

**Curriculum and Instruction
Assessment of Student Learning Report
2017**

A. Program Information

Department: Curriculum and Instruction
Program: Curriculum and Instruction (BSE)
Contact Name: Todd Goodson
Contact Email: tgoodson@ksu.edu
Program assessment website: [College of Education Assessment Page](#)
[Student Learning Outcomes Matrix](#)
[Results](#)

B. Outcome Reporting

1. Student Learning Outcome

The educator is a reflective practitioner who uses an understanding of historical, philosophical, and social foundations of education to guide his or her educational practices.

Program Standard One

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 1 of the student teaching portfolio requires students to document their professional growth and accomplishments to date and to prepare a comprehensive statement of teaching philosophy synthesizing their program of study. The entry is assessed through a rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 1 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	2 (0.5%)	7 (2%)	21 (7%)	280 (90%)
340	2012-2013	7 (2%)	10 (3%)	31 (9%)	292 (86%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	11 (4%)	8 (3%)	31 (12%)	216 (81%)
316	2015-2016	9 (3%)	11 (3%)	37 (12%)	259 (82%)
340	2016-2017	7 (2%)	7 (2%)	40 (12%)	286 (84%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Entry 1 of the Student Teaching Portfolio evaluates the background of the candidate as well as the candidate's philosophy in three key areas: Planning and Preparation, Effective Instruction, and Professionalism. The candidate is assessed on an eight-point rubric. 326 of the 340 candidates (96%) performed at the acceptable or exemplary level. The assessment specifically prompts students to discuss how they can effectively teach all students and respect their beliefs. We note the scores remain consistent.

2. Student Learning Outcome

The educator understands the role of technology in society and demonstrates skill in using instructional tools and technology to gather, analyze, and present information; enhance instructional practices; facilitate professional productivity and communication; and help all students use instructional technology effectively.

Program Standard Two

The educator demonstrates the ability to use the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of each discipline the educator teaches and can create opportunities that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for all students.

Program Standard Five

The educator demonstrates the ability to integrate across and within content fields to enrich the curriculum, develop reading and thinking skills, and facilitate all students' abilities to understand relationships between subject areas.

Program Standard Six

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 3.2 of the student teaching portfolio asks students, as part of a multi-week unit prepared and presented during their internships, to demonstrate their knowledge of their content fields and their abilities to communicate that knowledge within the rhetorical situation of the public school classroom. Candidates bring together content and pedagogical knowledge and effectively communicate to students. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 3.2 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	0	0	4 (1%)	306 (99%)
340	2012-2013	0	3 (0.9%)	30 (9%)	307 (90%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	2 (1%)	0	35 (13%)	229 (86%)
316	2015-2016	1 (.3%)	1 (.3%)	36 (11%)	278 (88%)
340	2016-2017	1 (.3%)	3 (7%)	39 (11%)	276 (81%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The skill sets required and measured by Entry 3.2 are complex and sophisticated. 340 candidates completed the assessment. 92% scored at the target level. The entry asks for evidence not only of knowledge of learning strategies, adaptations, active learning, content reading, content integration, instructional technology, and the use of community resources; but also the successful communication of that content to public school students.

These results indicate a slight increase in students scoring at the Developing level, but we do not interpret this as significant.

3. Student Learning Outcome

The educator demonstrates an understanding of how individuals learn and develop intellectually, socially, and personally and provides learning opportunities that support this development.

Program Standard Three

The educator demonstrates the ability to provide different approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are equitable, that are based on developmental levels, and that are adapted to diverse learners, including those with exceptionalities.

Program Standard Four

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 2 of the student teaching portfolio is an assessment where the candidate analyzes the contextual factors of the classrooms within which they complete their internships. Candidates are responsible for recording the data of their classroom and analyzing the potential impact of these factors upon their teaching. The entry reflects the need to meet the needs of a diverse student (K-12) population, recognizing the many forms diversity can take. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of candidate performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 2 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	1 (0.3%)	9 (3%)	48 (15%)	252 (81%)
340	2012-2013	7 (2%)	13 (4%)	61 (18%)	259 (76%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	9 (3%)	5 (2%)	39 (15%)	213 (80%)
316	2015-2016	4 (1%)	6 (2%)	29 (92%)	277 (88%)
340	2016-2017	2 (.6%)	3 (.8%)	30 (9%)	305 (90%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Entry Two of the Student Teaching Portfolio evaluates student understanding of the contextual factors of the classroom, school, and district in which they complete their student internship as well as student characteristics of the students. For the 2016-2017 academic year, 335 of the 340 candidates (99%) scored in the acceptable to exemplary range. Scores are developed from a combined scoring of a five-point checklist and a ten point rubric for fifteen total points on the assessment.

4. Student Learning Outcome

The educator plans effective integrated and coherent instruction based upon the knowledge of all students, home, community, subject matter, curriculum standards, and current methods of teaching reading. Program Standard Seven

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 3.1 of the student teaching portfolio asks candidates to develop a multi-week unit of study that is based on worthwhile and challenging learning goals and carefully aligned to school curricula and state standards for the appropriate content. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

.....Assessment 2 and expected level of performance

Entry 3.2 of the student teaching portfolio asks candidates, as part of a multi-week unit prepared and presented during their internships, to demonstrate their knowledge of their content fields and their abilities to communicate that knowledge within the rhetorical situation of the public school classroom. Candidates bring together content and pedagogical knowledge and effectively communicate to students. The

department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 3.1 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	0	0	3 (1%)	307 (99%)
340	2012-2013	0	1 (0.3%)	2 (0.6%)	337 (99%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	2 (<1%)	0	0	264 (>99%)
316	2015-2016	0	0	6 (2%)	310 (98%)
340	2016-2017	2 (.6%)	1 (.3%)	8 (.2%)	329 (97%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The data from Entry 3.1 clearly indicate candidates are capable of conceptualizing their various academic disciplines and placing their work within the existing frameworks for delivery of instruction. These scores are consistent with previous years.

Entry 3.2 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	0	0	4 (1%)	306 (99%)
340	2012-2013	0	3 (0.9%)	30 (9%)	307 (90%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	2 (1%)	0	35 (13%)	229 (86%)
316	2015-2016	1 (.3%)	1 (.3%)	36 (11%)	278 (88%)
340	2016-2017	1 (.3%)	23 (7%)	39 (11%)	276 (81%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The skill sets required and measured by Entry 3.2 are complex and sophisticated. 340 candidates completed the assessment. We note a sharp increase in the number of students scoring at the Developing (below target) level. This is likely a result of changes in the scoring process, as this data includes our first administration of the assessment scored by individuals other than those providing support for the completion of the portfolio. In the past, the Clinical Instructors or university faculty providing support likely invested extra time in revisions to bring the student work to the target standard. While that reflects very good teaching, our current practice is, we believe, better assessment practice.

5. Student Learning Outcome

The educator understands and uses formal and informal assessment strategies to evaluate and ensure the continual intellectual, social, and personal development of all learners.

Program Standard Eight

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 3.3 of the student teaching portfolio is devoted to the analysis of assessment procedures. In entry 3.3 the candidate describes her or his instructional unit assessment plan and provides analysis of student performance in relation to their instructional goals and objectives. Candidates must also discuss how they will use this data to plan and adjust instruction. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 3.3 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	2 (0.6%)	6 (2%)	23 (7%)	279 (90%)
340	2012-2013	0	1 (0.3%)	29 (8%)	310 (91%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	2 (<1%)	4 (1%)	15 (6%)	245 (92%)
316	2015-2016	1 (<1%)	0	9 (3%)	306 (97%)
340	2016-2017	3 (.9%)	1 (.3%)	15 (4%)	321 (94%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Our data on the performance of the candidates' ability to gather and analyze assessment data indicates that 98% of the candidates reached the target level, successfully describing their unit assessment plan, analyzing student performance based on the instructional goals and objectives for the unit, and discussing how the data could be used to plan for and adjust for future instruction. These results are consistent with previous years.

6. Student Learning Outcome

The educator uses an understanding of individual and group motivation and behavior to create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Program Standard Nine

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 4 of the student teaching portfolio asks the candidate to reflect upon and evaluate the relative effectiveness of instruction they have delivered to public school students. The entry requires a knowledge of the socio-cultural dynamics unique to the classroom situation, and the entry requires critical reflection upon the environment the intern was able to create. The entry is assessed by a rubric, and the department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 4 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	5 (2%)	19 (6%)	25 (8%)	261 (84%)
340	2012-2013	23 (7%)	16 (5%)	27 (8%)	274 (80%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	12 (5%)	11 (4%)	23 (9%)	220 (83%)
316	2015-2016	7 (2%)	8 (3%)	17 (5%)	284 (90%)
340	2016-2017	6 (1.8%)	6 (1.8%)	18 (5%)	310 (91%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Our data on this entry suggest the overwhelming majority of our candidates can critically reflect upon the classroom environments they are able to create in public schools, as 96% of the candidates performed at the acceptable level or better. We see consistency in this data.

7. Student Learning Outcome

The educator understands and uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies to encourage and develop various kinds of students' learning, including critical thinking, problem solving, and reading.

Program Standard Ten

The educator uses a variety of effective verbal and non-verbal communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.

Program Standard Eleven

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 5 of the student teaching portfolio requires interns to collect five formal observations of their teaching from their University Supervisor, Cooperating Teacher(s), and other appropriate school personnel. Additionally, the entry includes the pre-observation materials the intern prepares in advance of the observation and the post-observation reflections upon the lesson. Entry 5 brings together communication skills from multiple points of view. The intern must communicate effectively with the observer as well as the students with whom he or she is working. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 5 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	3 (1%)	10 (3%)	29 (9%)	268 (86%)
340	2012-2013	6 (2%)	11 (3%)	27 (8%)	296 (87%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	10 (4%)	10 (4%)	10 (4%)	236 (89%)
316	2015-2016	5 (2%)	12 (4%)	11 (3%)	288 (91%)
340	2016-2017	3 (.9%)	9 (2.6%)	11 (3%)	317 (93%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The data suggest that the vast majority of our undergraduate students provide evidence of instruction and are well versed in the use of instructional strategies; communication and collaboration techniques; and methods for promoting critical thinking, problem solving, and supportive learning environments in K-12 classrooms, with approximately 4% performing below an acceptable level of 80%. Of the 96% meeting this standard, it is noteworthy that 91% do so at an Exemplary level.

8. Student Learning Outcome

The educator is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community), actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally, and participates in the school improvement process.

Program Standard Twelve

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 3.4 of the student teaching portfolio requires the candidate to reflect on the multi-week instructional unit and which of the instructional learning goals were most and least successful. Candidates consider how they might improve their units and its teaching in subsequent classes.

The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

.....Assessment 2 and expected level of performance

Entry 6 of the student teaching portfolio requires the candidates to document their contacts with parents and other community members as well as the professional growth activities in which they participated during student teaching.

The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 3.4 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	0	3 (1%)	21 (7%)	286 (92%)
340	2012-2013	3 (0.9%)	7 (2%)	20 (6%)	310 (91%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	3 (1%)	3 (1%)	14 (5%)	246 (92%)
316	2015-2016	2 (0.6%)	4 (1%)	7 (2%)	303 (96%)
340	2016-2017	1 (.3%)	11 (3%)	18 (5%)	310 (91%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The data suggest our candidates are reflective practitioners who continually assess their teaching and its impact on student learning, using that information to plan for future teaching situations. 96% of 340 candidates reached the target level.

Entry 6 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	13 (4%)	32 (10%)	40 (13%)	225 (73%)
340	2012-2013	20 (6%)	31 (9%)	52 (15%)	237 (70%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	11 (4%)	27 (10%)	43 (16%)	185 (70%)
316	2015-2016	14 (4%)	23 (7%)	32 (10%)	247 (78%)
340	2016-2017	8 (2%)	14 (4%)	41 (12%)	277 (81%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

The data suggest that 6% of our undergraduate students fail to always meet professional responsibilities that make teachers true professional educators to the extent expected by the department. The portion of students meeting this standard (93%) reflects a slight improvement in student performance.

9. Student Learning Outcome

The educator fosters collaboration with school personnel, parents, and agencies in the larger community to support students' learning and well-being.

Program Standard Thirteen

Assessment Method(s)

Entry 6 of the student teaching portfolio requires the interns to document their contacts with parents and other community members as well as the professional growth activities in which they have participated during student teaching. The department has established a score of 80% as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of "acceptable" or "exemplary."

Results

Entry 6 Scores for Academic Years 2011-2017

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory < 70%	Developing 70%-79%	Acceptable 80%-89%	Exemplary >89%
310	2011-2012	13 (4%)	32 (10%)	40 (13%)	225 (73%)
340	2012-2013	20 (6%)	31 (9%)	52 (15%)	237 (70%)
--	2013-2014	KSDE Accreditation			
266	2014-2015	11 (4%)	27 (10%)	43 (16%)	185 (70%)
316	2015-2016	14 (4%)	23 (7%)	32 (10%)	247 (78%)
340	2016-2017	8 (2%)	14 (4%)	41 (12%)	277 (81%)

DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

As mentioned in SLO 8, 6% of our undergraduate students do not meet all professional responsibilities including communicating with personnel, parents, and community agencies. While these data are very similar to those of last year, the department should continue to consider ways to make professional expectations clear and find opportunities for emphasizing such expectations throughout the program.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Our portfolio system is in transition. We first moved it to the Canvas platform, a critical first step. Our next step was to stop our longstanding process of having portfolios assessed by the same faculty and/or Clinical Instructors who mentored students through the creation of the portfolio. That most recent modification is reflected in the data presented in this most recent report.

We have revised the portfolio, and a limited number of students completed that revised document as a pilot group last spring. The new portfolio is in effect for all students this current (Fall 2017) semester.

Two steps remain. First, we need to secure the resources to have multiple raters for each portfolio. This will allow us to have some indication of the reliability of our data. Second, we need to re-examine our SLOs in light of the new Conceptual Framework of the College of Education which is itself aligned to the new set of INTASC (Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium) standards.

We hope to report new SLOs with revised data tables to include a statement on inter-rater reliability in next year's report.