). Two of these are used to assess the candidate’s ability to facilitate learning through evidence-based practice informed by research: 1) 3B: Using Research Based Evidence; and 2) 3G: Effective Use of Diagnostic Data. There are three areas assessed on the TIP Part B (also known as EE 2B), and all three are used to assess SLO 2: 1) 4A: Using Formative Data to Modify Instruction; 2) 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth; and 3) 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data.  These areas collectively represent the ability to conduct and use evidence-based research to demonstrate leadership skills that advanced program candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for master’s-level licensure at the end of their programs. The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The rubric is completed by the course instructor.  For the TIP, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the TIP rubric indicators listed above. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **On-Campus** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **14** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3c | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3d | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3e | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **20** | **4** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE 2B: Other 1 | 100% | 100% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **Distance Education** | |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **16** | **11** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3c | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3d | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3e | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **15** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4a | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 1 | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Elementary Education MEd** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | **Spring 2015** | **Spring 2015 Distance Ed** |
| **ELED TIP Part A (EE 2A)** | **Count** | **0** | **9** | **2** | **14** |
| 3B: Using Research Based Evidence | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 11.11% | 50.00% | 35.71% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 8 | 1 | 9 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 88.89% | 50.00% | 64.29% |
| 3G: Effective Use of Diagnostic Data | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 44.44% | 100.00% | 50.00% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 5 | 0 | 7 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 55.56% | 0.00% | 50.00% |
| **ELED TIP Part B (EE 2B)** | **Count** |  | **5** | **6** | **13** |
| 4A: Using Formative Data to Modify Instruction | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 16.67% | 7.69% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 0 | 4 | 7 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 0.00% | 66.67% | 53.85% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 100.00% | 16.67% | 38.46% |
| 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 1 | 5 | 6 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 20.00% | 83.33% | 46.15% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 4 | 1 | 7 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 80.00% | 16.67% | 53.85% |
| 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data | **Count at Level 1** |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **% at Level 1** |  | 0.00% | 16.67% | 7.69% |
| **Count at Level 2** |  | 0 | 4 | 8 |
| **%at Level 2** |  | 0.00% | 66.67% | 61.54% |
| **Count at Level 3** |  | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| **% at Level 3** |  | 100.00% | 16.67% | 30.77% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the MAT program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 2. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making.  Based on the data presented here from Spring 2015, two areas of focus for program faculty to review are 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth and 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data. This will become an area of targeted focus for program faculty to review in the next academic year; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Advanced program candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, advocacy, and commitment to create supportive environments that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the course instructor on the program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate self- assessment ratings on program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills, advocacy, and commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the course instructor and the candidate during the identified program midpoint course are used. For the MAT in Elementary Education program, these evaluations occur during *ELED 6202: Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners,* which is approximately half way through candidates’ program of study if you count their initial licensure phase. Using both instructor ratings and candidate self-assessment ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings compare to the advanced candidates’ own perceptions of their performance. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80%of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Meets Expectations”) or better on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, which has a 4-point scale (0-3). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **On-Campus** |  | |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **2** | | **4** |
| PDM, EE1: 2a | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 2b | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 2c | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5a | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5b | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5c | 100% | | 100% |
| **Count** | **14** | | **1** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | | 100% |
| **Count** | **20** | | **4** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4b | 100% | | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 1 | 100% | | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 2 | 95% | | 100% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **Distance Education** |  |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **5** | **20** |
| PDM, EE1: 2a | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 2b | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 2c | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5a | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5b | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **16** | **11** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **15** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4b | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 1 | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 2 | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Elementary Education MAT** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015  Distance Ed** | | **Spring 2015**  **Distance Ed** | |
|  | **Count** | **2** | **6** | **0** | **0** |
| **Assessment of Professional Educator Dispositions** |  | **Instructor Midpt Eval** | **Candidate Midpt Self-Assess** | **Instructor Midpt Eval** | **Candidate Midpt Self-Assess** |
| APED: Impact | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 33.33% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 66.67% |  |  |
| APED: Professional Identity and Continuous Growth | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 33.33% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 66.67% |  |  |
| APED: Leadership | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 66.67% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 33.33% |  |  |
| APED: Advocacy | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 3 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 50.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 3 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 50.00% |  |  |
| APED: Collaboration | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 33.33% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 66.67% |  |  |
| APED: Ethics | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 100.00% | 33.33% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 0.00% | 66.67% |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the MAT program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 3. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty assessment of candidates’ dispositions is not always in alignment with candidates’ self-assessments. On all six areas of the dispositions, candidate rate themselves as “Exceeds Expectations” at a higher rate than faculty do. This will become an area of targeted focus for program faculty to review in the next academic year to better understand this phenomenon; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 4: Candidates model and apply technology standards to design, implement, and assess developmentally‐appropriate learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, a new data source is currently being developed. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The data source for SLO 4 is currently in development. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **On-Campus** |  |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **2** | **4** |
| PDM, EE1: 5a | 100% | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5b | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **14** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3g | 100% | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **20** | **4** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Delivery** | **Distance Education** |  | |
| **Semester** | **Spring**  **2014** | | **Fall**  **2014** |
| **Count** | **5** | | **20** |
| PDM, EE1: 5a | 100% | | 100% |
| PDM, EE1: 5b | 100% | | 100% |
| **Count** | **16** | | **11** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3g | 100% | | 100% |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | | 100% |
| **Count** | **15** | | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year.

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year. Therefore, there are no changes planned. |

**College: \_\_\_College of Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_Reading and Elementary Education\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program:\_ M.Ed. in Elementary Education**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| All students met the expectations associated with the Teacher Inquiry Project. Based on the data collected, achievement continues to be strong and no changes were needed. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1 (revised 2015 report): Advanced program candidates are able to demonstrate and apply content knowledge and skills specific to their content area or discipline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, an existing data source was identified: 1) The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project. Specific indicators as aligned with SLO 1 are indicated below. These indicators are different from the 2014 data report. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project is a two part project that collectively is designed to be the capstone experience of this program. The project will be completed in *ELED 6203 Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners* and *ELED 6303 Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis in the Elementary Classroom*, but it will require candidates to synthesize and apply knowledge from other courses (e.g., *ELED 6202 Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners*) taken earlier in the program. Through the Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project, the candidate will demonstrate content and curriculum expertise by researching a content area. In part A of the project, the candidate will show advanced content area knowledge appropriate for masters’ level teacher candidates by developing content-pedagogy strategies specific to the in the instructional needs of the diverse learners they teach, based on the contextual factors of the classroom and the school. Instruction will be designed to reflect cultural needs, learning differences, behavioral differences, and diverse learning styles. Instruction will reflect expertise in understanding and instructing using higher order thinking skills (revised Bloom’s taxonomy), effective intervention strategies, and teaching to multiple intelligences. For these reasons, the specific indicators on the TIP Project align with the revised SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The TIP Part A (EE 2A) is evaluated using a rubric developed by faculty of the program in ELED 6203: Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners. There are eight major areas assessed on the TIP Part A (also known as EE2A). Six of these areas are used to measure candidate content and curriculum expertise: 1) 3A Using Content Knowledge; 2) 3C: Identifying Key Concepts; 3) 3D: Identifying Essential Understandings; 4) 3E: Developing Higher Order Lesson Plans; 5) 3F: Using Appropriate Differentiations; 6) 3H: Reflecting on Practice**.** These areas collectively represent the advanced content knowledge and pedagogical skills that candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for master’s-level licensure at the end of their programs. The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The rubric is completed by the course instructor.  For the TIP, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% or higher of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the TIP rubric indicators listed above. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** | | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **5** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3a | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** |  | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | **Spring 2015** | **Spring 2015 Distance Ed** |
| **ELED TIP Part A (EE 2A)** | **Count** | **0** | **6** | **1** | **4** |
| 3A Using Content Knowledge | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 33.33% | 0.00% | 25.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 66.67% | 100.00% | 75.00% |
| 3C: Identifying Key Concepts | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 25.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 100.00% | 100.00% | 75.00% |
| 3D: Identifying Essential Understandings | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 50.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 50.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| 3E: Developing Higher Order Lesson Plans | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 16.67% | 0.00% | 25.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 5 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 83.33% | 100.00% | 75.00% |
| 3F: Using Appropriate Differentiations | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 16.67% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 5 | 1 | 4 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 83.33% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| 3H: Reflecting on Practice | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 50.00% | 0.00% | 25.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 50.00% | 100.00% | 75.00% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the M.Ed. program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 1. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, faculty will review any area where the overall candidate average is less than 2.8. For 2015 data, this would include 3H: Reflecting on Practice (overall average 2.75). However no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 2: Advanced program candidates use domain-specific research and evidence to demonstrate leadership in developing high quality learning environments. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, an existing data source was identified: 1) The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project. Specific indicators as aligned with SLO 2 are indicated below. These indicators are different from the 2014 data report. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis Project is a two part project that collectively is designed to be the capstone experience of this program. The project will be completed in *ELED 6203 Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners* and *ELED 6303 Teacher Inquiry and Data Analysis in the Elementary Classroom*, but it will require candidates to synthesize and apply knowledge from other courses (e.g., *ELED 6202 Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners*) taken earlier in the program. Through the Teacher Inquiry and Data-Analysis Project, the candidate will demonstrate content and curriculum expertise by researching a content area. In part A of the project, the candidate will show advanced content area knowledge appropriate for masters’ level teacher candidates by developing content-pedagogy strategies specific to the in the instructional needs of the diverse learners they teach, based on the contextual factors of the classroom and the school. These strategies are based on evidence of best practices as reflected in the research literature, and candidates must include documentation of this in their work. In Part B of the project, candidates will demonstrate their impact on student learning through pre/post-test and formative assessment data. Candidates collect these data within their own classrooms and then share these findings with colleagues. For these reasons, specific indicators on the TIP Project align with the revised SLO 2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The TIP Part A (EE 2A) is evaluated using a rubric developed by faculty of the program in ELED 6203: Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners. The TIP Part B (EE 2B) is evaluated in ELED 6203: Instructional Differentiation for 21st Century Learners. There are eight major areas assessed on the TIP Part A (also known as EE2A). Two of these are used to assess the candidate’s ability to facilitate learning through evidence-based practice informed by research: 1) 3B: Using Research Based Evidence; and 2) 3G: Effective Use of Diagnostic Data. There are three areas assessed on the TIP Part B, and all three are used to assess SLO 2: 1) 4A: Using Formative Data to Modify Instruction; 2) 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth; and 3) 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data. These areas collectively represent the ability to conduct and use evidence-based research to demonstrate leadership skills that advanced program candidates are required to demonstrate before being recommended for master’s-level licensure at the end of their programs. The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The rubric is completed by the course instructor.  For the TIP, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% or higher of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Proficient”) or better on the TIP rubric indicators listed above. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** | | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3d | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3e | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4a | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 1 (Analysis of Contextual Factors) | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Elementary Education MEd** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015** | **Fall 2015**  **Distance Ed** | **Spring 2015** | **Spring 2015 Distance Ed** |
| **ELED TIP Part A (EE 2A)** | **Count** | **0** | **6** | **1** | **4** |
| 3B: Using Research Based Evidence | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 25.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 6 | 1 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 100.00% | 100.00% | 75.00% |
| 3G: Effective Use of Diagnostic Data | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 50.00% | 0.00% | 50.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 50.00% | 100.00% | 50.00% |
| **ELED TIP Part B (EE 2B)** | **Count** |  | **4** | **2** | **1** |
| 4A: Using Formative Data to Modify Instruction | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 0.00% | 50.00% | 100.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 100.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |
| 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 25.00% | 50.00% | 100.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 75.00% | 50.00% | 0.00% |
| 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** |  | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 0.00% | 100.00% | 100.00% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 100.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the M.Ed. program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 2. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, two areas of focus for program faculty to review are 4B: Using Summative Data to Analyze Student Growth and 4C: Making Recommendations Based on Data. Indicator 4B had an overall performance average of 2.42 for Fall 2015-Spring 2015. Indicator 4C had an overall performance average of 2.33. While candidate scores are above the identified target performance outcomes for both these indicators, these total averages both fall below 2.5 and are the lowest on the TIP Project rubric. This will become an area of targeted focus for program faculty to review in the next academic year; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Advanced program candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, advocacy, and commitment to create supportive environments that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the course instructor on the program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate self- assessment ratings on program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills, advocacy, and commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the course instructor and the candidate during the identified program midpoint course are used. For the ELED M.Ed. program, these evaluations occur during ELED 6202 Classroom Management and Leadership for Diverse Learners, which is approximately half way through the program of study. Using both instructor ratings and candidate self-assessment ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings compare to the advanced candidates’ own perceptions of their performance. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, TaskStream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| The program expects 80% or higher of its candidates to obtain a score of 2 (“Meets Expectations”) or better on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, which has a 4-point scale (0-3). |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** | | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3b | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4b | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 1 (Analysis of Contextual Factors) | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: Other 2 (Evidence of Collaboration) | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **Elementary Education MEd** | | | |
|  | **Semester** | **Fall 2015  Distance Ed** | | **Spring 2015**  **Distance Ed** | |
|  | **Count** | **7** | **10** | **0** | **0** |
| **Assessment of Professional Educator Dispositions** |  | **Instructor Midpt Eval** | **Candidate Midpt Self-Assess** | **Instructor Midpt Eval** | **Candidate Midpt Self-Assess** |
| APED: Impact | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 5 | 4 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 71.43% | 40.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 2 | 6 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 28.57% | 60.00% |  |  |
| APED: Professional Identity and Continuous Growth | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 6 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 85.71% | 50.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 14.29% | 50.00% |  |  |
| APED: Leadership | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 6 | 8 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 85.71% | 80.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 1 | 2 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 14.29% | 20.00% |  |  |
| APED: Advocacy | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 6 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 85.71% | 50.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 14.29% | 50.00% |  |  |
| APED: Collaboration | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 6 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 85.71% | 50.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 14.29% | 50.00% |  |  |
| APED: Ethics | **Count of 1** | 0 | 0 |  |  |
| **% Score of 1** | 0.00% | 0.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 2** | 6 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 2** | 85.71% | 50.00% |  |  |
| **Count of 3** | 1 | 5 |  |  |
| **% Score of 3** | 14.29% | 50.00% |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the M.Ed. program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 3. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, it seems that the faculty assessment of candidates’ dispositions is not always in alignment with candidates’ self-assessments. On all six areas of the dispositions, candidate rate themselves as “Exceeds Expectations” at a higher rate than faculty do. This will become an area of targeted focus for program faculty to review in the next academic year to better understand this phenomenon; however no changes are identified to be made at this time. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 4: Candidates model and apply technology standards to design, implement, and assess developmentally‐appropriate learning experiences to engage students and improve learning. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, a new data source is currently being developed. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. A copy of the data collection instrument and any scoring rubrics associated with this student learning outcome are to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive. |
| The data source for SLO 4 is currently in development. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. *Example: 80% of the students assessed will achieve a score of “acceptable” or higher on the Oral Presentation Scoring Rubric. (*Note: a copy of the scoring rubric, complete with cell descriptors for each level of performance, is to be submitted electronically to the designated folder on the designated shared drive.) |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data** | | |
| **Semester** | **Spring 2014** | **Fall 2014** |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3g | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **1** | **2** |
| TIP, EE2A: 3h | 100% | 100% |
| **Count** | **5** | **1** |
| TIP, EE2B: 4c | 100% | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 report year.

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| We will continue to analyze data to find points of instructional and evaluative improvements. |

**College: \_\_**College of Education **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Department: \_\_**Reading and Elementary Education **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Program:** Masters of Education in Reading Education **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

|  |
| --- |
| **Reflection on the** **Continuous Improvement of Student Learning**  1. List the changes and improvements your program planned to implement as a result of last year’s student learning  outcomes assessment data.  2. Were all of the changes implemented? If not, please explain.  3. What impact did the changes have on student learning? |
| 1. Based upon the 2014 assessment data report, the Reading M.Ed. program determined all candidates were meeting the Student Learning Outcome goals. 2. No changes were needed in our READ courses and program. 3. N/A |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 1**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 1: Advanced program candidates are able to demonstrate and apply content knowledge and skills specific to their content area or discipline. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 1 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 1, one existing data source was identified: student’s presentation at the State Reading Conference. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:** Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. |
| Every Reading Education M.Ed. candidate must submit and present a [Reading Proposal/Presentation](file:///S:\coed\Shared\SACS%20Reports\12-13_ANNUAL_REPRTS\REEL\Masters\READ%20MED\SLO1_SLO2_SLO3_SLO4_SLO5_EE1_READ_MEd%20Rubric%20(revised).doc) for the State Reading Conference during the Master’s program. The Reading Presentation is completed during one required course: READ 6474 offered in the spring. This project requires teacher candidates to create a work product where candidates conduct a needs assessment that evaluates local, state, and national student performance data; develop a proposal for the State Reading Conference; implement the professional research presentation during a session at the conference, and reflect on the implementation and impact on student performance.  Because these presentations require candidates to synthesize their content knowledge into a focused, cohesive project, and because candidates apply this knowledge via a content presentation to colleagues, these indicators align to the revised SLO 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Reading Presentation is completed during one required course, READ 6474, which is offered in the spring. The components of the rubric that align with SLO 1 are:   * GTS 1a: Candidates review local, state, and national data on students’ performance to determine areas of need in the area of literacy instruction. * GTS 2a: Candidates select and design evidence-based strategies to meet the needs of all learners integrated into a positive learning environment.   The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The course instructor scores the work product using a rubric.  The scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, Taskstream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. |
| The program expects 80% of its students to score “2” or better (target/exemplary or proficient/accomplished) on a 3-point scale. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Count** | **3** |
| Needs Assessment :Analysis of National, state and local data to determine literacy needs: demonstrate in depth knowledge of content |  |
| Presentation & Reflection: Planning and development of research and standards-based content |  |
| Presentation & Reflection: Handout and website | 100% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Delivery/Count** | **DE/22** |
| Needs Assessment :Analysis of National, state and local data to determine literacy needs: demonstrate in depth knowledge of content | 100% |
| Presentation & Reflection: Planning and development of research and standards-based content | 100% |
| Presentation & Reflection: Handout and website |  |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Category** | **Fall 2015**  **Traditional & DE** | **Spring 2015 Traditional (N=2)** | **Spring 2015 DE (N=22)** |
| GTS 1a: Candidate review local, state, and national data on students’ performance to determine areas of need in the area of literacy instruction. | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% score of 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 2 | 19 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 100% | 86.36% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 0 | 3 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 0% | 13.64% |
| **Average** |  | 2.00 | 2.14 |
| **% Average** |  | 66.67% | 71.21% |
| GTS 2a:Candidates select and design evidence-based strategies to meet the needs of all learners integrated into a positive learning environment. | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% score of 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 2 | 2 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 100% | 100% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Average** |  | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| **% Average** |  | 66.67% | 66.67% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| All students were successful; no changes needed at this time. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. We are currently undergoing changes to improve our rubrics to meet CAEP minimal rubric requirements. These changes are also forcing us to consider how we assess candidates for this presentation. Any additional changes or strategies for improvement identified in 2016-17 will be reported next year, and the new rubric will also be used. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 2**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 2: Advanced program candidates use domain-specific research and evidence to demonstrate leadership in developing high quality learning environments. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 2 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 2, one data source was identified: student’s presentation at the State Reading Conference. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. |
| Every Reading Education M.Ed. candidate must submit and present a [Reading Proposal/Presentation](file:///S:\coed\Shared\SACS%20Reports\12-13_ANNUAL_REPRTS\REEL\Masters\READ%20MED\SLO1_SLO2_SLO3_SLO4_SLO5_EE1_READ_MEd%20Rubric%20(revised).doc) for the State Reading Conference during the Master’s program. It is completed during one required course: READ 6474 offered in the Spring. This project requires teacher candidates to create a work product where candidates conduct a needs assessment that evaluates local, state, and national student performance data; develop a proposal for the State Reading Conference; implement the Professional Development session at the conference, and reflect on the implementation and impact this Professional Development on student performance.  Because these presentations require candidates to develop the strategy for their proposal based on data, research, and evidence-based practice, these indicators align to the revised SLO 2. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| The Reading Presentation is completed during one required course, READ 6474, which is offered in the spring. The components of the rubric that align with SLO 2 are:   * GTS 3a: Candidate integrates literacy research, theory, and practice using appropriate data sources. * GTS 4a: Candidate designs a professional conference presentation informed by research, is evidence-based, and contributes to the field.   The instructor of the course scores the work product using a rubric. The rubric is on a 3-point scale: 1=Not Met, 2=Proficient, 3=Accomplished. The course instructor scores the work product using a rubric.  The scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, Taskstream. Scores are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to faculty within the College of Education. The data is discussed during REEL Leadership Council meetings as well as a department’s faculty meeting at least once per semester. In these meetings, next steps determined to address any needs identified. All strategies determined during this closing the loop discussion are implemented during the next academic year. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. |
| The program expects 80% of its students to score “2” or better (target/exemplary or proficient/accomplished) on a 3 point scale. |

**Assessment Data:** NOTE: our data sources have changed; therefore there will be **two tables** here – one for Spring 2014-Fall 2014 data, and one for Spring 2015-Fall 2015 data.

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Count** | **0** |
| Needs Assessment : Analysis of national, state and local data to determine literacy needs: ability to critique research; ability to analyze and synthesize data |  |
| Presentation & Reflection: Planning and development of research and standards-based content |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Delivery** | **DE** |
| **Count** | **22** |
| Needs Assessment : Analysis of national, state and local data to determine literacy needs: ability to critique research; ability to analyze and synthesize data | 100% |
| Presentation & Reflection: Planning and development of research and standards-based content | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Category** | **Fall 2015**  **Traditional & DE** | **Spring 2015 Traditional (N=2)** | **Spring 2015 DE (N=22)** |
| GTS 3a: Candidate integrates literacy research, theory, and practice using appropriate data sources. | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% score of 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 1 | 2 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 50% | 9.09% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 1 | 20 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 50% | 90.91% |
| **Average** |  | 2.50 | 2.91 |
| **% Average** |  | 83.33% | 96.97% |
| GTS 4a:Candidate designs a professional conference presentation informed by research, is evidence-based, and contributes to the field. | **Count of 1** |  | 0 | 0 |
| **% score of 1** |  | 0% | 0% |
| **Count of 2** |  | 0 | 10 |
| **% Score of 2** |  | 0% | 45.45% |
| **Count of 3** |  | 2 | 12 |
| **% Score of 3** |  | 100% | 54.55% |
| **Average** |  | 3.00 | 2.55 |
| **% Average** |  | 100% | 84.85% |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| All students were successful; no changes needed at this time. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. We are currently undergoing changes to improve our rubrics to meet CAEP minimal rubric requirements. These changes are also forcing us to consider how we assess candidates for this presentation. Any additional changes or strategies for improvement identified in 2016-17 will be reported next year, and the new rubric will also be used. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 3**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| Revised SLO 3: Advanced program candidates demonstrate knowledge, skills, advocacy, and commitment to create supportive environments that afford all P‐12 students access to rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to their learning needs. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 3 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 3, two existing data sources were identified: 1) candidate ratings by the course instructor on the program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions); and 2) candidate self- assessment ratings on program midpoint Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions. The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions evaluates candidates on their ability to display appropriate professional dispositions. These dispositions include demonstrating skills, advocacy, and commitment to providing a rigorous and relevant curriculum specific to individual learner needs Both of these data sources, therefore, align to the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. |
| The COED Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions is an internal rubric developed collaboratively by the faculty in the College of Education and vetted by our Professional Education Committee, which is made up of faculty from the College of Education, the College of Arts + Architecture, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, and the P12 school community. The assessment evaluates candidates on six dispositions areas: Impact, Professional Identity, Leadership, Advocacy, Collaboration, and Ethics. Candidates are rated on a 4-level rubric (0-3). Collectively, these six areas are defined as our Professional Educator Dispositions. For these reasons, the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions serves as an effective measure of the revised SLO 3. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| Candidates are assessed on the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions at three points during the program; however, for SLO 3, the assessments completed by the course instructor and the candidate during the identified program midpoint course are used. For the READ M.Ed. program, these evaluations occur during READ 6255: Middle Secondary Reading and Writing, which is approximately half way through the program of study. Using both instructor ratings and candidate self-assessment ratings allows faculty to compare how our internal faculty ratings compare to the advanced candidates’ own perceptions of their performance. The rubric has 4 levels: 0 = Not Observed, 1 = Does Not Meet Expectations, 2 = Meets Expectations, and 3 = Exceeds Expectations.  For the Assessment of Professional Education Dispositions, scores are collected using the College’s electronic data management system, Taskstream. Data are provided to program faculty bi-annually by the COED Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Simple descriptive statistics are used to analyze the scores, and disaggregated findings are reported by term at the college and program levels. All data reports created by the College of Education are housed on a secure website which is accessible to all faculty within the College of Education. Beginning with AY 2015-16, COED program faculty meet at least once each semester to review these data and plan program improvements based on the results. These meetings are documented by program directors and department chairs and revisited at each subsequent meeting to monitor implementation progress. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. |
| The program expects 80% of its students to score “2” or better (target/exemplary or proficient/accomplished) on a 3 point scale. |

**Spring 2014-Fall 2014 Assessment Data**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Count** | **4** |
| Professional Disposition Evaluation (READ 6255) | 100% |
| Professional Disposition Evaluation (READ 6260) |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **2014** |
| **Delivery** | **DE** |
| **Count** | **22** |
| Professional Disposition Evaluation (READ 6255) | 100% |
| Professional Disposition Evaluation (READ 6260) | 100% |

**Spring 2015-Fall 2015 Assessment Data**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Program** | **READ MEd** | |
|  | **Semester** | **Spring 2015**  **Distance Ed\*** | |
|  | **Count** | **5** | **5** |
| **Assessment of Professional Educator Dispositions** |  | **Instruc Midpt Eval** | **Candidate Midpt Self-Assess** |
| APED: Impact | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** | 0% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 4 | 5 |
| **% Score of 3** | 80% | 100.00% |
| APED: Professional Identity and Continuous Growth | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 2 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** | 40.00% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 2 | 5 |
| **% Score of 3** | 40.00% | 100.00% |
| APED: Leadership | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** | 0% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 4 | 5 |
| **% Score of 3** | 80.00% | 100.00% |
| APED: Advocacy | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 4 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** | 80.00% | 20.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 0 | 4 |
| **% Score of 3** | 0% | 80.00% |
| APED: Collaboration | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 0 | 0 |
| **% Score of 2** | 0% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 4 | 5 |
| **% Score of 3** | 80.00% | 100.00% |
| APED: Ethics | **Count of 1** | 1 | 0 |
| **% Score of 1** | 20% | 0.00% |
| **Count of 2** | 0 | 1 |
| **% Score of 2** | 0% | 20.00% |
| **Count of 3** | 4 | 4 |
| **% Score of 3** | 80.00% | 80.00% |

*\*Due to a miscommunication, not all candidates were assessed in Taskstream. This will be an area for improvement to target for the 2016 reports.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| Data indicated that candidates in the M.Ed. program met the targeted performance outcomes for revised SLO 3. However, the College of Education is focused on continuous improvement based on data-based decision-making. Based on the data presented here, it seems that the faculty assessment of candidates’ dispositions is not always in alignment with candidates’ self-assessments. On five of the six areas of the dispositions, candidate rate themselves as “Exceeds Expectations” at a higher rate than faculty do. This will become an area of targeted focus for program faculty to review in the next academic year to better understand this phenomenon. In addition, targeted efforts will be made to focus on making sure faculty and students fully understand and use Taskstream to manage the dispositions assessments. Any additional changes or strategies for improvement identified in 2016-17 will be reported next year. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Student Learning Outcome 4**  (knowledge, skill or ability to be assessed) |
| SLO 4: Advanced program candidates apply technology standards to design, implement and assess learning experiences/environments to engage children/students, improve learning, and enrich professional practice. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to the Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan:** If any changes were made to the assessment plan (which includes the Student Learning Outcome, Effectiveness Measure, Methodology and Performance Outcome) for this student learning outcome since your last report was submitted, briefly summarize the changes made and the rationale for the changes. |
| In 2013, the College of Education accrediting body, the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP), released new standards for educator preparation programs. To better align with these standards, the College of Education faculty have collaboratively worked this year to revise our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). In addition, the UNC Charlotte Office of Assessment recommends that programs revisit SLOs every 3-5 years to ensure that SLOs accurately assess student learning. As a result, SLO 4 has been changed as indicated above.  To assess the revised SLO 4, one new data source is being developed: Assessing Technology Knowledge (draft title).  This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Effectiveness Measure:**  Identify the data collection instrument, e.g., exam, project, paper, etc. that will be used to gauge acquisition of this student learning outcome and explain how it assesses the desired knowledge, skill or ability. |
| The data source for SLO 4 is currently in development. This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Methodology:** Describe when, where and how the assessment of this student learning outcome will be administered and evaluated. Describe the process the department will use to collect, analyze and disseminate the assessment data to program faculty and to decide the changes/improvements to make on the basis of the assessment data. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance Outcome:** Identify the percentage of students assessed that should be able to demonstrate proficiency in this student learning outcome and the level of proficiency expected. |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 reports. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Fall 2015-Spring 2015 Assessment Data** |
| There are no data currently available for the revised SLO 4. Data will be reported for the 2016 year. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Changes to be implemented Fall 2016:** Based upon the 2015 assessment data included in this annual report, what changes/improvements will the program implement during the next academic year to improve performance on this student learning outcome? |
| This assessment measure will be embedded into program coursework and reported on in the 2016 report. |

**INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS REPORT ASSESSMENT FINDINGS:**

Attach the 2015-16 Institutional Effectiveness Report template with assessment findings.