

Wells College Education Program Annual Assessment Report 2017

I. Program Assessment Meetings

Education Program faculty (Susan Talbot, Susan Wansor and Sara Levy) met weekly throughout the 2016-2017 academic year to discuss program issues, concerns, and questions. Topics relating to assessment were included in most program meetings. During the fall semester these meetings generally occurred on Mondays from 11 – 12:30. During spring, 2017 these meetings generally occurred on Tuesdays from 9:30 – 11:00. Topics discussed throughout the year included: revision of the case studies protocol; informal findings and questions that surface from the 2016-2017 case study observations; modifying requirements for the Adolescence Certification Program to include EDUC 304, allowing for more focus on content methodologies in EDUC 406; and the inclusion and modifying of projects that involve application of instructional technology. The Education Program faculty met on May 31, 2017 from 12:30 – 3:30 to discuss the assessment findings within this report and to articulate assessment goals for the 2017-18 academic year.

II. Closing the Loop

2016 Education Program Goals:

1. *Increase student teaching and field placements in urban districts.*

The Education Program has continued to expand its connections to small urban districts, specifically Auburn and Ithaca school districts. Nine of the twelve student teaching placements during the 2017 academic year were in Auburn and Ithaca. Every student teacher had at least one experience in a small city district. Three students had both of their student teaching placements these small urban districts.

2. *Increase opportunities for students to engage in discipline-specific instructional methodologies.*

We are working to meet this goal by requiring students seeking adolescent certification to take EDUC 304: Inclusive Instruction and Assessment, which will teach these students about lesson and unit planning and assessment. Students enrolled in EDUC 406: Instructional Strategies for Secondary Education will have a more individualized and content-specific curriculum. This will be achieved, in part, by having content-specific readings and projects in this course. For example, the Fall 2017 course will have one biology student and one history/social studies student; each of these students will read books and articles about the teaching of their specific content, will observe teachers at local schools and videos of teachers across the country, will design lessons and units specifically for their content, and will become familiar with the professional organizations associated with their content. This course continues to be an area we seek to improve, as larger programs provide at least one content-specific methods course for secondary education and our students must be able to compete with graduates of those programs.

3. *Review and redesign EDUC 226 to better reflect: current issues in today's classrooms; evidence-based practices for developing community and relationship building; and strategies for applying these practices in challenging systems.*

Course readings for EDUC 226: Building Classroom Community were altered significantly in order to meet these goals. In the past, students struggled to thoroughly read and comprehend a text focused on student motivation (Wentzel & Brophy, 2014). We identified key concepts and themes from this text and selected fewer readings, which allowed students to better grasp the theory of “motivation to learn,” which bridges

intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. We also integrated readings focused on multicultural classrooms, which provided students examples of how teachers effectively incorporate practices from students' homes and non-Western cultures to create strong classroom communities. Finally, we introduced a series of case studies that allow students to grapple with real-life classroom management issues. This course continues to be a challenge, as students who have not yet spent time teaching often have a hard time grasping the complexity of classroom community building. While students are successful in the class, and demonstrate an understanding of key concepts, themes, and ideas in their final projects, we do not always see these understandings enduring through their student teaching experiences. Future goals for this course include developing a stronger bridge between the course and the student teaching experience, though there are multiple outside factors that make this a challenging undertaking. One way to do this may be to modify the mid-term assignment, which currently asks students to analyze a peer-reviewed article through the lens of the course readings. Instead, we may want to have students work more specifically on a project that has them apply what they have learned in the course to specific classroom situations.

4. Increase opportunities for student engagement with technology.

A number of opportunities for engaging students with instructional technology have already been embedded in the Education Program curriculum. Students in the fall, 2017 EDUC 405: Elementary Methods in Math and Science course participated in a new project involving the creation of an instructional mathematics screencast.

5. Revise the case study protocol and implement throughout 2016-17.

Several changes were made to the case study protocol that allowed for more meaningful data collection. First, we determined that a more longitudinal design may elicit stronger and more robust data. Therefore, we shrunk the number of yearly participants and increased the number of observation days for each participant. We also developed and implemented one new data source, an interview with the Wells graduate's principal. The current data collection structure is as follows:

- 4-5 full day observations of each Wells College graduate over one academic year (September-June)
- Two interviews with each Wells College graduate (one during first observation, one during last observation)
- Two focus groups with 4-6 of each Wells College graduate's students (one during first observation, one during last observation)
- One interview with each Wells College graduate's principal

We believe that the longitudinal data will better help us understand how our graduates develop classroom community, alter their curriculum and pedagogy to meet their students' needs, and respond to building, district, state, and federal expectations and guidelines. We implemented this protocol with two graduates during the 2016-2017 academic year; one who is currently teaching 7th and 8th grade English-Language Arts and one who is currently serving as a K-2 math specialist. Preliminary analysis of the 2016-2017 data indicates that we do have the necessary data to address these concerns. As in past years, school culture and climate and play a large role in dictating how, why, and what our graduates do in their classrooms. Their students continue to give them high marks for care and concern, which are reflected in the remarks of the principals as well. Going forward, we may continue to revise the observation protocol, as it may be possible to collect the necessary data from shorter observation periods. We may also revise the interview and focus group protocols to better focus on our research questions and to eliminate questions that seem redundant.

6. *Explore changes to our program assessment plan (additions and deletions) in order to better serve the assessment of our new major and to streamline the assessment process.*

A few adjustments have been made to the Education Program Assessment Plan including the addition of tasks relating specifically to teaching students with disabilities within our Childhood Program. See Assessment Grid. There have also been some adjustments made in the data collected for both our Assessment Plan and our accreditation assessment.

New York State is in the process of eliminating the Assessment of Teaching Skills (ATS-W) and replacing this test with the Teaching Performance Assessment (edTPA). Currently candidates are required to take the edTPA. If candidates do not pass this assessment, they are required to pass the ATS-W which is used as a “safety net” for the edTPA.

Last year the New York State edTPA Task Force began its review of the edTPA. Most significantly, the Task Force recommended that the Department establish a standard setting panel to determine if the passing score for the edTPA should be reset and gradually phased-in over several years. The Department’s goal is to implement changes in fall 2017, after receiving recommendations from the standard setting panel.

As part of its January 2017 recommendation, the Task Force also asked the Department to implement a multiple measures review process in cases where there is compelling evidence that a candidate is ready to teach but did not achieve a passing score on the edTPA. In March the Board of Regents approved this proposal. To request such a multiple measures review, the candidate would need to score within one standard deviation of the passing score as established by the standard setting committee, and would need to demonstrate that he or she has the knowledge, skills and abilities to become a teacher.

As the issues surrounded the edTPA are being worked out, we are currently not using candidates’ scores on either the edTPA or the ATS-W as part of our assessment process. Instead, the Education Program is utilizing scores from candidates’ Portfolio Review and Defense. The Portfolio Review and Defense Rubric, along with other key rubrics, have been attached.

The Education Program will soon begin the process of preparing for our next CAEP (Council for the Accreditation of Education Programs) accreditation review to be completed by fall, 2020. CAEP has recently altered its accreditation protocols. It will be important in the year ahead to explore the CAEP requirements and modify our assessment tools and protocols to align with this new process.

III. Examination of Data Collected

The Wells College Education Program faculty makes four claims about our program:

Claim 1: Graduates of our program are proficient in subject matter knowledge and apply this knowledge in their teaching.

Claim 2: Graduates of our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students.

Claim 3: Graduates of our program are responsive, reflective professionals who have the knowledge and skills to serve their students.

Claim 4: Graduates of our program utilize relevant teaching technologies, their knowledge of students' individual and multi-cultural differences, and opportunities for continued growth in order to serve their students.

These claims were originally developed as part of the accreditation process defined by the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), which has now become the Council for the Accreditation for Educator Preparation (CAEP). They provide the frame for our data collection and can be interpreted as broad goal statements that describe our program completers, regardless of their grade level focus or certifications.

The data for this report was collected from candidates who completed the program within the 2014-15 and 2015-16 academic years. These candidates included 1 completer of the Childhood Education Program, 2 completers of the new Inclusive Childhood Education Major and 4 completers of our Adolescence Program—1 biology candidate, 1 English candidate and 2 social studies candidates. Since the Education Program only had data from two program completers to report on last year (Childhood and Adolescence: English) the data from those student (2014-15) has been combined with the data collected from students completing in 2015-16. Last year's assessment report focused solely on the qualitative data collected in the case studies of our graduates.

The measurement tools noted in this report were frequently used across claims; however, the specific evidence gathered from each tool was generally unique to each claim. For example, the Student Teacher Evaluation Rubric provided data for all claims, but each claim was supported by a particular, unique section of the rubric. Although we have made an attempt to disaggregate data across programs (Childhood, Adolescence: Biology, English, Social Studies), our very small numbers frequently make it impossible to test statistical significance. Still, we were able to draw some general conclusions concerning student learning and program effectiveness.

Claim 1: Graduates of our program are proficient in subject matter knowledge and apply this knowledge in their teaching.

**Table 1.1
Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge
Categories of Assessments (Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years)
Adolescence Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence					
	GPA:	NY Assessments	NYS Assessments:	Student Teaching Evaluation:	Student Teaching Portfolio:	Student Exit Interviews:
The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Major	NYS CST	NYS CST	Content Knowledge Section	Content Knowledge	Content Knowledge
	N=4 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7	N=1 Score Range 400-600 NYS Cut Score 520	N=3 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
	Subject Matter	Mean 3.50	Mean 546	Mean 248.3	Mean 3.52	Mean: 3.58

Table 1.2
Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge
Categories of Assessment (Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years)
Childhood Program

Claim	Categories of Evidence						
	Overall GPA	NYS Assessments: NYS CST	NYS Assessments: NYS CST Multi-Subject	NYS Assessments: NYS CST Students with Disabilities	Student Teaching Evaluation: Content Knowledge Section	Student Teaching Portfolio/Defense: Content Knowledge	Student Exit Interviews: Content Knowledge
The program's graduates have acquired ...	N=2 GPA range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7	N=1 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=2 Score Range 300-600 NYS Cut Score 520	N=2 Score Range 300-600 NYS Cut Score 520	N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=3 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard Level: 4
	Mean 3.74	Mean 256	Mean 560	Mean 539	Mean 3.61	Mean 3.5	Mean 4.75
Subject Matter							

Table 1.3
Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rate
Claim 1: Subject Area Knowledge (Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years)
Adolescence Program

Content Area	GPA in Major Adolescence Program Program Standard: 2.7		Scores on NYS CST NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 520 / 220		
	Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Scaled Score	Statewide Mean Scaled Score
English	1	4.30	1	546	531.9 (revised test)
Biology	1	2.55	1	255	239
Social Studies (History)	2	3.57	2	245	226.9
Total	6	3.47	4	250 (excluding English)	232.9 (excluding English)

Tables 1.1 and 1.2 look across the categories of evidence used to support Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge in both the Adolescence and Childhood Program. The mean major GPA (Adolescence) and overall GPA (Childhood) exceeded the performance criteria set by faculty. Mean exam scores for both Childhood and Adolescence program completers on the New York State Certification Exam (NYSTCE): Content Specialty Test were considerably higher than the NYS cut score for the exam. Mean scores on content knowledge sections of both the Student Teaching Evaluation and Student Exit Interview also exceeded the performance standard.

To find more evidence of subject matter knowledge for the Adolescence Certification Program completers, we looked at the GPAs and CST scores in their specific majors. Table 1.3 presents the mean GPAs and CST scores for the program completers disaggregated by major. Three of the four program completers achieved GPAs that exceeded the program standard (the exception—biology) and all of the completers had CST scores that exceeded the program standard. It should be noted here that New York State certification exams are being revised. Included in this data is a completer score from the revised English CST with a cut score of 520. The CSTs for Biology and Social Studies have yet to be revised and have a cut score of 220.

Table 1.4
Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rates
Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge (Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years)
Childhood Program

General GPA Childhood Program		Scores on NYS CST (Multi-Subject) NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 220 / 520		
Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Scaled Score	Statewide Mean Scaled Score
1	3.83	1 (old version)	256	231
2	3.7	2 (new version)	560	539.9

To find evidence of subject matter knowledge for those within the Childhood Certification program, we looked at the general education GPA that summarizes success in a variety of liberal arts areas. These GPAs were substantially higher than the 2.7 GPA currently mandated within our program. Table 1.4 also shows the mean pass score for the CST exams was substantially higher than the NYS mean score. Again, these scores reflect both versions of NYS CSTs.

Table 1.5
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Across Programs and Content Areas
Claim 1: Content Knowledge Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years)
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adolescence Biology	Adolescence Social Studies	Adolescence English	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=3 Mean (1-4)	N=4 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=2 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=7 Mean (1-4)	
Content Knowledge	1. Content Standards						
	1.a	3.66	3.75	3	4	4	3.7
	2. Knowledge of Content						
	2.a	3.5	3.37	3.5	3.5	3	3.43
	2.b	3.66	3.62	3.5	3.75	3.5	3.64
	2.c	3.33	3.5	4	3.25	3.5	3.41
	3. Academic Language						
	3.a	3.66	3.37	3.5	3	4	3.52
	4. Tools of the Discipline						
	4.a	3.83	3.62	3.0	3.75	4	3.72

Table 1.5 looks at the mean scores across all dimensions within the content knowledge section of the student teaching evaluation rubric. These scores have been disaggregated across the Childhood and Adolescence Programs and across the individual certification areas of the Adolescence Program. All Childhood and Adolescence completers scored above the 3.0 performance standard. Mean scores in a majority of areas were substantially above the standard. Mean scores for the combined Adolescence and Childhood completers ranged from 3.41 to 3.72.

Claim 2: Graduates of our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students.

**Table 2.1
Claim 2: Pedagogy
Pedagogy Across Assessment Categories
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	GPA: Education	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners Section	Student Teaching Portfolio/Defense: Planning for Diverse Learners	Student Exit Interviews: Preparation and Planning
The program's graduates have acquired . . .	N=4 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7	N= 4 Score Range: 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N= 4 Score Range: 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range: 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Pedagogy	Mean 3.57	Mean 3.41	Mean 3.65	Mean 4.44

Table 2.2
Claim 2: Pedagogy
Pedagogy Across Assessment Categories
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Childhood Program

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	GPA: Education	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners Section	Student Teaching Portfolio/Defense: Planning for Diverse Learners	Student Exit Interviews: Planning and Preparation
The program's graduates have acquired . . .	N=3 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7	N= 3 Score Range: 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N: 3 Score Range: 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=3 Score Range: 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
	Mean 3.74	Mean 3.77	Mean 3.36	Mean 4.75
Pedagogy				

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show the categories of evidence used to support Claim 2: Graduates of our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students. Mean Education Program GPAs (education courses) and the mean scores on both the student teaching and portfolio evaluations (Planning for Diverse Learners section) exceeded the performance criteria set by the faculty for both the Childhood and Adolescence Programs. Responses on the Planning section of the Exit Interview surpassed the standard, as well.

Table 2.3
Claim 2: Pedagogy
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adolescence Biology	Adolescence Social Studies	Adolescence English	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=3	N=4	N=1	N=2	N=1	N=7	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Planning for Diverse Learners	1. Goal Development						
	1.a	3.83	3.62	3.5	3.5	4	3.72
	1.b	3.83	3.5	3	3.5	4	3.66
	2. Plan for Instruction						
	2.a	3.75	3.37	3	3.5	3.5	3.56
	2.b	3.66	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.58
	2.c	3.83	3.25	3.5	3.25	3	3.54
	2.d	3.83	3.37	3.5	3.25	3.5	3.6
	2.e	3.83	3.25	3.5	3.25	3	3.54
	3. Knowledge of Students						
	3.a	3.83	3.37	3	3.5	3.5	3.6
	3.b	3.66	3.5	3.5	3.75	3	3.58
	3.c	3.66	3.37	3.5	3.25	3.5	3.52

Table 2.3 looks at the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric. These scores have been disaggregated across the Childhood and Adolescence Programs and across the individual certification areas of the Adolescence Program. All Childhood and Adolescence program completers scored above the 3.0 performance standard. Combined means for both Childhood and Adolescence Programs ranged from 3.54 to 3.72.

Claim 3: Graduates of our program are responsive, reflective professionals who have the knowledge and skills to serve their students.

Table 3.1
Claim 3: Teaching Skill
Teaching Skill Across Assessment Categories
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence Program

Claim	Category of Evidence		
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section	Student Teacher Portfolio /Defense Instruction for Diverse Learners
N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3		N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N= Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean 3.42		Mean 3.47	Mean 4.68
Teaching Skill			

Table 3.2
Claim 3: Teaching Skill
Teaching Skill Across Assessment Categories
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Childhood Program

Claim	Category of Evidence		
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section	Student Teacher Portfolio / Defense: Instruction for Diverse Learners
N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3		N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=3 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean 3.66		Mean 3.25	Mean 4.68
Teaching Skill			

Tables 3.1 and 3.2 present the categories of evidence used to support Claim 3: Teaching Skill in both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs. Mean scores on the Instruction for Diverse Learners section of the student teaching rubric and the Portfolio Artifacts and Defense rubric exceeded the defined quality standard as did the mean scores for the instruction section of the Exit Interview Survey.

Table 3.3
Claim 3: Teaching Skill
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Biology	Adol. Social Studies	Adol. English	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=3	N=4	N=1	N=2	N=1	N=7	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Instruction for Diverse Learners	1.Active Learning Strategies						
	1.a	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.75	3	3.5
	1.b	3.5	3.25	3.0	3.5	3	3.37
	1.c	3.66	3.75	3.5	3.75	4	3.7
	2.Resources/Technology						
	2.a	3.5	3.62	3.5	3.75	3.5	3.56
	2.b	3.33	3.37	3.5	3.5	3	3.35
	2.c	3.5	3.25	3.0	3.25	3.5	3.37
	3.Instructional Roles						
	3.a	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.75
	4.Use of Questions						
	4.a	3.5	3.37	3.5	3.5	3	3.43
	4.b	3.33	2.87	3	2.75	3	3.1
	4.c	3.66	3.5	3	3.75	3.5	3.58
	5.Communication						
	5.a	3.83	3.37	4	3	3.5	3.6
	5.b	3.83	3.5	3.5	3.25	4	3.66
	5.c	3.66	2.87	3	2.75	3	3.26
	6.Instruction Strategies That Support Literacy						
	6.a	3.5	3.5	3	4	3	3.5
	6.b	3.66	3.62	3.5	3.75	3.5	3.64
	6.c	3.66	3.5	3	3.75	3.5	3.58
	6.d	3.66	3.37	3	3.25	4	3.51
	7.Responsiveness to Learners						
	7.a	3.66	3.62	3.5	3.5	4	3.64
	7.b	3.83	3.62	3.5	3.5	4	3.72

Table 3.3 shows the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric. These scores have been disaggregated across the Childhood and Adolescence Programs and across the individual certification areas of the Adolescence Program. The means of all the indicators measured within the Childhood Program met or exceeded the Wells expectation. The specific indicator means that fell below the 3.0 performance standard within the Adolescence Program were 4.b (Use of Questions: “Regularly uses probing, ‘higher level thinking’ questions . . .”) and 5.c (“Directions are generally clear to students and contain an appropriate amount of detail”). These same indicator means assessing the instruction utilized by social studies pre-service teachers fell below the Program expectation.

Table 3.4
Claim 3: Teaching Skill
Mean Scores Across Student Teaching Rubric
Data from Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

Category	Childhood N=3 Score Range 1-4 Mean	Adolescence N=4 Score Range 1-4 Mean
Planning for Diverse Learners	3.77	3.41
Instruction for Diverse Learners	3.66	3.42
Assessment for Diverse Learners	3.56	3.50
Reflection	3.8	3.72

Table 3.4 provides a quick look at the means across five sections of the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric relevant to the overall picture of effective instruction: Planning for Diverse Learners, Instruction for Diverse Learners, Assessment for Diverse Learners and Reflection. All mean scores exceeded the level 3 performance expectation.

Claim 4: Graduates of our program utilize relevant teaching technologies, their knowledge of students' individual and multi-cultural differences, and opportunities for continued growth in order to serve their students.

Table 4.1

**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Continuous Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N= 4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3
Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.72	Mean 3.87

Table 4.2

**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Childhood Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Cont. Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N= 3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3
Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.8	Mean 4.0

Table 4.3
Claim 4: Cross-Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Reflection
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood (total) N=3	Adolescence (total) N=4	Adol. Biology N=1	Adol. Social Studies N=2	Adol. English N=1	Child./Adol. Combined N=7	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Reflection and Continuous Growth	1.Reflection on Teaching						
	1.a	3.66	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.58
	1.b	3.66	3.5	3	3.75	3.5	3.58
	1.c	3.83	4	4	4	4	3.91
	2.Consideration of New Ideas						
	2.a	4	3.87	3.5	4	4	3.93
	2.b	3.83	3.75	3	4	4	3.79
	3.Goal Setting						
	3.a	3.83	3.75	3	4	3.4	3.79

Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 look across the categories of evidence used to support the Cross Cutting Theme of “Learning How to Learn” in both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs. Responses from cooperating teachers on the Reflection sections of the 2012-2013 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics were analyzed. Overall mean scores exceeded the performance standard. In addition, mean scores on the Professionalism and Collaboration criterion 6.c (“Attitude is mature, positive and professional at all times.”) were 3.87 for the Adolescence Program and 4.0 for the Childhood Program.

Table 4.4
Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Adolescence Program

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence		
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners	Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners	NYSTCE: EAS
	Section: Knowledge of Students	Section: Knowledge of Students	
	N=4 Score Range 1-4	N=4 Score Range 1-5	N=4 Score Range 300-600
	Performance Standard: Level 3	Performance Standard: Level 4	NYS Cut Score: 500
Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives	Mean 3.41	Mean 4.75	Mean 542

Table 4.5
Claim 4: Cross-Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Childhood Programs

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence		
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners	Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners	NYSTCE: EAS
	Section: Knowledge of Students	Section: Knowledge of Students	
	N= 3 Score Range 1-4	N= 3 Score Range 1-5	N=3 Score Range 300-600
	Performance Standard: Level 3	Performance Standard: Level 4	NYS Cut Score: 500
Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives	Mean 3.77	Mean 4.33	Mean: 525

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 look across the categories of evidence used to support the Cross Cutting Theme of Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives in both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs. Responses from cooperating teachers on specific sections within the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics, responses from candidates on the Exit Interview, and NYS test scores for the Educating All Students exam were analyzed.

Overall mean scores for relevant sections on our assessment surpassed the established performance standard. Scores on the NYS EAS surpassed the established cut scores.

Table 4.6
Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology
Data from 2014-20146 Academic Years
Adolescence Program

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Resources and Technology Criterion #2b	WebQuest Project
	N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7
Technology	Mean 3.37	Mean 3.3

Table 4.7
Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology
Data from 2014-2016 Academic Years
Childhood Program

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Resources and Technology Criterion #2b	WebQuest
	N=3 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: 3.0	N=3 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7
Technology	Mean 3.33	Mean 4,0

Tables 4.7 and 4.8 show means for the categories of evidence used to support the Cross Cutting Theme of Technology in both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs. Responses to specific criteria describing the integration of relevant technology into instruction from the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric were examined. Scores for completers from both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs exceeded the defined quality standard.

Summary and Discussion

It is important to note that the data within this report represents only seven program completers. Given this small group of pre-service teachers, the analysis has limited value. The data collected, will play a more important role once combined with the data from past and future completers. Still, examination of this year’s data has provided an opportunity for Education Program faculty to have thoughtful conversations about the strengths and needs of the Childhood and Adolescence Certification Programs.

The Wells College Education faculty makes four claims about our programs. Were these claims supported by the results? What questions surface as a result of this examination? How do we plan to use these results to continually improve our program?

Claim 1: Graduates of our program are proficient in subject matter knowledge and apply this knowledge in their teaching.

There is evidence across the measures used in this report that students completing the Wells Education Program during the 2014-2016 academic years will bring a firm foundation of subject matter knowledge into their classrooms. The data collected from the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric completed by the

cooperating teachers is strong across the Childhood and Adolescence candidates and is matched by equally strong scores on the Education Program Portfolio review and defense that is scored collaboratively by Education faculty. This data is supported by solid scores on the NYS Content Specialty Tests and high ratings by candidates on the exit interview. Although one student (biology) did not meet the 2.7 performance standard established by the Program, there was substantial evidence across the other measurements that the candidate has a strong understanding of the content she is teaching, including a score on the NYS CST that was substantially higher than the statewide mean.

Claim 2: Graduates of our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students.

There appears to be ample evidence that students completing our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the needs of students. This evidence includes mean Education Program GPAs, mean scores on the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (Planning/Preparation), mean scores on the faculty scored Portfolio Rubric, and mean scores on the Planning and Preparation section of the Exit Interview survey that all exceed the Education Program standards.

Claim 3: Graduates of our program are responsive, reflective professionals who have the knowledge and skills to serve their students.

When viewed across programs, the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric, Portfolio Rubric and exit interview information support that the recent graduates of the Wells Education Program are responsive practitioners who have the foundational knowledge and instructional skill to serve their students. One specific student teaching evaluation indicator that continues to be rated below the performance standard on the rubric is 4.b, Use of Questions: "Regularly uses probing, 'higher level thinking' questions". This has surfaced regularly over the years (most recently in the 2015 Assessment Data) as an area that candidates struggle with.

Claim 4: Graduates of our program utilize relevant teaching technologies, their knowledge of students' individual and multi-cultural differences, and opportunities for continued growth in order to serve their students.

Given the evidence from across the Student Teacher Evaluation Rubric and Exit Interviews, the Education Program has done a solid job of preparing our graduates to utilize relevant instructional technology, address diversity and reflect thoughtfully on their practice.

General Discussion

As in previous years the faculty discussion immediately focused on the fact that that the data represented only seven students: three Childhood certification candidates and four Adolescence level candidates. This data, once combined with additional years, will allow us to see patterns of success along with patterns of challenge. Analyzed alone, however, little can be inferred.

Education Faculty agreed that there is a need for developing a sustainable system for gathering qualitative evidence on our program completers. We have made strides in that this year. Sara Levy began working on this in summer, 2014 through a Wells faculty grant enabling her to develop a case study protocol and to engage in a qualitative study of four program completers (spring, 2015). See the Education Program 2016 Assessment Report. This case study protocol was revised in summer, 2016 and Sara continued to gather data on two program completers during the 2016-17 academic year.

V.-VI. Program Changes with Action Plan for the Upcoming Year

The Education Program decided on the following goals and action steps for the upcoming 2017-18 academic year.

1. *Increase opportunities for students to engage in discipline-specific instructional methodologies.*
(Continued from 2016-17)

As noted earlier, the decision was made this year to require that all students seeking adolescence certification take EDUC 304: Inclusive Instruction and Assessment. This course focuses on the general principles / practices of lesson and curriculum design and was required for all students seeking childhood certification. Prior to this decision, students seeking adolescence certification were only required to take EDUC 406: Instructional Strategies for Secondary Education, which included this same focus on lesson and curriculum design in addition to focus on specific content methodologies. By requiring EDUC 304, the attention to general lesson and curriculum planning can be removed from EDUC 406, allowing more time to be devoted to content-specific methodologies and readings. Although the formal requirement to complete EDUC 304 will be in place for the 2017-18 academic year, there is still much to be done to develop the curriculum of EDUC 406 into a course rich in learnings and outcomes that address these methodologies. As mentioned in section II, the challenge is to develop the course structure, materials, learning experiences, and assessments that address the many and varied content areas. In addition, EDUC 304 will need to be revised to address the needs of students planning to teach grades 7-12 while also continuing to meet the needs of those planning to teach grades 1-6.

Action Steps:

- Re-develop the structure, materials, learning tasks and assessments of EDUC 406: Instructional Strategies for Secondary Education to focus more intentionally and thoroughly on varied content-specific methodologies. (Sara Levy)
 - Revise EDUC 304: Inclusive Instruction and Assessment to address the learning needs of candidates seeking certification at the Childhood (gr. 1-6) and Adolescence (gr. 7-12) levels. (Susan Wansor)
2. *Review and redesign EDUC 226: Building Classroom Community to better reflect: current issues in today's classrooms; evidence-based practices to develop community and relationship building; and strategies for applying these practices in challenging systems.* (Continued from 2016-17)

Our specific goal for this year is to develop a stronger bridge between EDUC 226 and the student teaching experience.

- Modify major course assignments to more directly apply course learnings to authentic classroom situations. (Sara Levy)
3. *Increase opportunities for student engagement with technology.* (Continued from 2016-17)
 - Review the goals and outcomes for EDUC 225: Technology in the Classroom, and organize curriculum and learning tasks around utilizing technology for K-12 student engagement, instruction, and communication. (Susan Wansor)

- Develop a culminating project and corresponding rubric to replace the current WebQuest project utilized as evidence of addressing Claim Four's Crosscutting Theme: Technology. (Susan Wansor)
4. *Explore changes to our program assessment plan in order to better serve the assessment of both student learning and our program in general. (Continued from 2016-17 with slight modification)*
- Build understanding and capacity to address the new CAEP standards and recently modified CAEP accreditation protocol. Attend CAEP accreditation workshops, conferences etc. (Sara Levy)
 - Re-evaluate and modify the Portfolio Defense Rubric for clarity and alignment with other assessment tools. (Susan Wansor and Sara Levy)
 - Submit key assessment tools and rubrics to CAEP for review and feedback.
5. *Provide instructional scaffolding to support candidate application of student-directed questions that address higher order thinking.*
- Provide more explicit instruction and guided practice for development and use of questions that promote higher order thinking.
 - Develop learning experiences and assessment opportunities in EDUC 405. (Marci Belfi)
 - Develop learning experiences and assessment opportunities in EDUC 302 and 332. (Susan Wansor)
 - Develop learning experiences and assessment opportunities in EDUC 406. (Sara Levy)