

Wells College Education Program Annual Assessment Report May 2015

The Wells College Education Program Mission Statement

The Wells College Teacher Education Program proceeds from the belief that classroom teaching done well is enormously complex. Mastery of subject matter is necessary but hardly sufficient; to help their students understand and embrace important knowledge and skills, teachers must understand learners as diverse, intellectual, emotional, and social beings. To help our students develop this understanding, we take advantage of and build upon the foundation laid by a Wells general education—the ability and inclination to engage with (rather than retreat from) complexity, to examine arguments critically but also to imagine constructively, and to exercise a strong ethical sense. We aim to graduate outstanding pre-service teachers who can model these liberal arts traits for their own students, who can draw upon a rich base of instructional principles and practices, and who collaborate with others in order to fulfill one of the major goals of Wells College: “sharing the privileges of education with others.”

Program Claims

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 who have met the outcomes and objectives described below.

Domain: Planning and Preparation

Planning for Diverse Learners

Wells pre-service teachers will understand that although the basic principles of learning, motivation, and effective instruction apply to all learners (regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, disability, religion, socioeconomic status etc.), learners differ in their developmental needs, preferences for learning mode and strategies, the pace in which they learn, their cultural backgrounds and unique capabilities. Addressing the needs of diverse learners begins in the planning process.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

1. develop clear instructional goals/objectives that reflect high expectations, curriculum standards and varied student needs while also permitting sound assessment;
2. plan how to achieve student learning goals, choosing appropriate strategies, resources and materials to: differentiate instruction, develop appropriate sequencing and pacing of learning experiences, and allow multiple ways to demonstrate learning;
3. design developmentally appropriate learning plans that demonstrate a knowledge of the students being taught; and
4. engage in inquiry about learning and inclusive practices within the contexts of teaching, learning, and schools and effectively communicate their learnings.

Content Knowledge

Wells' pre-service teachers will understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) they teach.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

1. have a working knowledge of the content standard(s);
2. understand major concepts, principles, debates, methods of inquiry, and outstanding issues that are central to the discipline(s) they teach;
3. know and use the academic language of the discipline; and
4. apply tools, structures and pedagogical techniques of the discipline(s).

Assessment

Wells' pre-service teachers will use multiple, varied measures to document student growth, engage students in reflection and goal setting, evaluate instructional effectiveness and modify instruction.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

1. design and use diagnostic, formative and summative assessments that engage learners in demonstrating clearly defined knowledge and skills;
2. design and implement assessment accommodations and modifications;
3. develop and articulate assessment criteria;
4. provide timely, specific, constructive feedback to guide students' progress toward goals;
5. analyze and interpret assessment data to monitor student progress and inform instructional practice;

Domain: Instruction

Instruction

Wells' pre-service teachers will understand and apply a variety of instructional strategies that support diverse groups of students in meeting rigorous learning goals.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

1. implement a variety of active learning strategies based on principles of effective instruction that meet varied learning needs and encourage higher level thinking;
2. use a variety of resources, including human and technological, to engage students in learning;
3. vary their roles in the instructional process (e.g. instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and needs of the students;
4. ask questions that serve different purposes—probing for learner understanding, helping students articulate ideas and thinking processes, facilitating factual recall, stimulating curiosity etc.;
5. model effective communication strategies;
6. use a variety of instructional strategies to support and expand learner's communication through reading, writing, speaking and listening;
7. monitor student learning and adjust instruction in response to learning needs; and

- analyze and evaluate a range of instructional theories and practices for their effectiveness in meeting diverse student needs.

Domain: Learning Environment

Learning Environment

Wells' pre-service teachers will work with learners to create challenging, inclusive environments that support individual and collaborative learning, encourage positive social interaction, and develop motivation to learn.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

- communicate and interact with students in ways that demonstrate respect and responsiveness to individual needs and cultural backgrounds; and
- organize and manage a classroom effectively using the concepts of respect and responsibility as the cornerstones.

Domain: Professional Responsibilities

Professionalism and Collaboration

Wells' pre-service teachers will demonstrate professional responsibility and engage relevant stakeholders to maximize student growth, development and learning.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

- participate actively as part of an instructional team and effectively collaborate with a variety of adults within the school community;
- communicate and collaborate with families, guardians and caregivers;
- maintain timely and accurate records;
- maintain confidentiality regarding student records and information;
- participate in school and district events;
- demonstrate professional behavior and attitudes in the workplace;
- understand and discuss schools as organizations within a historical, cultural, political, and social contexts; and
- understand and discuss the alignment of family, school and community;

Reflection and Continuous Growth

Wells' pre-service teachers will use evidence to continually evaluate and adapt their practice to meet the needs of the learner and to set informed goals.

Pre-service teachers will . . .

- reflect on their instructional decisions, assess their effectiveness and generate alternative actions
- actively investigate and consider new ideas that improve teaching and learning and draw on current education policy and research as sources of reflection;
- set goals to enhance personal strengths and address personal weaknesses in teaching practice; and
- understand and discuss how personal identity, worldview, and prior experience affect perceptions and expectations, and recognize how they may bias behaviors and interactions with others.

Assessment of Claims, Outcomes and Objectives

Assessment tools used to measure the accuracy of our claims are noted in the chart below. The highlighted forms of evidence have been used in this year's assessment report. These include:

Student GPAs

New York State Teaching Certification Exams scores

EdTPA scores

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics scores and comments

Student Exit Interview scores and comments

Web Quest Project scores

It is important to note that some new data sources have been recently added to the evidence used. All students certified after May 1, 2014 are required to pass new assessments including New York State’s Educating All Students exam (EAS) and the national edTPA performance exam. The 2013-14 list of completers included pre-service teachers that were certified both before and after the May 1, 2014 deadline. This meant that test scores were collected and analyzed from both the old and new assessments. Next year’s assessment report will include the scores from the new and revised assessments only. Two NYS certification exams have been eliminated and will not be included after this year: the Liberal Arts and Science Test (LAST) and the Assessment of Teaching Strategies—Written (ATS-W). A matrix that summarizes how these tools are used to assess our outcomes and objectives is attached. The matrix identifies additional course projects that measure the defined outcomes/objectives and show progress towards achieving our claims. The Education Program has begun to collect data on these key projects to be used in the future.

No data has been collected using our Graduate Survey since summer, 2012. Graduate Surveys are sent periodically to our completers who have been teaching for at least one year. Surveys are scheduled to be sent to our in-service teachers in summer, 2015 along with surveys for the principals who supervise those teachers. Data collected from these surveys will be include in the 2016 Assessment Report.

The measurement tools noted in this report were frequently used across claims. However, the specific evidence gathered from each tool was 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: English, biology), our very small numbers make it impossible to test statistical significance. Still, we were able to draw some general conclusions concerning our program. The data collected during the 2013-14 academic year will eventually be combined with data from additional years allowing us to draw more sound conclusions.

Assessments Organized Around Claims

Claim	Sources of Evidence
<i>Claim 1: Graduates of our program are proficient in subject matter knowledge and apply this knowledge in their teaching.</i>	~GPA: Major ~NYSTCE test score: CST ~NYSTCE test score: LAST ~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Content Knowledge ~Exit Interview Survey: Content Knowledge (Question 1) ~Survey of Graduates: Content Knowledge ~Case Studies
<i>Claim 2: Graduates of our program understand and apply the necessary pedagogy and methodology to meet the diverse needs of students.</i>	~GPA: Education ~NYSTCE test score: ATS-W ~edTPA scores ~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners ~Exit Interview Survey: Preparation (Question #2) ~Survey of Graduates: Planning ~Case Studies

<p><i>Claim 3: Graduates of our program are responsive, reflective professionals who have the knowledge and skills to serve their students.</i></p>	<p>~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learners ~Exit Interview Survey: Instructional Delivery (Question #3) ~Survey of Graduates: Instruction ~Case Studies</p>
<p><i>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.</i></p>	<p>~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Technology #2b Planning for Diverse Learners: Knowledge of Students Reflection and Continuous Growth Professionalism Criterion #6 ~Exit Interview: Know and Apprec. of Student Diversity (Question #5) ~Graduate Survey: Instruction Question #2- Technology Reflection and Continuous Growth ~Web Quest Project ~Case Studies</p>

Results

In the fall of 2012, our department undertook a small qualitative study of graduates as part of our application for accreditation through the Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) (now the Council for the Accreditation for Education Preparation (CAEP)). This study was well-received by our accreditors and, perhaps more importantly, was informative for Education Program faculty in thinking about how we have served our students well in the past, and how we can continue to improve going forward in relationship to the new CAEP standards and the Regents Reform Agenda. In spring 2015, the Education Program, led by Professor Levy, began to conduct an in-depth qualitative case study of four (two elementary, two secondary) program graduates, including classroom visits and focus group interviews with the P-12 students of the graduates. The number of study participants was chosen because it provided robust data while allowing Professor Levy time to spend several days in each of the teachers' classrooms. The outline of this study was developed during summer 2014 by Professor Levy and two undergraduate research assistants, and received approval from the Wells College IRB. Our research questions include: how are our graduates integrating their knowledge of best practices (e.g., student-centered instructional strategies, cooperative learning) with the Common Core State Standards?; how are they using data to inform instruction?; and how are they making use of available technology? We will be working to collect data that demonstrates our effectiveness in terms of CAEP standards 1 (Content and Pedagogical Knowledge), 4 (Program Impact), and 5 (Provider Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement). Given the size of our program, which averages seven completers per year, a qualitative study will yield findings that the Education Program will be able to use immediately as we continuously work to strengthen and improve our program.

Data collected from this project will be analyzed in summer, 2015. The outcome for this project will be a detailed, actionable plan that specifies the changes that need to be made to our existing program in order to best prepare teachers for the rigors of P-12 classrooms. This will include, but is not limited to, specific revisions to current courses to equip teacher candidates with knowledge and understanding of how to best use the CCSS as guides in the classroom, how to guide students in meeting and exceeding the expectations set forth by the standards, and how to implement the tenets of data-driven instruction. The data analysis summary and action plan will be included in the Wells 2016 Assessment Plan.

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 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Adolescence Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	GPA: Major	NYS Assessments: NYS CST	Student Teaching Evaluation: Content Knowledge Section
N=2 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7		N=2 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean
Subject Matter	2.84	251	3.5	4.12

**Table 1.2
Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge
Categories of Assessment (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Childhood Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Overall GPA	NYS Assessments: NYS CST	Student Teaching Evaluation: <u>Content Knowledge Section</u>
N=2		N=2 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard Level: 4
Mean		Mean	Mean	Mean
Subject Matter	3.38	258	3.5	4.12

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. While the overall Childhood GPA substantially exceeded the performance criteria

set by faculty, the major GPA for the Adolescence Program was only slightly above the program standard of 2.7. 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.

Table 1.3
Claim 1: Subject Area Knowledge (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rate
Adolescence Program

Content Area	GPA in Major Adolescence Program Program Standard: 2.7		Scores on NYS CST NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 220		
	Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Test Scores	Mean Scaled Score
English	1	3.25	1	257	232.2
Science	1	2.43	1	245	245
Total	2	2.84	2	251	238.6

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. The English student had a GPA that exceeded the program standard while the biology student's GPA fell short of the 2.7 standard. Individual CST scores matched or exceeded the average state-wide scaled score and the overall mean pass rate for the CST was above the NYS mean pass rate.

Table 1.4
Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rates
Childhood Program

General GPA Childhood Program		Scores on NYS CST NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 220		
Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Test Score	Mean Scale Score
2	3.39	2	258	228.9

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. Table 1.4 shows that the students in

this program comfortably exceeded the required 2.7 GPA. In addition, the mean pass score for their CST exams was substantially higher than the NYS mean score.

Table 1.5
Claim 1: Content Knowledge (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Across Programs and Content Areas
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adolescence English	Adolescence Biology	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=2	N=2	N=1	N=1	N=4	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Content Knowledge	1. Content Standards					
	1.a	3.75	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.625
	2. Knowledge of Content					
	2.a	3.5	3.75	3.5	4	3.625
	2.b	3.5	3.25	3	3.5	3.375
	2.c	3.25	3.25	3	3.5	3.25
	3. Academic Language					
	3.a	3.5	3.5	3	4	3.5
	4. Tools of the Discipline					
	4.a	3.5	3.75	3.5	4	3.625

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 Program and across the individual certification areas of the Adolescence Program. All Childhood completers scored above the 3.0 performance standard. Individual completers in the English and biology content areas (Adolescence) also both scored above the 3.0 performance standard. Mean scores for the combined Adolescence completers were above the performance standard.

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
Categories of Assessment (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Childhood Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence				
	GPA: Education	NYS Assessment NYS ATS-W	edTPA	Student Teaching Evaluation Planing for Diverse Learners Section	Student Exit Interviews: Planning and Preparation
The programs graduates have acquired ..	N=2 GPA Range: 0 – 4.3 Standard: 2.7	N=1 Score Range: 0-3.00 NYS Cut Score 220	N=1 NYS Cut Score 49	N=4 Score Range: 1-4 Perf. Stand. Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-5 Perf. Standard Level 4
Pedagogy	Mean 3.57	Mean 286	Mean 71	Mean 3.6	Mean 4.5

**Table 2.2
Claim 2: Pedagogy
Categories of Assessment (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Adolescence Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence				
	GPA: Education	NYS Assessment NYS ATS-W	edTPA	Student Teaching Evaluation Planing for Diverse Learners Section	Student Exit Interviews: Planning and Preparation
The programs graduates have acquired ..	N=2 GPA Range: 0 – 4.3 Standard: 2.7	N=1 Score Range: 0-3.00 NYS Cut Score 220	N=2 NYS Cut Score 41	N=2 Score Range: 1-4 Perf. Stand. Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-5 Perf. Standard Level 4
Pedagogy	Mean 3.36	Mean 273	Mean 37	Mean 3.25	Mean 4.4

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show the categories of evidence used to support Claim 2: Pedagogy in both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs. Mean Education Program GPAs (education courses) and the mean scores on NYSTCE Assessment of Teaching Strategies exam (ATS-W) exceeded the performance criteria set by the faculty. Scores on the Planning for Diverse Learners sections of the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric also exceeded the defined quality standard. Responses on the Planning section of the Exit Interview surpassed the standard, as well.

All students seeking certification on or after May 1, 2014 were required to pass the national performance test, edTPA. As a result, three out of the four program completers took this exam. One Childhood Program completer finished the

program in December, 2013 and was exempt from the new requirement. Those completing the exam in this first round were offered a safety net; if the completers did not pass the edTPA, they could take the ATS-W. If a passing score was achieved on that exam, the completer would meet the requirement. After June 30, 2016 all students will be required to pass the edTPA in order to receive certification and no safety net will be provided.

The sole Childhood Program completer took the test passed the edTPA at the mastery level. Our biology candidate within the Adolescence Program also achieved a passing score, while our English candidate did not.

Table 2.3
Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Mean GPA & ATS-W/edTPA Scores and Pass Rates
Adolescence Program

Content Area	GPA in Education Program Courses		Scores on NYS ATS-W NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 220			edTPA Scores		
	Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Pass Score	Mean State Scaled Score	Completers	Mean Score Cut Score 41 Mastery Score 48	Mean National Score
Biology	1	3.4	0	—	—	1	45	45.4
English	1	3.33	1	273	264.7	1	30	46.4
Combined	2	3.36	2	273	264.7	2	37	45.9

To find evidence of pedagogical knowledge for the Adolescence Certification Program completers, we looked at students' Education Program GPAs (Education courses) and the mean scores on both the NYS ATS-W exam and the edTPA. All Education Program GPAs exceeded the Program's standard. The NYSTCE ATS-W exam score for our English candidate exceeded performance criteria set by faculty and exceeded the mean State pass rates. This same candidate, however, did not meet the cut score on the edTPA. The biology candidate did, however.

Table 2.4
Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Mean GPA & ATS-W/edTPA Scores and Pass Rates
Childhood Program

Education Program GPA Childhood Program Standard 2.7		Scores on NYS ATS-W NYS Mean Scores NYS cut score 220			edTPA		
Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Score	Mean State Pass Score 2013-2014	Completers	Mean Score Cut Score 49 Mastery Score 57	Mean National Score
2	3.5	1	286	264.4	1	71	52.7

To find evidence of pedagogical knowledge for those within the Childhood Certification program, we looked at the Education Program GPA that summarizes success in those courses that address pedagogy and instructional theory. The mean Education GPA of the Childhood program completers, along with both the NYSTCE ATS-W and the edTPA scores, exceeded performance criteria set by faculty. The program completer who passed the edTPA did so at the mastery level with a score that was substantially higher than the national mean.

Table 2.5
Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning
Adolescence and Childhood Program

		Childhood N=2	Adolescence (total) N=2	Adolescence Bio N=1	Adolescence English N=1	Child./Adol. Combined N=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	3.75	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	1.b	3.75	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	2. Plan for Instruction					
	2.a	4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.7
	2.b	3.75	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	2.c	3.5	3.25	3.5	3	3.37
	2.d	3.75	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	2.e	3.5	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	3. Knowledge of Students					
	3.a	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
	3.b	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.5
	3.c	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.12

Table 2.5 looks at the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the 2013-2014 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. Both Childhood completers scored at or above the 3.0 performance standard as did both Adolescence completers.

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 (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Assessment Categories
Adolescence Program**

Claim	Category of Evidence	
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section
N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3		N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Teaching Skill		Mean 3.37

**Table 3.2
Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Assessment Categories
Childhood Program**

Claim	Category of Evidence	
	The program's graduates have acquired . . .	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section
N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3		N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Teaching Skill		Mean 3.38

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 2013-2014 Instruction for Diverse Learners section of the student

teaching 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 (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Biology	Adol. English	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=2	N=2	N=1	N = 1	N=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	4	3	3.5
	1.b	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.125
	1.c	3.75	3.75	4	3.5	3.75
	2.Resources/Technology					
	2.a	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.5
	2.b	3.25	3	3	3	3.125
	2.c	3.25	3	3.5	2.5	3.125
	3.Instructional Roles					
	3.a	3.75	3.25	4	2.5	3.5
	Use of Questions					
	4.a	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.5
	4.b	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.125
	4.c	3.25	3.25	3.5	3	3.25
	5.Communication					
	5.a	3.5	3.25	3.5	3	3.375
	5.b	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
	5.c	3	3	3	3	3
	6.Instruction Strategies That Support Literacy					
	6.a	3.25	3.5	4	3	3.375
	6.b	3.75	3.75	4	3.5	3.75
	6.c	3.75	3.75	4	3.5	3.75
	6.d	3	3	3.5	2.5	3
	7.Responsiveness to Learners					
	7.a	3.5	3.25	4	2.5	3.375
	7.b	3.25	3.25	3.5	3	3.25

Table 3.3 shows the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the 2013-2014 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. Although the mean scores within the Adolescence Program met or exceeded the program expectation, the English candidate scored below the standard on

four indicators within the dimensions of Resources (use of paraprofessionals and volunteers), Instructional Roles (awareness and utilization of the many teacher roles), Literacy Strategies (reinforcing the rules of standard written and spoken English) and Responsiveness to Learners (making adjustments to lessons based on information gathered from student performance).

Table 3.4
Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Mean Scores Across Student Teaching Rubric
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

Category	Childhood N=2 Score Range 1-4 Mean	Adolescence N=2 Score Range 1-4 Mean
Planning	3.6	3.25
Instruction	3.375	3.375
Assessment	3.31	3
Reflection	3.75	3.45

Table 3.4 provides a quick look at the means across five sections of the 2013-2014 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric that support effective instruction. 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 (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Means
Adolescence Program

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Continuous Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N= 2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3
Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.85	Mean 3.675

Table 4.2

**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Means
Childhood Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Continuous Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3
Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.85	Mean 3.75

Table 4.3

**Claim 4: Cross-Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Reflection
Adolescence and Childhood Programs**

	Childhood (total)	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Bio	Adol. English	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=2	N=2	N=1	N=1	N=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	3.75	3.25	3	3.5	3.5
	1.b	3.75	3.25	3	3.5	3.5
	1.c	3.75	3.75	4	3.5	3.75
	2.Consideration of New Ideas					
	2.a	3.75	3.5	4	3	3.625
	2.b	3.75	3.25	3.5	3	3.5
	3.Goal Setting					
	3.a	3.75	3.75	4	3.5	3.75

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 2013-2014 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics were analyzed. All individual and mean scores for the Adolescence and Childhood completers exceeded the performance standard.

Table 4.4

**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives (Data 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teacher Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners
Adolescence Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners Criteria 3a 3b 3c	ST Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners Criterion 3
	N= 2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
	Mean 3.41	Mean 4.
Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives		

Table 4.5

**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives (Data 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners
Childhood Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners Criteria 3a 3b 3c	ST Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners Criterion 3
	N= 2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=2 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
	Mean 3.33	Mean 4
Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives		

Table 4.6
Claim 4: Cross-Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives
Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning-Knowledge of Students
Adolescence and Childhood Programs

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Bio	Adol. English	Child./Adol. Combined
	N=2 Mean (1-4)	N=2 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=4 Mean (1-4)
	3. Planning - Knowledge of Students				
3.a Developmental	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
3.b Learning Styles	3.5	3.5	4	3	3.5
3.c Backgrounds and cultures	3	3.25	3.5	3	3.125

Tables 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 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 2013-2014 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics and responses from the completer's Exit Interview were analyzed. All mean and individual scores for relevant sections met or surpassed the performance standard.

Table 4.7
Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learner
Adolescence Program

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

Table 4.8
Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology (Data from 2013-2014 Academic Year)
Student Teaching Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learner
Childhood Program

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Resources and Technology Criterion #2b	WebQuest
N=2 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: 2.7	N=2 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7	
Technology	Mean 3.25	Mean 3.3

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 2013-2014 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric were examined. Scores for completers from both the Adolescence and Childhood Programs exceeded the defined quality standard.

Discussion and Plan

The Education Program faculty met on May 28th, 2015 to discuss the annual assessment results. It is important to note, however, that the Education Program faculty meets weekly throughout the fall/spring semesters to discuss program development and student progress/concerns. Assessment is an on-going conversation and course assessment results are shared regularly.

It is important to note that the data within this report represents only four program completers. Given this particularly 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. These claims were first outlined in our TEAC Inquiry Brief. 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 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.

Looking at the GPAs, however, it is clear that the student completing the biology program did not meet the required 2.7 GPA in her content area. This same student, however, scored exceptionally well in the area of subject matter knowledge with a total mean for this section of 3.75. In addition, this student passed the NYSTCE Content Specialty Test in biology with a solid score that matched the NYS mean score for that content area. Prior to approving this particular student for student teaching, faculty took care to examine all the evidence regarding the student's content knowledge readiness. Although some course grades were particularly low, these courses were primarily addressing chemistry content. Cooperating teachers who supervised earlier field placements also spoke very highly of the student subject matter knowledge. In the end Education faculty felt that, although the candidate struggled in a number of courses required for the major, there was substantial evidence of understanding the biology content that is taught at the 7-12 levels.

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 that exceed the Wells standard; mean scores on the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (Planning/Preparation) that exceed the Wells performance standard; and mean scores on the Planning and Preparation section of the Exit Interview survey.

As noted earlier in this report, all students seeking certification on or after May 1, 2014 were required to take the national performance test, edTPA. As a result, three out of the four program completers took this exam. One Childhood Program completer finished the program in December, 2013 and was exempt from the new requirement. Those completing the exam in this first round were offered a safety net; if the completers did not pass the edTPA, they could take the ATS-W. If a passing score was achieved on that exam, the completer would meet the requirement. After June 30, 2016 all students will be required to pass the edTPA in order to receive certification and no safety net will be provided.

Childhood candidate exam scores on the ATS-W (1) and the edTPA (1) were strong. The Childhood candidate taking the ATS-W scored 16 points below a perfect score and well above the NYS mean. The Childhood candidate taking the edTPA achieved mastery level on that exam.

Within the Adolescence Program the biology candidate passed the edTPA exam while the English candidate did not. Using the safety net, however, enabled that candidate to take the ATS-W and pass with a solid score substantially higher than the NYS mean.

This first round of edTPA prompted substantial discussion and reflection on the part of the Education Program faculty, as noted below.

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 and exit interview information supports that the graduates of the Wells Education Program are responsive practitioners who have the foundational knowledge and instructional skill to serve their students. Although the mean scores within the Adolescence Program met or exceeded the program expectation, the English candidate scored below the standard on four indicators within the dimensions of Resources (use of paraprofessionals and volunteers), Instructional Roles (awareness and utilization of the many teacher roles), Literacy Strategies (reinforcing the rules of standard written and spoken English) and Responsiveness to Learners.

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 four students: two Childhood certification candidates and two Adolescence level candidates. This year's 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. Did the lower scores on the Student Teacher Evaluation Rubric and on the edTPA for candidate1 (English) reflect issues within the Education Program or did they simply reflect areas of struggle unique to the student? Was it possible that the lower scores on the Student Teacher Evaluation Rubric reflected issues with the cooperating teacher who scored the Wells student? Given the new assessments and the roll-out schedule of these (implemented before education programs were able to align their coursework to adequately prepare candidates), does the lack of one student's success on the edTPA indicate an issue with the program, an issue with one unique student, an issue with the edTPA, or an issue with NY State's roll-out plan?

It was acknowledged by the faculty that candidate 1, although a bright, competent student often lacked the intense work ethic needed to implement the layered, complex teaching/planning process. This candidate also struggled with making strong, positive student connections. Compounding that issue was the fact that this candidate's first student teaching placement was in an urban high school with substantial diversity. This candidate also had a cooperating teacher who appeared to lack the coaching strategies needed to scaffold the student teaching experience successfully. In the hands of a more skilled cooperating teaching the result of this placement might have been improved.

In the end, when the edTPA failing scores were received, faculty was not surprised. That said, faculty also has many questions about the validity and reliability of the edTPA as a predictor of teacher success. It is felt that in many ways the edTPA, worked on and submitted during student teaching, detracts from the thoughtful, reflective, on-going process of teaching. The focus during student teaching easily becomes one of "getting through the test" as opposed to meeting student needs.

Candidate 2 (biology) had outstanding success in the classroom but struggled to maintain a subject matter GPA that met our defined standard. Looking across evidence sources, however, a strong understanding of biology surfaced in the both the Student Teacher Evaluation Rubric and Content Specialty Test. The strengths and challenges of this candidate were literally the opposite of candidate 1. One candidate had a strong academic background but struggled when implementing learning in the classroom. The other struggled academically but excelled when implementing learning in the MS/HS classroom.

Faculty also discussed the limitations of analyzing quantitative data collected from such a small number of students on an annual basis. Faculty agreed that there is a need for developing a sustainable system for gathering qualitative evidence on our program completers. Sara Levy began working on this in summer, 2014 through a Wells faculty grant enabling her to revise our case study protocol and to engage in a qualitative study of four program completers (spring, 2015). The work on these case studies will continue through summer, 2015 with the hope of creating a sustainable, case study protocol that will allow us to gather qualitative data from our program completers an annual basis.

As a result of this discussion a few goals surfaced:

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- Develop opportunities for additional edTPA support and curricular alignment to strengthen preparation.
 - Redesign lesson template to include language and focus areas aligned with the edTPA.
 - A task aligned to the Special Education edTPA will be developed and included in the new EDUC 307 to begin in fall, 2015.
 - 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).
- Develop a plan for sustainable, qualitative assessment of our program completers through the use of graduate case studies.
 - Analysis of information gathered in the spring, 2015 case studies will be completed in summer, 2015 and included in the 2015-2016 assessment report.
 - 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.

LAST YEAR'S GOALS (2013-14): What have we achieved?

- *Expand the number of quality teachers in our cooperating teacher pool.*
 - ~ *Expand the number of schools contacted with inquiries regarding possible student teaching placements. Tier the letters so that the first round goes to new schools.*
 - ~ *Continue to send our criteria for an effective cooperating teacher. Arrange to meet with principals to discuss partnerships and the need for quality coaches.*
 - ~ *Specifically reconnect with Auburn and Ithaca principals to increase number of placements in more diverse schools.*

The Education Program expanded the number of schools used for field work and student teaching, and have successfully tiered the letters to these schools. Meetings with area principals have been achieved only through informal contacts. More work on this needs to be completed in 2015-16. Our placement of candidates in schools with diverse student populations has increased, especially for those within the Childhood Program, but these placements need to be more consistent within the Adolescence Program. It will be especially important to locate quality teachers in urban areas to act as cooperating teachers.

- *Increase support/scaffolding for students who struggle in their chosen content area.*
 - ~ *Increase focus on content in EDUC 331 and 332.*
 - ~ *EDUC 406 already focuses on instructional skills across content areas. Augment to increase content knowledge in these subjects.*
 - ~ *Look at curriculum across EDUC 331, 332 and 406. Make sure there are a range of topics being addressed. Use state and Common Core standards as a guide.*
 - ~ *Continue discussions with our supporting content-focused majors. Meet regularly to discuss how to guide students to take courses most relevant for preparing to teach grades 7-12.*

EDUC 406 was not taught last year but will shift to the fall semester in 2015. Revision of curricula within EDUC 331 and 332 have provided more “touches” with the Common Core Standards and provided more opportunities for candidates to link methodology and pedagogy with their specific subject areas. The new and more specific strategies outlined this year will allow us to continue to move forward on this goal.

- *Directly teach the effective use of paraprofessionals and volunteers in the Student Teaching Reflective Seminar.*

Both 2014-15 student teachers essentially completed the *Student Teaching Reflective Seminar* as a tutorial, working one to one with supervising faculty. Although this topic came up for discussion responding to the candidates’ needs and specific circumstances, given the structure of the course it was not officially taught. The *Reflective Seminar* will be taught in a more traditional format in spring of 2016. At that point it will be taught more formally.