

**Assurance of Student Learning  
2019-2020**

College of Education and Behavioral Sciences

School of Teacher Education

Elementary Education (527)

Sue Keeseey, Interim Director

**Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.**

**\*\* We acknowledge that our students' success rates were lower than the previous year, but also understand that all of our students are teachers who had outside demands placed on them as a result of COVID-19.**

**Student Learning Outcome 1:** Students will demonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher.

<b>Instrument 1</b>	Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – PLT K-6
<b>Instrument 2</b>	Proprietary Assessment (Direct): Praxis II – Content Areas
<b>Instrument 3</b>	N/A

<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
--	------------	----------------

**Student Learning Outcome 2:** Students will apply knowledge of content and pedagogy to teach effectively.

<b>Instrument 1</b>	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 6: Design for Instruction (scored by rubric)
<b>Instrument 2</b>	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample (scored by rubric)
<b>Instrument 3</b>	N/A

<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
--	------------	----------------

<b>Student Learning Outcome 3: Students will analyze student learning using assessments.</b>		
<b>Instrument 1</b>	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment (scored by rubric)	
<b>Instrument 2</b>	Direct: CAEP Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning (scored by rubric)	
<b>Instrument 3</b>	N/A	
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>		<b>Met</b>
<b>Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)</b>		<b>Not Met</b>

**Student Learning Outcome 1**

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Students will demonstrate the content knowledge and pedagogy necessary to be a teacher.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<p><b>DIRECT measure: Praxis Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) K–6</b></p> <p>This standardized test measures teacher candidates’ knowledge of the foundation of teaching required of beginning educators. It is usually completed near the end of the undergraduate program to reflect pedagogical understanding gained through their educator preparation program. Teacher candidates must pass the PLT before teacher certification is granted by the State.</p>		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	<p>The overall pass rate for students on the Praxis PLT K-6 Exam will be no less than 95%, and on each Praxis Content Category, students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.</p> <p>The Content Categories are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Students as Learners</li> <li>● Instructional Process</li> <li>● Assessment</li> <li>● Professional Development, Leadership, and Community</li> <li>● Analysis of Instructional Scenarios</li> </ul>		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	<p>The 2019-2020 data show that 100% of student test takers passed the Praxis PLT K-6 exam. On each Content Category, the percentage target 70% of available points was achieved on each of the content categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Students as Learners -- 73%</li> <li>● Instructional Process -- 76%</li> <li>● Assessment -- 75%</li> <li>● Professional Development, Leadership, and Community -- 82%</li> <li>● Analysis of Instructional Scenarios -- 84%</li> </ul>	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>100% of students passed PLT exam AND ALL indicators had greater than 70% success rate.</b>

<b>Methods</b>	Teacher candidates complete the PLT at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. This is a timed, computer-based standardized test. It includes both grade- specific and general knowledge about teaching questions. Not all questions are scored as several are used for norming to develop future questions. Scores are reported directly to WKU.
<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<b>DIRECT measure: Praxis Subject Assessments</b> Teacher candidates must pass standardized subject assessments for all content areas they will be certified to teach. Certification does not occur until all assessments are passed. These exams are completed near the completion of the undergraduate program to ensure teacher candidates have the necessary content knowledge to successfully improve student learning outcomes.
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	<p>The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Social Studies, Math, Reading/Language Arts, and Science will be no less than 70%. On each Praxis Content Category, students will earn an average of at least 70% of the available points.</p> <p>The categories are:</p> <p>Social Studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. US History, Government, Citizenship</li> <li>II. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology</li> <li>III. World History, Economics</li> </ol> <p>Mathematics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Numbers and Operations</li> <li>II. Algebraic Thinking</li> <li>III. Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability</li> </ol> <p>Reading/Language Arts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Reading</li> <li>II. Writing, Speaking, Listening</li> </ol> <p>Science:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. Earth Science</li> <li>II. Life Science</li> <li>III. Physical Science</li> </ol> <p><b>Social Studies</b></p> <p>The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Social Studies (target of 70%) was 79% (N=128 with 101 passing). For each Praxis Content Category (compared to the targeted 70%), the following level was achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. US History, Government, Citizenship -- 65%</li> </ol>

	<p>II. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology -- 64%</p> <p>III. World History, Economics -- 63%</p> <p><b>Mathematics:</b>  The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Mathematics (target of 70%) was 89% (N=114 with 102 passing). For each Praxis Content Category (compared to the targeted 70%), the following level was achieved:</p> <p>I. Numbers and Operations- 82%</p> <p>II. Algebraic Thinking -- 66%</p> <p>III. Geometry and Measurement, Data, Statistics, and Probability -- 67%</p> <p><b>Reading/Language Arts:</b>  The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Reading/Language Arts (target of 70%) was 91% (N=111 with 101 passing). For each Praxis Content Category (compared to the targeted 70%), the following level was achieved:</p> <p>I. Reading -- 70%</p> <p>II. Writing, Speaking, Listening -- 71%</p> <p><b>Science:</b>  The overall average score across all students on the Praxis II Content Area Exam for Elementary in Reading/Language Arts (target of 70%) was 83% (N=120 with 100 passing). For each Praxis Content Category (compared to the targeted 70%), the following level was achieved:</p> <p>I. Earth Science -- 66%</p> <p>II. Life Science -- 74%</p> <p>III. Physical Science -- 72%</p>		
<p><b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b></p>	<p>70% overall on each of the 4 content areas;  70% of points available on each content category</p>	<p><b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b></p>	<p><b>4 of the 4 content areas had at or above 70% success rate;</b></p> <p><b>NOT MET: 6 of the 11 content categories did not have 70% or higher percentage of points scores</b></p>

<b>Methods</b>	Similar to the other Praxis exams, teacher candidates must complete the subject assessments at an approved testing site. Proper identification is required and stringent testing protocol is followed. These are timed, computer-based standardized tests. The elementary education certification requirement includes subject assessments in math, reading and language arts, science, and social studies.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>		<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	
<b>Methods</b>			
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.</b>		<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
<p>We will continue to work with our students to prepare them in the areas of content that they need to be more robust in their content areas: Social Studies continues to need attention as it is the lowest performance content area overall for our students and in the break-down of content areas as well:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I. US History, Government, Citizenship -- 65%</li> <li>II. Geography, Anthropology, Sociology -- 64%</li> <li>III. World History, Economics -- 63%</li> </ul> <p>A way that we are going to work on this is to hone our focus in our SS Methods course to bring our overall pass rate up as well.</p> <p>We also recognize that we have areas of concern that we plan to educate our colleagues beyond our college about so that our efforts to help our preservice teachers broaden beyond our walls. For example, the mathematics department has been determined to continue with the requirement for our students to take the three content courses for elementary teachers in mathematics, but in turn, needs to help us prepare our students for passing this content exam.</p> <p>For science and social studies content taught outside of the College of Education and Behavior Sciences, it is important for us to work with these faculty to better determine how to help prepare our preservice teachers.</p>			

**Follow-Up** (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

We plan to talk with the mathematics department Fall 2020 to help with a preparation program.

We will talk with the Center for Literacy for supporting students in preparing for Praxis II.

**Next Assessment Cycle Plan** (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)

When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note *when* it will be assessed again.

Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.

This can be assessed again in Fall 2020 and Spring 2021. Collect Praxis II data.

**Student Learning Outcome 2**

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	Students will apply knowledge of content and pedagogy to teach effectively.																																		
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<p>Direct: Key Assessment 6: Design for instruction</p> <p>This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design effective instruction based on pre-assessment results. They must use their knowledge of students, the classroom environment, teaching methods, and students' prior knowledge to determine the most effective strategy of instruction.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="495 431 1682 716"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>Ave. Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>DI 2</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>8.3% (5)</td> <td>63.3% (38)</td> <td>28.3% (17)</td> <td>3.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 3</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>28.3% (17)</td> <td>63.3% (38)</td> <td>8.3% (5)</td> <td>2.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 4</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>8.3% (5)</td> <td>68.3% (41)</td> <td>23.3% (14)</td> <td>3.15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>DI 5</td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>8.3% (5)</td> <td>68.3% (41)</td> <td>23.3% (14)</td> <td>3.15</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						1	2	3	4	Ave. Score	DI 2	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	63.3% (38)	28.3% (17)	3.2	DI 3	0% (0)	28.3% (17)	63.3% (38)	8.3% (5)	2.8	DI 4	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	68.3% (41)	23.3% (14)	3.15	DI 5	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	68.3% (41)	23.3% (14)	3.15
	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score																														
DI 2	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	63.3% (38)	28.3% (17)	3.2																														
DI 3	0% (0)	28.3% (17)	63.3% (38)	8.3% (5)	2.8																														
DI 4	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	68.3% (41)	23.3% (14)	3.15																														
DI 5	0% (0)	8.3% (5)	68.3% (41)	23.3% (14)	3.15																														
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The overall success rate for success rate for all students on the Design for Instruction Key Assessment will be <b>no less than 80%</b> scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and <b>no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.</b>																																		
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of or more students will score an average of 3 out of 4 on each of the Key Assessment rubric indicators.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>MET: 3 of the 4 indicators scored at or above a 3 of 4 for 80% or more of the student population.</b>  <b>NOT MET: 1 of the 4 indicators</b>																																
<b>Methods</b>	This data is collected each semester as part of ELED 465. Faculty evaluated this assignment, which requires teacher candidates to use pre-assessment data to plan a unit of instruction. They must reflect on the data and justify instructional decisions in terms of content and methods. In addition, teacher candidates create formal formative assessments and make plans to differentiate instruction for students in the classroom. This is a detailed document explaining the learning goals, objectives of the lesson, instructional methods, assessments and modifications/accommodations for different students.																																		



**Measurement Instrument  
2**

**Direct: Key Assessment 7: Teacher Work Sample**

This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to design a unit of instruction from beginning to end. Teacher candidates design a pre and post assessment, instructional strategies, lesson plans, describe and evaluate the learning context, differentiate for students' needs, use formative and summative assessments to evaluate student learning, analyze assessment data and reflect on their own practice as a teacher.

	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score
Holistic	0% (0)	28.2% (11)	69.2% (27)	2.6% (1)	2.74
CF 1	2.6% (1)	5.1% (2)	51.3% (20)	41.0% (16)	3.31
CF 2	2.6% (1)	5.1% (2)	69.2% (27)	23.1% (9)	3.13
CF 3	2.6% (1)	7.7% (3)	31.8% (28)	17.9% (7)	3.05
LG1	0% (0)	35.9% (14)	64.1% (25)	0% (0)	2.64
LG2	10.3% (4)	25.6% (10)	59% (23)	5.1% (2)	2.59
LG3	2.6% (1)	25.6% (10)	64.1% (25)	7.7% (3)	2.77
LG4	17.9% (7)	20.5% (8)	56.4% (22)	5.1% (2)	2.49
LG5	0% (0)	5.1% (2)	92.3% (36)	2.6% (1)	2.97
LG6	7.7% (3)	17.9% (7)	66.7% (26)	7.7% (3)	2.74
LG7	10.3% (4)	17.9% (7)	56.4% (22)	12.8% (5)	2.67
LG8	0% (0)	15.4% (6)	74.4% (29)	10.3% (4)	2.95
LG9	2.6% (1)	17.9% (7)	74.4% (29)	5.1% (2)	2.82
DI1	0% (0)	10.3% (4)	61.5% (24)	28.2% (11)	3.18
DI2	0% (0)	17.9% (7)	61.5% (24)	23.1% (9)	3.13
DI3	5.1% (2)	15.4% (6)	56.4% (22)	23.1% (9)	2.97
DI4	0% (0)	17.9% (7)	51.3% (20)	30.8% (12)	3.13
DI5	7.7% (3)	12.8% (5)	56.4% (22)	23.1% (9)	2.95
ASL1	0% (0)	12.8% (5)	48.7% (19)	38.5% (15)	3.26

	ASL2	0% (0)	20.5% (8)	61.5% (24)	17.9% (7)	2.97	
	ASL3	0% (0)	17.9% (7)	66.7% (26)	15.4% (6)	3.03	
	ASL4	2.6% (1)	17.9% (7)	66.7% (26)	12.8% (5)	2.90	
	ROT1	0% (0)	5.1% (2)	84.6% (33)	10.3% (4)	3.05	
	ROT2	0% (0)	20.5% (8)	48.7% (19)	17.9% (7)	2.59	
	ROT3	0% (0)	48.7% (18)	46.2% (18)	5.1% (2)	2.51	
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The overall success rate for success rate for all students on holistic score the Teacher Work Sample will be 100% scoring 2 or above and, at least 70% of the students scoring 3 or higher out of 4 possible points on the rubric; and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.						
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	95% of students will score no lower than an average of 2 out of 4 holistic rubric points on the Key Assessment rubric and the individual rubric dimension indicators average score across all students will be 3 out of 4 at a rate 70% or higher.			<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>		<b>MET: 22 of the 24 indicators had at or above a 3 of 4 for 70% or more of the student population. 10 of the 22 had at or above the 3.0 or above overall average across all scores with the entire population.</b>  <b>NOT MET: 12 of the 24 indicators</b>	
<b>Methods</b>	This capstone project is a requirement of the EDU 489 course, which all students take during their student teaching semester, which is their final semester. All students will design a unit of instruction including pre- & post test, lessons, formative assessments, differentiated instruction, and analysis of student learning.						
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	N/A						
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>							
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>				<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>			

<b>Methods</b>		
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.</b>	<b>Met</b>	<b>Not Met</b>
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)		
Design for Instruction and Reflection on Teaching are two of the indicators where students do not meet our determined goal for success. We will focus on a review of our formative preparation in “Block II” courses, especially the Senior Project course, ELED 465, and in their Student Teaching Seminar course, EDU 489, where the Teacher Work Sample is used as a Summative Assessment.		
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)		
Our follow-up will begin immediately, Fall 2020, as we are using these assessments in our courses and need to enact measures to better prepare our students.		
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)		
When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note <i>when</i> it will be assessed again.  Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.		
This will be assessed again each semester – Fall 2020 and Spring 2021. ELED 465 and EDU 489 are contributing courses to the data collection in this assessment cycle plan.		

### Student Learning Outcome 3

<b>Student Learning Outcome</b>	<b>Students will</b> analyze student learning using assessments.																																																												
<b>Measurement Instrument 1</b>	<p><b>NOTE: Each student learning outcome should have at least one direct measure of student learning. Indirect measures are not required.</b></p> <p>Direct: Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals &amp; Pre/Post Assessment</p> <p>This Key Assessment requires all teacher candidates to demonstrate their ability to set learning targets and design assessments that align to the content standards.</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th style="background-color: #fce4d6;">1</th> <th style="background-color: #fce4d6;">2</th> <th style="background-color: #fce4d6;">3</th> <th style="background-color: #fce4d6;">4</th> <th style="background-color: #fce4d6;">Ave. Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>LGA 1</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>5.08% (3)</td> <td>66.1% (39)</td> <td>43.6% (17)</td> <td>3.24</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 2</b></td> <td>3.4% (2)</td> <td>11.9% (7)</td> <td>59.3% (35)</td> <td>25.4% (15)</td> <td>3.06</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 3</b></td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>10.2% (6)</td> <td>62.7% (37)</td> <td>25.4% (15)</td> <td>3.12</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 4</b></td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>16.9% (10)</td> <td>61.0% (36)</td> <td>20.3% (12)</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 5</b></td> <td>3.4% (2)</td> <td>6.8% (4)</td> <td>64.4% (38)</td> <td>25.4% (15)</td> <td>3.19</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 6</b></td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>71.2% (42)</td> <td>25.4% (15)</td> <td>3.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 7</b></td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>8.5% (5)</td> <td>71.2% (42)</td> <td>18.6% (11)</td> <td>3.07</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 8</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>74.6% (44)</td> <td>23.7% (14)</td> <td>3.22</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>LGA 9</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>1.7% (1)</td> <td>74.6% (44)</td> <td>23.7% (14)</td> <td>3.22</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		1	2	3	4	Ave. Score	<b>LGA 1</b>	0% (0)	5.08% (3)	66.1% (39)	43.6% (17)	3.24	<b>LGA 2</b>	3.4% (2)	11.9% (7)	59.3% (35)	25.4% (15)	3.06	<b>LGA 3</b>	1.7% (1)	10.2% (6)	62.7% (37)	25.4% (15)	3.12	<b>LGA 4</b>	1.7% (1)	16.9% (10)	61.0% (36)	20.3% (12)	3	<b>LGA 5</b>	3.4% (2)	6.8% (4)	64.4% (38)	25.4% (15)	3.19	<b>LGA 6</b>	1.7% (1)	1.7% (1)	71.2% (42)	25.4% (15)	3.2	<b>LGA 7</b>	1.7% (1)	8.5% (5)	71.2% (42)	18.6% (11)	3.07	<b>LGA 8</b>	0% (0)	1.7% (1)	74.6% (44)	23.7% (14)	3.22	<b>LGA 9</b>	0% (0)	1.7% (1)	74.6% (44)	23.7% (14)	3.22
	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score																																																								
<b>LGA 1</b>	0% (0)	5.08% (3)	66.1% (39)	43.6% (17)	3.24																																																								
<b>LGA 2</b>	3.4% (2)	11.9% (7)	59.3% (35)	25.4% (15)	3.06																																																								
<b>LGA 3</b>	1.7% (1)	10.2% (6)	62.7% (37)	25.4% (15)	3.12																																																								
<b>LGA 4</b>	1.7% (1)	16.9% (10)	61.0% (36)	20.3% (12)	3																																																								
<b>LGA 5</b>	3.4% (2)	6.8% (4)	64.4% (38)	25.4% (15)	3.19																																																								
<b>LGA 6</b>	1.7% (1)	1.7% (1)	71.2% (42)	25.4% (15)	3.2																																																								
<b>LGA 7</b>	1.7% (1)	8.5% (5)	71.2% (42)	18.6% (11)	3.07																																																								
<b>LGA 8</b>	0% (0)	1.7% (1)	74.6% (44)	23.7% (14)	3.22																																																								
<b>LGA 9</b>	0% (0)	1.7% (1)	74.6% (44)	23.7% (14)	3.22																																																								
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The overall success rate for all students on the Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of nine rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.																																																												

<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of students will score a 3 or 4 of 4 points on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>MET:</b> <b>9 of 9 indicators had at or above a 3 or 4 for 80% or more of the student population and an average of 3.0 or greater on each indicator.</b>																														
<b>Methods</b>	This data is collected each semester as part of ELED 465. Faculty evaluate this instrument, which requires teacher candidates to create 2 learning goals aligned to state standards that reflect the needs of the students in the classroom and the content to be taught. Teacher candidates will also create a summative assessment to give to students prior to instruction and after instruction of lessons. This assessment includes a variety of question types and aims to give the best picture of the students' understanding of the content.																																
<b>Measurement Instrument 2</b>	<p>Direct: Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning</p> <p>The overall success rate for success rate for all students on the Analysis of Student Learning will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="491 831 1772 1133"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>1</th> <th>2</th> <th>3</th> <th>4</th> <th>Ave. Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><b>ASL 1</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>1.2% (1)</td> <td>40.2% (33)</td> <td>58.5% (48)</td> <td>3.57</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 2</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>6.1% (5)</td> <td>50% (41)</td> <td>43.9% (36)</td> <td>3.38</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 3</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>7.3% (6)</td> <td>26.8% (22)</td> <td>65.9% (54)</td> <td>3.59</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>ASL 4</b></td> <td>0% (0)</td> <td>7.3% (6)</td> <td>32.9% (27)</td> <td>59.8% (49)</td> <td>3.52</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				1	2	3	4	Ave. Score	<b>ASL 1</b>	0% (0)	1.2% (1)	40.2% (33)	58.5% (48)	3.57	<b>ASL 2</b>	0% (0)	6.1% (5)	50% (41)	43.9% (36)	3.38	<b>ASL 3</b>	0% (0)	7.3% (6)	26.8% (22)	65.9% (54)	3.59	<b>ASL 4</b>	0% (0)	7.3% (6)	32.9% (27)	59.8% (49)	3.52
	1	2	3	4	Ave. Score																												
<b>ASL 1</b>	0% (0)	1.2% (1)	40.2% (33)	58.5% (48)	3.57																												
<b>ASL 2</b>	0% (0)	6.1% (5)	50% (41)	43.9% (36)	3.38																												
<b>ASL 3</b>	0% (0)	7.3% (6)	26.8% (22)	65.9% (54)	3.59																												
<b>ASL 4</b>	0% (0)	7.3% (6)	32.9% (27)	59.8% (49)	3.52																												
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>	The overall success rate for success rate for all students on Analysis of Student Learning will be no less 80% scoring a 3 of 4 points on each of four rubric categories, and no average score across all students in any indicator is less than 3.0.																																
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>	80% of students will score a 3 or 4 or 4 points on the Key Assessment rubric and on no individual rubric dimension will the average score across all students be less than 3.0.	<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	<b>4 of 4 indicators had at or above a 3 or 4 for 80% or more of the student population and an</b>																														

			<b>average of 3.0 or greater.</b>
<b>Methods</b>	This data is collected each semester as part of ELED 405. As part of the unit of instruction, students will use their assessment data from pre and post assessments and formal and informal formative assessments to evaluate student learning. This is the culmination of a semester long unit instruction project.		
<b>Measurement Instrument 3</b>	N/A		
<b>Criteria for Student Success</b>			
<b>Program Success Target for this Measurement</b>		<b>Percent of Program Achieving Target</b>	
<b>Methods</b>			
<b>Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.</b>			<b>Met</b>
<b>Not Met</b>			
<b>Actions</b> (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)			
Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment and Analysis of Student Learning are two of the indicators where our students perform at the success rate level we predetermined. We will continue to focus on the preparation in our formative instruction in ELED 465 and ELED 405 for both of the assessments to prepare for the Teacher Work Sample and skills assessed in this large assessment.			
<b>Follow-Up</b> (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)			
The follow-up begins in the Fall 2020 semester.			
<b>Next Assessment Cycle Plan</b> (Please describe your assessment plan timetable for this outcome)			
When will this outcome be assessed again? It is perfectly fine to not assess every outcome every year; however, it is important to note <i>when</i> it will be assessed again.			
Please include the year this outcome will be assessed again, when and what data/artifacts will be collected, what courses will be sampled, and who will be responsible for collecting and providing data and information.			
The assessments are every semester – Fall 2020 and Spring 2021 in ELED 405 (5B) and ELED 465 (5A).			



Rubrics:

Key Assessment 5A: Learning Goals & Pre/Post Assessment Rubric							
Scoring Sheet							
CAE P	InTA SC	KT S	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
LGA1				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.1	<b>LGA 1</b> List 2 to 3 learning goals	None of the learning goals are clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum	Only one clear learning goal provided Or one of the 2 to 3 learning goals are not clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content /curriculum.	2 to 3 learning goals stated as clear, logical learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA2				○	○	○	○
1.1 D	2,3	3.1	<b>LGA 2</b> Levels of learning goals	Goals do not reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals somewhat reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA3				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.1	<b>LGA 3</b> Alignment of Learning Goals with standards	Not every learning goal is aligned with local, state or national standards Or content and Bloom's levels are incorrect.	Each of the learning goals is not correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels. Some standards are missing or incorrectly aligned with goals.	Each of the learning goals is correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA4				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.2 2.2	<b>LGA 4</b> Appropriateness of Learning Goals	Justification is missing for two goals Or 2 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Justification is missing for one goal Or 3 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Clear and logical justification in the 4 required areas for learning goal appropriateness: student prior knowledge, student learning needs and/or developmental appropriateness, authentic real world, and other relevant connections.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA5				○	○	○	○
1.1 D	2,3	3.1	<b>LGA 5</b> Mastery levels for each Learning Goal	Mastery level is not provided for each goal Or it is not mathematically possible Or indicates level that is too low for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal may not be mathematically possible or indicates lower expectations for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal is mathematically possible and indicates high expectations for student abilities or discipline	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA6				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1 5.3	<b>LGA 6</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals	All assessment items are not aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to 2 of the following: specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA7				○	○	○	○



1.1 1.3 1.4	1,7	2.2	<b>LGA 7</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations	Description of adaptations does not meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or no description is provided.	Description of adaptations does not clearly meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or description is incomplete.	Clear, logical description of adaptations that meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA8				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1 5.3	<b>LGA 8</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessment	The pre and post assessment represents only one mode or assessments do not integrate knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment duplicates some modes or assessments do not require clear integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment includes multiple modes and requires the integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
LGA9				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6	5.1	<b>LGA 9</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria	Scoring procedures are not explained; assessment items or prompts are not written for student understanding; mastery levels are not defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are incomplete.	Scoring procedures are not well explained; assessment items or prompts are not clearly written; mastery levels are not clearly defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached but do not include all required components.	Scoring procedures are explained, assessment items or prompts are clearly written, mastery levels defined, directions and procedures are clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached and include all required components.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

## Key Assessment 5B: Analysis of Student Learning

### Scoring Guide

CAE P	InTAS C	KT S	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
ASL1				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.5 T	1,6,8,9, 10	6.4	<b>ASL 1</b> Visual Representation of Student Performance	No use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables are hand drawn.  3 or more required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but most are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Poor use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables do not clearly or accurately communicate data. 1 or 2 required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but some are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Excellent use of technology tools to create graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately.  At least three graphs/tables from the prompt are included, providing accurate data to communicate, assess, and compare student learning gains. Representations are labeled accurately.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
ASL2				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.2	6 9	5.4 7.1	<b>ASL 2</b> Analysis of Student Performance	No discussion for 2 or more graphs or 2 or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for all learning goals.  No alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal.	Accurate and logical description and reflection on data results and interpretation for only one learning goal; or no discussion for one graph for one or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for some learning goals.	Accurate and logical description, analysis, evaluation and reflection on data results to determine progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals. Identify differences in progress among student groups.  Clear, accurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

				<p>No conclusions drawn from data or incorrect data used.</p> <p>No reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>No interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Unclear or inaccurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal;</p> <p>or discussion of alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards is left out for one or more graphs/goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate conclusions drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Little or no reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>Unclear or inaccurate interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>required graph and each learning goal.</p> <p>Meaningful conclusions drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data.</p> <p>Clear and accurate reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>Thorough interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	
<b>ASL3</b>			○	○	○	○	
<p>1.1</p> <p>1.2</p> <p>1.3</p> <p>1.4</p>	<p>1,7</p> <p>9</p>	<p>2.4</p> <p>7.2</p>	<p><b>ASL 3</b> Instructional Implications from Data</p>	<p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching and discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or two or more goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching or no discussion.</p> <p>No discussion of content/skills that need remediation or discussion is not based on data results or results are missing for 2 or more groups or for 2 goals.</p>	<p>Accurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching but discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or one or more goals; or inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching.</p> <p>Insufficiently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Unclear description which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains;</p> <p>inadequate discussion on which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and inadequate discussion which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Unclear description of 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Inadequate description of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	<p>Clear reflection and evaluation of instructional practice to inform future teaching.</p> <p>Competently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Thoroughly describes which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; discusses which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and discusses which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Clearly describes 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Appropriately provides logical, detailed discussion of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

ASL4				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5	1.5	ASL 4 Analysis of an Individual Student	<p>Inaccurate data used for student evaluation.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>No description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment or instruction.</p> <p>No discussion of student's misconceptions about content. No discussion on how formative assessments helped with instructional adjustment.</p> <p>No reflection of what could have been done differently. No description of next steps.</p>	<p>Inaccurate portrayal and description of the individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments.</p> <p>Inappropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Inaccurate description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment, and instruction or parts missing.</p> <p>Unclear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Collaborative efforts did not connect to student results.</p> <p>Inaccurate, short reflection of what could have been done differently. Little description of next steps or unclear connection of next steps to student success.</p>	<p>Accurate portrayal and description of an individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments along with the instruction and connection to contextual factors.</p> <p>Appropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Accurately describes students' misconceptions about content with clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Includes any collaborative efforts.</p> <p>Clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Any collaborative efforts connect to student results.</p> <p>Accurate, in-depth reflection of what could have been done differently. Thorough description of next steps for individual.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

**Key Assessment Six: Design for Instruction  
Scoring Sheet**

CAEP	InTASC	KTS	Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
DI2				○	○	○	○
1.1 1.3 1.4	4,5 1,7	1.1 1.2 1.3 2.1 2.5	DI 2 Unit Overview	<p>Provides a limited description for 5 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections; Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description for 6 following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections; Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate</p>	<p>Provides thorough understanding of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson; Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement; Real world connections; Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

				and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	and aligned to the Learning Goals; Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.	
<b>DI3</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1 1.5 T</b>	<b>1,6,8,9,10</b>	<b>6.1</b>	<b>DI 3</b> Integration of Technology	Minimal technology use in planning and instruction	Some technology use in planning and instruction	Demonstrate technology integration in planning and instruction and how P-12 student use of technology will be integrated in unit for higher level thinking activities and in a real world context.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>DI4</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1 1.3 1.4</b>	<b>4,5 1,7</b>	<b>1.1 1.2 1.3 2.4 2.5</b>	<b>DI 4</b> Instructional Strategies	Provides a limited description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;  Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.  Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Provides an adequate description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 3 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;  Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.  Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Thorough and clear description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals that includes:  Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;  Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.  Real world connections; Discussion of materials/technology.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>DI5</b>				○	○	○	○
<b>1.1 1.2 1.3 1.4</b>	<b>1,7 6</b>	<b>2.3 5.4</b>	<b>DI 5</b> Formative Assessments	Provides a limited description for 1 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Provides an adequate description for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Thorough and clear explanation of Formative Assessments including the following items:  Description of assessment and purpose; Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students; Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

## Teacher Work Sample Scoring Sheet

**Name** \_\_\_\_\_ **Instructor** \_\_\_\_\_

	Percentage	Points Earned	Points Possible
Contextual Factors . . . . .	15%	_____	(30)
Learning Goals and Pre/Post Assessment. . . . .	20%	_____	(40)
Design for Instruction . . . . .	25%	_____	(50)
Analysis of Student Learning . . . . .	30%	_____	(60)
Reflection of Teaching Practices . . . . .	10%	_____	(20)
<b>TOTAL</b> . . . . .	<b>100%</b>	_____	<b>(200)</b>
Format . . . . .	_____	_____	(10)

(Separate score based on instructor preference)

<b>Critical Performance Holistic Scoring Guide</b>		
Level	Percentage	Descriptor
<b>4</b>	97-100%	No revision required; rich, insightful, in-depth and elaborate; establishes and maintains purpose throughout; accurate, relevant, and thorough
<b>3</b>	85-97%	Standard-met with few errors that do not deter from accuracy and/or meaning; focused, effective, and relevant
<b>2</b>	77-84%	Significant gap in understanding, although an attempt was made; unelaborated with several errors present
<b>1</b>	76% or less	Minimal understanding; only small portions are addressed; response is limited, incorrect, missing, random, weak, and/or ineffective
<b>0</b>	0	Response is completely irrelevant or not submitted

**NOTE: Students must score a Level 2 in order to receive a passing grade in EDU 489 and EXED 434. Students who score below Level 2, must register for EDU 491 the next semester (J-term or May term) and complete a TWS in a new setting.**

<b>Contextual Factors Rubric</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>CF 1</b> School Information  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	Characteristics of school described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the required areas. School information provided limited to the 5 required areas.  Implications based on this information are missing or not appropriately stated.	Characteristics of school described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 5 required areas. School information provided includes the 5 required areas and at least 1 additional area.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for the 1 area.	Characteristics of school described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 5 required areas. School information provided includes the 5 required areas and at least 1 additional area.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 2 areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>CF 2</b> Knowledge of Classroom Information  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	Characteristics of classroom described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the 4 required areas.  Implications based on this information are missing	Characteristics of classroom described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 4 required areas.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 1 area.	Characteristics of classroom described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 4 required areas.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for at least 2 areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>CF 3</b> Knowledge of Student Characteristics  <b>KTS 2.2, 3.3</b>	Characteristics of students described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 2 or more of the 8 required areas.  Implications based on this information are missing or not appropriately stated in at 2 areas.	Characteristics of students described at the minimal, inaccurate, irrelevant or biased level in 1 of the 8 required areas.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for 6 of the 7 areas.	Characteristics of students described clearly at a substantive, accurate, and unbiased level in all of the 8 required areas.  Implications based on this information are clearly stated and complete for the 7 required areas.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>Learning Goals &amp; Pre/Post Assessment Rubric</b>				
<b>Prompt Areas</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>LGA 1</b> List 2 to 3 learning goals	None of the learning goals are clear or logical for one or more of the following:	Only one clear learning goal provided	2 to 3 learning goals stated as clear, logical learning outcomes, stated in behavioral	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first

<b>KTS 2.1</b>	learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum	Or one of the 2 to 3 learning goals are not clear or logical for one or more of the following: learning outcomes, stated in behavioral terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	terms, focused on the unit topic, appropriate for student abilities, and appropriate for content/curriculum.	attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 2</b> Levels of learning goals <b>KTS 3.1</b>	Goals do not reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals somewhat reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Goals reflect revised Bloom's Taxonomy with at least one goal at or above the Analyzing level.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 3</b> Alignment of Learning Goals with standards <b>KTS 2.1</b>	Not every learning goal is aligned with local, state or national standards Or content and Bloom's levels are incorrect.	Each of the learning goals is not correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels. Some standards are missing or incorrectly aligned with goals.	Each of the learning goals is correctly and logically aligned with local, state or national standards in content and Bloom's levels.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 4</b> Appropriateness of Learning Goals <b>KTS 2.2, 1.2</b>	Justification is missing for two goals Or 2 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Justification is missing for one goal Or 3 or more justifications of the required areas in the prompt	Clear and logical justification in the 4 required areas for learning goal appropriateness: student prior knowledge, student learning needs and/or developmental appropriateness, authentic real world, and other relevant connections.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 5</b> Mastery levels for each Learning Goal <b>KTS 3.1</b>	Mastery level is not provided for each goal Or it is not mathematically possible Or indicates level that is too low for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal may not be mathematically possible or indicates lower expectations for student abilities or discipline	Mastery level for each goal is mathematically possible and indicates high expectations for student abilities or discipline	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 6</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Learning Goals <b>KTS 5.1, 5.3</b>	All assessment items are not aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to 2 of the following: specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	All assessment items are clearly and appropriately aligned to specific learning goals, correct level of Bloom's, and content standard.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 7</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Adaptations <b>KTS 2.2</b>	Description of adaptations does not meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or no description is provided.	Description of adaptations does not clearly meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors or description is incomplete.	Clear, logical description of adaptations that meet the individual needs of students as described in the contextual factors	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

<b>LGA 8</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Modes of Assessments  <b>KTS 5.1, 5.3</b>	The pre and post assessment represents only one mode or assessments do not integrate knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment duplicates some modes or assessments do not require clear integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	The pre and post assessment includes multiple modes and requires the integration of knowledge, skills and/or reasoning ability.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>LGA 9</b> Pre-post Assessment Blueprint: Scoring Criteria  <b>KTS 5.1</b>	Scoring procedures are not explained; assessment items or prompts are not written for student understanding; mastery levels are not defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are incomplete.	Scoring procedures are not well explained; assessment items or prompts are not clearly written; mastery levels are not clearly defined; directions and procedures are not clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached but do not include all required components.	Scoring procedures are explained, assessment items or prompts are clearly written, mastery levels defined, directions and procedures are clear to students. Scoring key and/or rubrics are attached and include all required components.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>Design for Instruction</b>				
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Beginning</b>	<b>Developing</b>	<b>Proficient</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>
<b>DI 1</b> Results of pre- assessment  <b>KTS 5.4, 2.2</b>	Depicted the results of the pre-assessment. Failure to administer pre-assessment or to accurately provide 2 or more of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:  Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.  For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre- assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre- assessment data analysis.	Depicted the results of the pre- assessment. Administration of pre-assessment but failure to accurately provide 1 of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:  Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.  For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre-assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre-assessment data analysis.	Depicted the results of the pre- assessment. Administration of pre-assessment and accurate inclusion of the following information pieces and implications as they relate to learning goals:  Number of students mastering each learning goal; type of missed questions/tasks; and content/skill of incorrect responses.  For each of the above areas, identify the implications derived from pre-assessment data and adjustments planned due to information from pre- assessment data analysis.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>DI 2</b> Unit Overview  <b>KTS 2.1, 1.3, 2.5, 1.1, 1.2</b>	Provides a limited description for 5 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;	Provides an adequate description for 6 following criteria in unit overview:  Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;  Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;	Provides thorough understanding of the following criteria in unit overview:  Learning goals and objectives for each day/lesson;  Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.



	<p>Topic/activity per day related to at least one learning goal;</p> <p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	<p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	<p>Instructional strategies content aligned with Bloom's levels and differentiation of instruction.</p> <p>Variety of research-based strategies, activities, alignments/resources</p> <p>Student engagement</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Description multiple formative assessments that are appropriate and aligned to the Learning Goals;</p> <p>Specific adaptations and differentiation per strategy that address Contextual Factors and the pre-assessment.</p>	
<p><b>DI 3</b> Integration of Technology</p> <p><b>KTS 6.1</b></p>	<p>Minimal technology use in planning and instruction</p>	<p>Some technology use in planning and instruction</p>	<p>Demonstrate technology integration in planning and instruction and how P-12 student use of technology will be integrated in unit for higher level thinking activities and in a real world context.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>
<p><b>DI 4</b> Instructional Strategies</p> <p><b>KTS 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.4, 2.5</b></p>	<p>Provides an limited description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p>	<p>Provides an adequate description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals for 3 of the following criteria in unit overview:</p> <p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p> <p>Real world connections;</p> <p>Discussion of materials/technology.</p>	<p>Thorough and clear description of two instructional strategies from different learning goals that includes:</p> <p>Identification of appropriate content related strategies to meet Learning Goals and revised Bloom's levels;</p> <p>Instructional strategies meet student needs through appropriate adaptations and differentiated instruction based on pre-assessment data.</p> <p>Real world connections;</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

	Real world connections;  Discussion of materials/technology.		Discussion of materials/technology.	
<b>DI 5</b> Formative Assessments  <b>KTS 2.3, 5.4</b>	Provides a limited description for 1 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Description of assessment and purpose;  Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;  Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Provides an adequate description for 2 of the following criteria in unit overview:  Description of assessment and purpose;  Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;  Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Thorough and clear explanation of Formative Assessments including the following items:  Description of assessment and purpose;  Justify appropriateness for the content and developmental level of students;  Inclusion of formative assessments and scoring criteria.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

### Analysis of Student Learning

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<b>ASL 1</b> Visual Representation of Student Performance  <b>KTS 6.4</b>	No use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables are hand drawn.  3 or more required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but most are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Poor use of technology tools to create graphs/tables; graphs/tables do not clearly or accurately communicate data.  1 or 2 required graphs/tables are not included. Or All required graphs/tables from the prompt are included but some are inaccurate, do not communicate student learning gains, or do not compare groups and assessments correctly.	Excellent use of technology tools to create graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately.  At least three graphs/tables from the prompt are included, providing accurate data to communicate, assess, and compare student learning gains. Representations are labeled accurately.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.

<p><b>ASL 2</b> Analysis of Student Performance <b>KTS 5.4, 7.1</b></p>	<p>No discussion for 2 or more graphs or 2 or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for all learning goals.</p> <p>No alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn from data or incorrect data used.</p> <p>No reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>No interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Accurate and logical description and reflection on data results and interpretation for only one learning goal; or no discussion for one graph for one or more goals; or inaccurate discussion and reflection of data results and interpretation for some learning goals.</p> <p>Unclear or inaccurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal; or discussion of alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards is left out for one or more graphs/goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate conclusions drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions.</p> <p>Little or no reference to trends and patterns in student performance.</p> <p>Unclear or inaccurate interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Accurate and logical description, analysis, evaluation and reflection on data results to determine progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals. Identify differences in progress among student groups.</p> <p>Clear, accurate alignment of analysis with learning goals, contextual factors, and curriculum standards for each required graph and each learning goal.</p> <p>Meaningful conclusions drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data. Clear and accurate reference to trends and patterns in student performance. Thorough interpretation of student misconceptions of content.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>
<p><b>ASL 3</b> Instructional Implications from Data <b>KTS 2.4, 7.2</b></p>	<p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching <u>and</u> discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or two or more goals.</p> <p>Inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching or no discussion.</p> <p>No discussion of content/skills that need remediation or discussion is not based on data results or results are missing for 2 or more groups or for 2 goals.</p>	<p>Accurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching but discussion is missing for 2 or more groups or one or more goals; or inaccurate reflection and evaluation of instructional practice for future teaching.</p> <p>Insufficiently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Unclear description which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; inadequate discussion on which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why;</p>	<p>Clear reflection and evaluation of instructional practice to inform future teaching.</p> <p>Competently identifies small groups for specific content/skills based on data representations and clearly evaluates instructional practice in terms of specific student needs that were noted in contextual factors.</p> <p>Thoroughly describes which goal the students made the most learning gains and the goal students made the least learning gains; discusses which learning goal determined the best conceptual understanding of content and why; and discusses which learning goal provided more learning gains</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

		<p>and inadequate discussion which learning goal provided more learning gains due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Unclear description of 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Inadequate description of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	<p>due to the assessment mode and why.</p> <p>Clearly describes 2 changes that could be made to instruction and assessment for this unit if the unit were to be taught again.</p> <p>Appropriately provides logical, detailed discussion of reinforcement and extension activities of this unit.</p>	
<p><b>ASL 4</b> Analysis of an Individual Student</p> <p><b>KTS 1.5</b></p>	<p>Inaccurate data used for student evaluation.</p> <p>No conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>No description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment or instruction.</p> <p>No discussion of student's misconceptions about content. No discussion on how formative assessments helped with instructional adjustment.</p> <p>No reflection of what could have been done differently. No description of next steps.</p>	<p>Inaccurate portrayal and description of the individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments.</p> <p>Inappropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Inaccurate description of student's misconceptions about content, assessment, and instruction or parts missing.</p> <p>Unclear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Collaborative efforts did not connect to student results.</p> <p>Inaccurate, short reflection of what could have been done differently. Little description of next steps or unclear connection of next steps to student success.</p>	<p>Accurate portrayal and description of an individual student's data from pre-, formative, and post-assessments along with the instruction and connection to contextual factors.</p> <p>Appropriate conclusions drawn about the extent to which this student attained learning goals in this unit.</p> <p>Accurately describes students' misconceptions about content with clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Includes any collaborative efforts.</p> <p>Clear discussion on how formative assessments helped with instruction adjustment. Any collaborative efforts connect to student results.</p> <p>Accurate, in-depth reflection of what could have been done differently. Thorough description of next steps for individual.</p>	<p>Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.</p>

### Reflection of Teaching Rubric

Criteria	Beginning	Developing	Proficient	Exemplary
<b>R 1</b> Self-assessment of KTS  <b>KTS 9.1</b>	Completes self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS but leaves 3 or more standards blank Or does not complete either pre-assessment or post-assessment of KTS standards.	Completes and includes self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS but leaves 2 or more standards blank.	Completes and includes entire self-assessment of KTS standards before and after completion of TWS.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>R 2</b> Identify Teaching Strengths  <b>KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1</b>	Short and disconnected discussion of 1 of the teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS, Or discussion is very vague and not related to KTS, Provides no examples from teaching experience in this unit to support discussion.	Short and disconnected discussion of 2 of teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS and student learning Or discussed only 1 teacher strength related to self-evaluation of KTS, Provides one example from teaching experience in this unit that is unrelated to the KTS strength discussed and student learning.	Appropriate, logical, detailed discussion of 2 of teacher's strengths as related to self-evaluation of KTS and student learning. Provides one or more examples from teaching experience in this unit in revealing each KTS strength discussed.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.
<b>R3</b> Identify areas of Professional Development  <b>KTS 7.2, 7.3, 9.1, 9.2</b>	Discussion of teacher's needs for improvement is not related to self-evaluation of KTS Or only one improvement is discussed. Description of one or more priorities for your own professional development is vague and not clearly based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Discussion of one or more of teacher's needs for improvement as related to self-evaluation of KTS may not be clear, logical, or appropriate. Description of one or more priorities for your own professional development is not clearly based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Appropriate, logical, detailed discussion of 2 of teacher's needs for improvement as related to self-evaluation of KTS. Clearly describes 2 to 3 priorities for your own professional development based on specific data from self-assessment and student performance. Include a specific plan for growth.	Achieves the Proficient level with minimal assistance on the first attempt and demonstrates above and beyond the Proficient level.