Wells College Inclusive Childhood Education Major and Adolescence Education Annual Assessment Report May 2016

The Annual Assessment Meeting

Although assessment discussions frequently take place within the Education Program's weekly meetings, and the impact of the information that surfaced from the Case Studies was discussed throughout the academic year, the formal discussion to review the Case Studies and formalize goals occurred on June 2, 2016. The meeting lasted approximately 2 ½ hours and included Susan Talbot (program director), Susan Wansor and Sara Levy. The topics discussed included how to better prepare our pre-service teachers to: apply effective, content-specific methodologies; address the issues and constraints often faced within dysfunctional school systems; and address the needs of diverse student populations specifically within urban districts. We brainstormed ideas for increasing relevant, reflective student experiences in urban schools, and increasing student application of technology across all education courses. In addition, as a direct result of information shared within the case studies, we discussed the possibilities of engaging in a thorough review of EDUC 226, Building Classroom Community.

Last Year's Goals (2015): What Have We Achieved?
- *Increase opportunities for students to work in diverse, urban classrooms.*
    - *We will continue to explore internships/student teaching opportunities in Syracuse and Rochester City School Districts. It may be possible to connect with our program graduates there.*
    - *Strengthen connections with Auburn and Ithaca principals/superintendents.*

Out of 14 student teaching placements over the past two years, (seven students, each having two placements), six of them have been in urban settings (Auburn and Ithaca). Five out of the seven student teachers involved had urban experiences. We also began working with Auburn and Ithaca districts to provide field experiences opportunities in these districts. Of the ten students taking EDUC 307 (*Teaching Student with Disabilities*) during the 2016 academic year, eight of them participated a 40-hr. field experiences in either Auburn or Ithaca School Districts. Continued work is needed. See 2016 goals.

- *Continue to emphasize and develop new opportunities to strengthen specific content area pedagogy in Adolescence methods courses (EDUC 331, 332, 406).*
    - *Create opportunities for math/science students to explore inquiry-based instruction within our secondary methods course, EDUC 406.*
    - *Coordinate projects across the methods course (EDUC 406/331/332) so that students are required to address a range of specific concepts/information/skills from across their appropriate content standards.*

All assignments for EDUC 406, 331 and 332 have been converted to discipline specific assignments. All textbooks and most assigned readings used in these courses are discipline specific. Although we feel we have addressed both of these action steps through course modifications, there is more to do. See 2016 goals.

- *Develop additional supports for the New York State Teaching Certification exams.*
    - *Create test prep workshops to be offered to program completers in the fall of their senior year.*
    - *Infuse case study activities into EDUC 405 and 307 to help prepare students for case study questions on the Multi-Subject CST and EAS exam.*

A test preparation workshop was provided for program completers in December, 2015. All student teachers attended.   Case study activities were included in both EDUC 405 and 307 during the 2015-16 academic year. More will be developed and incorporated into the 2016-17 curriculum.

- *Develop opportunities for additional edTPA support and curricular alignment to strengthen preparation.*
    - o *Redesign lesson template to include language and focus areas aligned with the edTPA.*
    - o *A task aligned to the Special Education edTPA will be developed and included in the new EDUC 307 to begin in fall, 2015.*
    - o *Develop consistent language and a consistent protocol (supportive of the edTPA) for reflecting on instructional decisions across courses. This will not be done at the expense of additional reflection on non-instructional decisions (ex. reflecting on decisions intended to support to students' affective or emotional needs).*

All action steps were achieved. Faculty will provide continued focus on utilizing consistent language in alignment with the edTPA for pre-service teacher reflection.

- *Develop a plan for sustainable, qualitative assessment of our program completers through the use of graduate case studies.*
    - o *Analysis of information gathered in the spring, 2015 case studies will be completed in summer, 2015 and included in the 2015-2016 assessment report.*
    - o *Once that analysis is complete, a revised case study protocol will be developed and implemented on an annual basis.*
- *Review technology expectations to determine a new project to include as an assessment of students' learning in this area. As of fall, 2016 all students seeking certification will have taken, or will be required to take EDUC 225, Technology in the Classroom.*
- *Directly teach the effective use of paraprofessionals and volunteers in the Student Teaching Reflective Seminar.*

Four case studies were completed in spring of last year. A summary and analysis of findings are included in this plan. Challenges encountered this year prevented the WCEP from completing the revision of the case studies protocol and no new case studies were completed. The revision of the protocols will continue and two new case studies will be completed during the 2016-17 academic year. See 2016 goals.

The WCEP review of technology expectations led to some unexpected changes in our program. The course modification of increasing the credit received for EDUC 225 to three was approved in spring, 2015. As a 200 level course, this class is being taken primarily by freshman and sophomores. The WCEP faculty felt that the final project was not an appropriate substitute for the current program assessment (WebQuest) given that most students are in their first or second year at Wells. Program faculty decided to maintain the use of the WebQuest as the assessment tool but to move that project, for students in the Inclusive Childhood Education Program, into EDUC 305, Literacy in the Social Studies. The WebQuest remains in EDUC 332 for students in the Adolescence Certification Program. See 2016 goals.

The effective use of paraprofessionals and volunteers has been included as an instructional topic in both EDUC 408, *Student Teaching Reflective Seminar*, and EDUC 307, *Teaching Students with Disabilities*.

Examination of New Assessment Data
Typically the Education Program Assessment Report gathers and analyzes data from across the assessment tools noted in our assessment plan. This data includes scores on the student teacher evaluation rubrics, student teacher portfolio defense rubric, New York State Teaching Certification Exams. Data is collected from the previous year's program completers. For example, the 2014-15 assessment report analyzed data collected from our 2013-14 program completers. Given that there were only two program completers during the 2014-15 academic year, education faculty decided to combine the collected data from these two graduates with the data

collected from our five completers in spring, 2016. The data from these two years (2014-15 and 2015-16) will be combined and reported in our 2017 assessment report. This 2017 report will include, for the first time, data collected from our first graduates of the new Inclusive Childhood Education major.

For this year's annual assessment report, the Education Program decided to look closely at the results of the spring, 2015 case studies in order to identify specific changes might strengthen our program and increase our effectiveness at preparing quality pre-service teachers.

Summary: 2015 Case Studies

Introduction

In order to best understand the strengths and weaknesses of the Wells College Education Program (WCEP), we have undertaken a qualitative case study approach to our assessment. After a pilot study in the fall of 2012, we were able to conduct a more thorough classroom-based study in May 2015. There are several reasons why the case study approach is appropriate for the WCEP. First, this methodology allows us to better understand the conditions facing our graduates when they enter the classroom, which will allow us to better prepare future students for these ever-changing environments. Additionally, the size of our program and average number of graduates per year means that using more traditional quantitative measures does not yield significant or informative results. Finally, the case study method allows for a more holistic approach to assessment, yielding findings that may not have come to light through other means. As in the 2012 pilot study, Professor Sara Levy was the primary investigator and performed all data collection and analysis. Before examining the findings of the 2015 data, we will provide a brief overview of the methodology used to collect this data.

Methodology

In keeping with the principles of qualitative data collection, multiple data points were identified in order to triangulate data and to develop robust findings. After completing the pilot project in 2012, it became clear that classroom observations of Wells graduates would yield more information about the ways in which the WCEP influenced graduates' teaching and decision making. Each Wells graduate is considered a case for the purposes of this study, and is bounded by all the data collection associated with that graduate. Due to logistical considerations such as researcher availability, school schedules, and outside grant funding, we were able to spend two days observing each participating graduate teach. Additionally, we interviewed each teacher once and conducted a focus group with several current students of each graduate. Therefore, each case includes field notes from two days of classroom observations, a teacher interview, a student focus group, and curricular materials.

Participants

We identified four graduates, two who received their Childhood Education (grades 1-6) certification through the WCEP and two who received their Adolescent Education (grades 7-12) certification through the WCEP, who were willing and able to participate in this study. All four are teaching in New York State and three of the four have earned master's degrees since their completion of the WCEP. This is quite common for our graduates and therefore representative of a larger group of graduates. Information about participants can be found in Table One.

Table One. WCEP Graduates Participating in 2015 Case Study Research

Graduate Name[1]	WCEP Certification	Spring 2015 Position	Years Teaching
Sally Adams	May, 2013: Childhood	Oak Elementary School, Syracuse, NY 6th grade general education	One
Carol	May, 2014:	Girls Charter High School, Albany, NY	One

---

[1] All participant names are pseudonyms.

Green	Adolescent (Biology)	9th grade Living Environment, 12th grade A.P. biology	
Kelly Harris	December, 2008: Childhood	Maple Elementary School, Aurora, NY 4th grade general education	Six
Matthew Smith	December, 2011: Adolescent (Math)	Elm School (K-8), Syracuse, NY 8th grade math	Two

As seen in Table One, three of the four participants have relatively little experience in the classroom. Also, three of the four are now teaching in urban environments. They are all teaching in the areas in which they gained their initial certification through the WCEP, though three of the four (all but Carol Green) have earned master's degrees since their graduation from Wells College.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed according to a priori codes based on the four primary claims of the WCEP:
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.

Professor Levy read through all of the field notes, curricular materials, interview transcripts, and focus group transcripts several times in order to gather information about each participant in relation to the four areas of interest and to develop assertions and ground conclusions about each participant's performance. Additionally, during this coding process, other themes emerged. Those themes will be highlighted in this report as well, as they provide valuable information about the contexts in which our graduates will likely be teaching.

Findings

Subject Matter Knowledge

It is clear that the Wells College Education Program graduates are "proficient in subject matter knowledge and [can] apply this knowledge in their teaching," as stated in Claim 1. The structure of the Wells College Education Program allowed all four WCEP graduates to gain a strong grounding in their content areas. An English major and Childhood Education minor at Wells, Ms. Harris stated her appreciation for her English classes because she "was really able to support when it came to writing and breaking it down . . . I felt like I was prepared; and parents' questions – I felt I was prepared to answer them." During my two days of observation, Ms. Harris demonstrated her deep understanding of the subject matter she was teaching. She was able to explain, re-explain, and scaffold appropriately, particularly during math lessons involving multiplying fractions. Students often struggle while learning fractions, and Ms. Harris' knowledge and experience teaching this topic to fourth graders helped her and her students better understand the concepts. During the focus group interview, her students affirmed their teacher's subject matter knowledge by noting that she had worked with them on long division, multiplying fractions, and understanding decimals. As one student said: "She helped me learn decimals and fractions, and if you're having a very, very, very hard time at it, she'll work with you the most, and the other kids that need help." Here, the student is noting not only that she feels her teacher knows the content well enough to teach it, but that she is dedicated to helping her students master difficult and challenging concepts.

As Ms. Green noted in her interview, her challenge in terms of subject matter was "figuring out what is applicable to ninth graders – they don't need to know everything that [she] learned in college." She cited the New York State Regents Exam in Living Environment, which her students must pass in order to graduate, as

somewhat constricting in her choice of content. She described her curricular decision making as a balance: "what do they need to know, versus what I want to teach them" with a focus on topics that are relevant to her students' lives. Ms. Green felt well-prepared by both the WCEP and the Biological and Chemical Sciences faculty, though stated that she wished she had been able to take a discipline-specific methods course. Due to program size, the WCEP offers a general secondary methods course to all students earning certification in Adolescent Education. Despite this perceived shortcoming, Ms. Green's students believed that their teacher was knowledgeable about biology and appreciated her ability to explain concepts in multiple ways: "I think she does a good job because if she tries to teach us in one way, and it doesn't work, she does multiple ways to see which one works best." Similar to Ms. Harris, Ms. Green's students appreciate her willingness and desire to work with her students until she is sure they have mastered the concepts at hand.

Pedagogical Decision Making
Our graduates demonstrate their ability to "understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students" within the structural constraints of their schools, districts, and New York state, as stated in Claim 2. A pillar of the WCEP is cooperative learning, which is grounded in the belief that learning is a social process and that students learn more deeply and authentically when they work together to make meaning and knowledge. All four WCEP graduates cite cooperative learning strategies learned at Wells as integrated into their pedagogy. However, the structures in which the graduates are currently working often make it challenging for them to fully implement these strategies. This can be seen in my observations of Ms. Green's classroom.

During the two days I was there, the students were tasked with completing packets about human body systems using information from their textbooks. Ms. Green greeted me the first day by apologizing for this pedagogical choice, as she knew it was not related to what she had been taught at Wells. At the small charter high school where Ms. Green was hired after the several weeks after the school year began, she has less decision-making power than her senior colleague in the biology department. Therefore, when the other teacher introduced the worksheet packets to Ms. Green as a curricular tool they would use during their study of human body systems, Ms. Green was able to ask a few questions about their effectiveness but was ultimately not able to avoid using the packets. As we both watched her students struggle to complete the work in the allotted time, Ms. Green revised her lesson to attempt to have her students jigsaw the readings about human body systems. One partner would read and answer questions about one system while the other partner did the same for a different system. They would then teach each other about "their" system before completing a quiz about each system. However, as ninth graders in a single-sex charter high school that draws from all over the city, the students were still working to trust each other. Therefore, Ms. Green's attempts at using this cooperative learning strategy with a more traditional curricular resource were only marginally successful, as several girls chose to complete the work individually. Here, the nature of the school enrollment process, Ms. Green's inexperience and late hiring, and the general problem of high teacher turnover at this school have contributed to a classroom environment of mistrust. Though she had made progress in her first year, Ms. Green still faced significant obstacles in implementing cooperative learning strategies in a meaningful and consistent way.

The teacher who was observed engaging in these strategies the most was Ms. Harris, which is unsurprising for several reasons. As the most experienced of the four teachers, she has had more time in the classroom to refine and hone her teaching. Additionally, and perhaps more importantly, she teaches a self-contained fourth grade class with fifteen students. She has arranged desks in groups of three or four in one area of the classroom, has two desktop computers along one wall, a small reading nook, two tables for station work, and a large rug with a world map on it for whole class meetings. She has the time and space to cultivate a sense of community in her classroom. During every lesson I observed Ms. Harris teach, students were working together; for example, she would have students whisper answers to their partners, read and edit each other's writing, check each other's work during math, and participate in literature circles.

In comparison, Ms. Adams teaches in a departmentalized sixth grade, meaning that she teaches math and science to both sixth grade classes, while the other sixth grade teacher teaches English-Language Arts (ELA) and social studies. Ms. Adams has 21-24 students in her room at any one time. Her classroom is crowded with five groups of five desks each and two desktop computers, which makes it hard for students to move around to work with each other during the class period. Ms. Adams teaches math in a more traditional format, calling on individual students to answer questions as she teaches from the SmartBoard at the front of the room. She switches easily and often between instruction and modeling of processes, guided practice, and independent practice. She consistently checks in with students about their process, answers individual questions during work time, scaffolds steps in mathematical processes for students struggling to understand the content, and constantly focuses and refocuses her students' attention.

While feeling tied to the curricular modules that many districts have adopted as scripted curriculum, Ms. Adams looks for moments when she can help her students understand their own agency and power. While teaching a lesson about interquartile range, she had students generate data to be used in the lesson. She asked students how many siblings they have and used this data for the next section of her lesson. During this lesson, she made a point of asking students if they are capable of collecting and analyzing their own data, and then pointing out that they had just done so with the sibling data. She told the students that one of her goals was for students to be able to collect their own data, based on questions developed from their own interests, and to analyze that data by the end of the unit. This pedagogical choice, to show students their power and agency in asking and answering important questions using complex mathematical concepts, reflects Ms. Adams' understanding of urban schooling and culturally relevant pedagogy. As a sociology major at Wells, Ms. Adams was introduced to these concepts and has found ways to incorporate what she has learned about cultural capital and cultural funds of knowledge into her teaching.

Unfortunately, the discipline system used by the school seems to interfere with student learning. One method the school apparently employs is to remove disruptive students from their classrooms and have them sit in other classrooms for a "break." The students are escorted from room to room by school security guards. During my first day of observation, two students were placed in Ms. Adams' room via this system, which was disruptive and distracting to her students. Throughout my two days at the school, the use of security guards to address behavior issues was troubling. Guards would deliver students to classrooms, remove students from classrooms, and discipline students in the hallway. This helped to create a school environment in which the students did not feel trusted by administration or teachers, which also makes it difficult to implement teaching strategies grounded in the belief that students and teachers must trust and respect each other.

Inclusive and Culturally Relevant Instruction
Our graduates excel at developing individual relationships with students. They are clearly compassionate, kind, and invested educators. Each teacher took time to answer students' questions, to encourage reluctant students to engage with the lesson, to give thoughtful and specific praise, and to sit next to students as they struggled to make sense of fractions, the Pythagorean Theorem, human body systems, and rock formation. They chatted with students in the hall before and after school and were praised by their students for their dedication to student learning and general well-being. As Mr. Smith's students said, "he knows how to help us and connect with us." Ms. Adams' students appreciated that she "knows how to deal with us and be able to explain it and get it stuck in our brain." Comments like these were common across the four focus groups, and reflect the WCEP graduates' dedication, care, and authenticity in relationships with students.

However, those currently teaching in urban schools seem unaware of some of the structural problems inherent in the ways their schools engage in discipline and management. The two schools in Syracuse in particular were troubling due to their focus on extrinsic motivation, incentives, and punishments. The messages from both schools seemed to be that it was expected that students would not want to be present, would resist learning, and would need to be heavily controlled in order to learn. Both Ms. Adams and Mr. Smith's schools use a point system called Class Dojo (www.classdojo.com), which awards points for behaviors such as "working hard,"

"helping others," and being "on task." Students can also lose points. Teachers can award and take away points from either a computer or their smartphone, and a message pops up on the SmartBoard indicating which student has gained or lost a point, and why. Mr. Smith also has his own incentive point system, where each class works to earn points, with a maximum of five per day by being on task. When the class has earned sixty points, they can choose a reward. Ms. Adams and the other sixth grade teacher decided to give their students some recess time in the afternoon given the sweltering temperatures and long school day (8 am – 4 pm), though would also use this time as incentive and punishment. Students who had been off-task earlier in the day would have to sit on the stairs by the teachers for the number of minutes "owed" to the teachers for this off-task behavior.

Each school also had specific rules around hallway behavior. Mr. Smith's eighth graders were not allowed to change classes by themselves, but were instead held in their classrooms as the teachers coordinated their passage from class to class. This meant that Mr. Smith and the rest of the eighth grade team would stand in their doorways with their students lined up in the classrooms, and they would call to each other to decide whose students would be allowed to move to their next classroom first, second, etc. They also kept all classroom doors locked, so that when students would return from the bathroom or came in late, they would need to knock and someone would need to let them in. Much of the conversation during the time I was at Mr. Smith's school was focused on the eighth grade trip to Darien Lake, an amusement park near Buffalo, NY. Students were allowed to attend if they had less than a certain number of referrals, absences, and suspensions. For those students who were already over the number, this trip served as a disincentive to participate in school.

Ms. Adams would lead her students to the drinking fountain and bathroom a few times a day, including after the recess time in the afternoon. Two students skipped, silently, from the bathroom to the classroom one of the days I was there. It seemed to be an innocent and well-intentioned blowing off of some steam, and Ms. Adams was seemingly willing to allow this brief moment of levity. However, the principal saw the students and gently reprimanded Ms. Adams by asking what the students had won to be able to skip down the hall. Ms. Adams, a first year untenured teacher, responded that they had won a trip back to the water fountain to walk down the hall. All of these structures around hallway behavior contribute to a school environment that feels constrained. Even when the WCEP graduates attempt to allow some freedom for their children, they know they are taking a risk, as Ms. Adams did with the skipping in the hall.

Therefore, given these constraints, it is admirable that the WCEP graduates and their colleagues genuinely care about their students and their success. They worry about them when they leave school and are aware of their limitations as educators. Mr. Smith made several phone calls home to tell parents how well their students were doing, allowed students to store their belongings in his room, and bought lunch for students on a regular basis. He made a trip to the office to speak to a parent who was taking her daughter out of school early so that the student could babysit for a younger child. Ms. Adams reflected on one student who is often quite disruptive in class; the student was born in a refugee camp in an African country, her parents both died of AIDS, and she currently lives with a nutritionist who had worked at the camp. Her caregiver had told Ms. Adams that he tells the student that she will have to go back to the camp if she misbehaves too much. Ms. Adams noted that she makes it a point to hug the girl each morning when she arrives and to make sure the student knows Ms. Adams cares about her.

It is important to closely examine the structures in which teachers work and to consider the lives of the students whom they teach because these are the factors that impact teacher decision-making on a daily basis. Ultimately, our graduates are faced with impossible choices on a regular basis – to lecture a parent for taking her child out of school or to provide support for that student and her family, to prioritize their own job security or to allow students time to be kids, to reward good behavior or to push for authentic learning. It is imperative that we consider these realities when looking holistically at the Wells College Education Program in order to identify areas where we can discuss these realities and help prepare students for these impossible choices.

Conclusion

Currently, the Wells College Education Program prepares students well in terms of subject matter knowledge, pedagogical decision-making, and reflective practice. The areas where our graduates struggle are areas where almost all thoughtful and dedicated educators are struggling; working to adopt the New York state ELA and math modules to fit their students' needs, working to meet the needs of all students with increasing pressure from administration, parents, and others, and working to understand how and why students use social media (cited as an issue by both Ms. Adams and Mr. Smith). There are a few improvements that the WCEP has already made that are hopefully beginning to address some of these issues. These are the development of EDUC 215: Technology in the Classroom and EDUC 225: Issues in Multicultural and English Language Learner Education. These are courses that were not available to the participants during their time at Wells. As we continue this qualitative work with more recent graduates in the coming years, we will hopefully see teachers with a better understanding of how to develop a multicultural curriculum and a better sense of culturally relevant pedagogy, as well as teachers working to use available educational technology in innovative ways. Both Ms. Green and Mr. Smith also cited the need for more discipline-specific methods courses, and Professor Levy continues to work to refine and develop this EDUC 406: Instructional Strategies for the Secondary Classroom to meet the needs of pre-service teachers in a variety of content areas.

There are a few concrete steps the WCEP can take to address some of the concerns raised earlier in this report. As Mr. Smith noted in his interview, the majority of available jobs for new teachers are in urban areas. This is evidenced by the teaching placements of Mr. Smith, Ms. Green, and Ms. Adams. The WCEP needs to continue to seek out urban field placements for our students and Professor Levy will need to continue to refine the EDUC 215 course to better prepare students for all educational settings. As more schools are departmentalizing their elementary grades, as seen in Ms. Adams' class, we will need to be creative in finding field placements for students that are meaningful and immersive in all content areas. Ms. Harris also noted that her school would be departmentalizing beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year, indicating that this trend continues to grow.

There are also areas that will require more research and reflection by WCEP faculty before decisions can be made about how to proceed. As discussed in the final section of this report, many schools are not currently structured to support authentic learning and academic engagement. They are currently structured to make students behave in a certain way, and the punish those that don't fit a specific mold. It is important that our students understand these differences and focus their energy on student *learning* rather than *behavior*, despite the overall focus on behavior in any school in which they may find themselves working. Just as we expect our graduates to be thoughtful and reflective in their work, we need to reflect not only on what we value, but how to help our students develop and maintain their own values in oppressive and constricted teaching environments.

Program Changes: Summary

As a result of the information presented within the case studies and the related discussion that followed, the program changes that are being implemented during the 2016-17 academic year include:

- Increasing student teaching and field placements in urban districts;
- Increasing opportunities for students to engage in discipline-specific instructional methodologies by restructuring the Adolescence Certification Program to include EDUC 304;
- Reviewing and redesigning EDUC 226 to better reflect the current issues in today's classrooms, evidence-based practices for developing community and relationship building, and strategies for applying these practices in challenging systems;
- Increasing opportunities for student engagement with technology within a minimum of three courses; and
- Revising the case study protocol to reflect a rich but reasonable process that could be successfully implemented throughout the 2016-17 academic year.

Action Plan for the 2016-17 Academic Year

Goal	Action Steps	Faculty Responsible	Timeline
Increase student teaching and field placements in urban districts.	1. Provide all student teachers with at least one urban placement. 2. Explore creating urban experiences as alternatives to traditional field work.	1.Wansor 2.Faculty collaboration	1.Fall 2.Fall/Spring
Increase opportunities for students to engage in discipline-specific instructional methodologies.	1. Review EDUC 406 in order to determine course content relevant to discipline-specific methodology (would remain in EDUC 406) and course content relevant to general instructional methodology (shifted to EDUC 304). 2. Propose a modification of Adolescence Education minor and certification program to include EDUC 304.	1.Levy 2.Talbot	1.Fall 2.Spring
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.	1. Review current syllabus and outcomes for course. 2. Develop new outcomes. 3. Review and select new texts. 4. Review and select resources for case studies/critical incidents. 5. Develop Syllabus. 6. If necessary, propose course description modification.	1.-6. Levy with faculty collaboration	1.Fall 2.Fall 3.Fall 4.Spring 5.Spring 6.Spring
Increase opportunities for student engagement with technology.	Infuse courses with opportunities for students to engage with technology. 1. EDUC 405 Flipped Classroom Project 2. EDUC 304 Google Sheets/Google Docs to collect data 3. EDUC 305 WebQuest and use of Google Earth	1.Talbot 2.Wansor 3.Levy	1.Fall 2.Fall 3.Fall
Revise the case study protocol and implement throughout 2016-17	1. Revise case study protocol. 2. Contact graduates and establish schedule for classroom visits. 3. Visit classrooms (3X). 4. Organize, analyze and disseminate data collected.	1.Levy with faculty collaboration 2.-4.Levy	1.Fall 2.Fall 3.Fall/Spring
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.	1. Discuss / develop the addition of clarifying practices and guidelines within our goals / objective / outcomes section and our student teaching evaluation rubric, specifically to help identify quality "look fors" in the context of teaching students with disabilities.	1.-2. Talbot with faculty collaboration	1. Fall

	2. Explore / discuss prioritizing and eliminating some of the assessments to better streamline and manage the assessment process.		2.Spring

The Updated Assessment Plan
The updated assessment plan has been submitted as a separate document. Updates to this document include:
- a description of the impact of the new Inclusive Childhood Education major on our assessment process;
- he addition of two EDUC 307 projects (IEP and Planning / Instruction / Assessment) and one EDUC 405 project (Planning / Instruction / Assessment) to our assessment list and program assessment map;
- a description of our use of graduate case studies and their role in developing goals for the 2016-17 academic year; and
- an updated identification of recent course titles and levels.