

# **Wells College Education Program Annual Assessment Report May, 2014**

## **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.

## Outcomes and Objectives (revised spring, 2011)

### 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
8. 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 . . .

1. communicate and interact with students in ways that demonstrate respect and responsiveness to individual needs and cultural backgrounds; and
2. 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 . . .

1. participate actively as part of an instructional team and effectively collaborate with a variety of adults within the school community;
2. communicate and collaborate with families, guardians and caregivers;
3. maintain timely and accurate records;
4. maintain confidentiality regarding student records and information;
5. participate in school and district events;
6. demonstrate professional behavior and attitudes in the workplace;
7. understand and discuss schools as organizations within a historical, cultural, political, and social contexts; and
8. 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 . . .

1. reflect on their instructional decisions, assess their effectiveness and generate alternative actions
2. actively investigate and consider new ideas that improve teaching and learning and draw on current education policy and research as sources of reflection;
3. set goals to enhance personal strengths and address personal weaknesses in teaching practice; and
4. 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 strategies and tools used to measure the accuracy of our claims are noted in the chart below. A matrix that summarizes how these same strategies and tools are used to assess our outcomes and objectives is attached. The matrix identifies additional course projects that measure the defined outcomes/objective 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.

### 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 ~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners ~Exit Interview Survey: Preparation (Question #2) ~Survey of Graduates: Planning ~Case Studies
<i>Claim 3: Graduates of our program are responsive, reflective professionals who have the knowledge and skills to serve their students.</i>	~Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learners ~Exit Interview Survey: Instructional Delivery (Question #3) ~Survey of Graduates: Instruction ~Case Studies
<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>	~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 ~WebQuest Project ~Case Studies

## **Assessments: 2014**

The tools used to assess our program this year using data collected from our 2012-2013 program completers are:

GPA's

New York State Teaching Certification Exam Scores

Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics (attached)

Student Exit Interview Surveys (attached)

WebQuest Project

We are currently revising our case study protocol and hope to collect additional qualitative data through this refined process next year. 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 schedule to be sent to our 2013 program completers in summer, 2014.

The data analyzed for this report stems from 2012-2013 program completers and was collected primarily over the 2012-13 academic year, although some NYS test scores were not available 2013-2014. There were 10 program completers in the 2012-13 academic year. Six students completed the Adolescence Certification Program (three English, one social studies, one math and one French) and four students completed the Childhood Certification Program.

## **Results**

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, Math, Social Studies, French), our very small numbers frequently make it impossible to test statistical significance. Still, we were able to draw some general conclusions concerning our program.

Our analysis includes data from one student who completed our French certification program. Although the French major and certification program have been discontinued and this student received a unique version of this program, we felt it was important to include the information in order to get a full picture of how we are doing, especially in regards to claims 2, 3 and 4.

**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 2012-2013 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=6 GPA Range: 0-4.3 Standard: 2.7		N=6 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=6 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=6 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean 3.247		Mean 232.33	Mean 3.3	Mean 4.75
Subject Matter				

**Table 1.2**  
**Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge**  
**Categories of Assessment (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	The program's graduates have acquired ...	Overall GPA	NYS Assessments: NYS CST	Student Teaching Evaluation: Content Knowledge Section
N=4		N=4 Score Range 0-300 NYS Cut Score 220	N=4 Score Range 1-4 Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-5 Performance Standard Level: 4
Mean 3.594		Mean 268.75	Mean 3.3	Mean 4.25
Subject Matter				

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. 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.

**Table 1.3**  
**Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rate**  
**Claim 1: Subject Area Knowledge (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**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 Pass Rates	Mean State Pass Rate
English	3	3.388	3	241.67	226.5
Math	1	3.048	1	229	243.7
Social Studies (History)	1	2.88	1	228	223.6
French	1	3.389	1	212	224.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3.247</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>232.33</b>	<b>228.5</b>

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. Five out of the six program completers had GPAs that exceeded the program standard (the exception—history) and five out of the six program completers had CST scores that exceeded the program standard (the exception—French). Although the overall mean pass rate for the CST was above the NYS mean pass rate, two content areas (French and Math) fell below the NYS mean pass rate.

**Table 1.4**  
**Mean GPA & CST scores and pass rates**  
**Claim 1: Subject Matter Knowledge (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**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 Pass Rates	Mean State Pass Rate
229.1	230.1	231.1	232.1	233.1

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 the mean pass score for the CST exams was substantially higher than the NYS mean score.

**Table 1.5**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Across Programs and Content Areas**  
**Claim 1: Content Knowledge (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence and Childhood Programs**

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adolescence Math	Adolescence Social Studies	Adolescence English	Adolescence French	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=4	N=6	N=1	N=1	N=3	N=1	N=10	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Content Knowledge	<b>1. Content Standards</b>							
	1.a	3.4	3.5	3	3	3.7	4	3.5
	<b>2. Knowledge of Content</b>							
	2.a	3.3	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.7	3.5	3.3
	2.b	3.4	3.2	2.5	2.5	3.5	3.5	3.3
	2.c	3.4	3.3	3	2.5	3.5	4	3.4
	<b>3. Academic Language</b>							
	3.a	3.3	3.4	2.5	3	3.8	3.5	3.4
	<b>4. Tools of the Discipline</b>							
	4.a	3.4	3.3	2.5	2.5	3.7	4	3.4



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. Completers in the math and social studies content areas (Adolescence) had a number of scores below the 3.0 performance standard. Mean scores in English were substantially above the 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 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
	The program's graduates have acquired ...	GPA:  Education	NYS Assessments:  NYS ATS-W	Student Teaching Evaluation:  Planning for Diverse Learners Section
N=4 GPA Range: 0-4.3  Standard: 2.7		N=4 Score Range: 0-300  NYS Cut Score 220	N= 4 Score Range: 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range: 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
Pedagogy	Mean 3.675	Mean 272.25	Mean 3.4	Mean 4.42

**Table 2.2**  
**Claim 2: Pedagogy**  
**Categories of Assessment (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

Claim	Categories of Evidence			
The program's graduates have acquired ...	GPA:  Education	NYS Assessments:  NYS ATS-W	Student Teaching Evaluation:  Planning for Diverse Learners Section	Student Exit Interviews:  Preparation and Planning
	N=6 GPA Range: 0-4.3  Standard: 2.7	N=6 Score Range: 0-300  NYS Cut Score 220	N= 6 Score Range: 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=6 Score Range: 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
Pedagogy	Mean 3.669	Mean 268.5	Mean 3.2	Mean 4.94

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.

**Table 2.3**  
**Mean, GPA & ATS-W scores and pass rate**  
**Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

Content Area	GPA in Education Program Courses		Scores on NYS ATS-W		
	Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Pass Rates	Mean State Pass Rate
English	3	3.716	3	270.67	259.4
Math	1	3.583	1	270	262.2
Social Studies (History)	1	3.25	1	266	259
French	1	3.95	1	263	258.5
Combined	6	3.669	6	268.5	259.67

To find evidence of pedagogical knowledge for the Adolescence Certification Program completers, we looked at the students Education Program GPAs (Education courses) and the mean scores on their NYS ATS-W exams. All Education Program GPAs exceeded the Program’s standard. NYSTCE ATS-W exam means also exceeded performance criteria set by faculty and exceeded the mean State pass rates.

**Table 2.4**  
**Mean GPA & ATS-W Scores and pass rates**  
**Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Education Program GPA		Scores on NYS ATS-W		
Childhood Program Standard 2.7		NYS Mean Scores		
		NYS cut score 220		
Completers	Mean (0-4)	Completers who took test	Mean Pass Rate	Mean State Pass Rate 2012-2013
4	3.675	4	272.25	259.8

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 and NYSTCE ATS-W exam means both exceeded performance criteria set by faculty. The ATS-W exam means also exceeded the State pass rate.

**Table 2.5**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Planning**  
**Claim 2: Pedagogy (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence and Childhood Program**

	Childhood N=4	Adolescence (total) N=6	Adolescence Math N=1	Adolescence Social Studies N=1	Adolescence French N=1	Adolescence English N=3	Child./Adol. Combined N=10	
	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	
Planning for Diverse Learners	<b>1. Goal Development</b>							
	1.a	3.4	3.3	2.5	3	4	3.3	3.3
	1.b	3.4	3.2	3	2.5	4	3.2	3.3
	<b>2. Plan for Instruction</b>							
	2.a	3.5	3.3	3	2.5	4	3.5	3.4
	2.b	3.5	3.2	3	2	4	3.3	3.3
	2.c	3.3	3.2	2.5	2.5	4	3.3	3.2
	2.d	3.4	3.2	3	2.5	4	3.2	3.3
	2.e	3.4	3.1	2	2.5	4	3.3	3.2
	<b>3. Knowledge of Students</b>							
	3.a	3.1	3.3	3	2.5	4	3.5	3.3
	3.b	3.6	3.1	2.5	2.5	4	3.2	3.3
	3.c	3.5	2.9	2	2.5	3.5	3.2	3.2

Table 2.4 looks at the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the 2011-2012 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 completers scored above the 3.0 performance standard. Completers in the math and social studies content areas (Adolescence) had a number of scores below the 3.0 performance standard across all three clusters. Mean scores in English were substantially above the standard. Mean scores for the combined Adolescence completers were the performance standard except for 3.C in the “Knowledge of Students” cluster: “Knowledge of students varied interests, backgrounds and cultures is consistently and thoughtfully reflected in the planning process.”

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

**Table 3.1**  
**Assessment Categories**  
**Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

Claim	Category of Evidence	
	The program's graduates have acquired ...	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section
N=6 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3		N=6 Score Range 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean 3.2		Mean 4.7
Teaching Skill		

**Table 3.2**  
**Assessment Categories**  
**Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Claim	Category of Evidence	
	The program's graduates have acquired ...	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners Section
N=4 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3		N=4 Score Range 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
Mean 3.2		Mean 4.7
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 2012-2013 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**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Instruction**  
**Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence and Childhood Programs**

	Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Math	Adol. Social Studies	Adol. English	Adol. French	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=4 Mean (1-4)	N=6 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=10 Mean (1-4)	
Instruction for Diverse Learners	<b>1.Active Learning Strategies</b>							
	1.a	3.3	3.3	2.5	3	3.5	4	3.3
	1.b	3.3	3.3	2.5	3	3.3	4	3.3
	1.c	3.5	3.3	3	2.5	3.5	4	3.4
	<b>2.Resources/Technology</b>							
	2.a	3.5	3.3	3	3	3.3	4	3.4
	2.b	3.4	3.3	3.5	2.5	3.3	4	3.4
	2.c	3.4	2.9	1.5	2.5	3.4	3.5	3.1
	<b>3.Instructional Roles</b>							
	3.a	3.3	3.3	2.5	3.5	3.3	4	3.3
	<b>4.Use of Questions</b>							
	4.a	3.4	3.3	2.5	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.3
	4.b	3.1	2.9	2	2	3.3	3.5	3
	4.c	3.3	3.2	2	2.5	3.5	4	3.2
	<b>5.Communication</b>							
	5.a	3.4	3.3	2.5	3	3.5	4	3.4
	5.b	3.4	3.3	3	3	3.3	4	3.4
	5.c	3.3	3	2.5	2.5	3.2	3.5	3.1
	<b>6.Instruction Strategies That Support Literacy</b>							
	6.a	3.5	3	2.5	2.5	3.4	3	3.2
	6.b	3.4	3	2	2.5	3.3	3.5	3.2
	6.c	3.4	3.2	2	3	3.3	4	3.3
	6.d	3.4	3.3	3	3	3.2	4	3.3
	<b>7.Responsiveness to Learners</b>							
	7.a	3.4	3.3	2	2.5	3.7	4	3.3
	7.b	3.4	3.2	2.5	2.5	3.3	4	3.3

Table 3.3 shows the mean scores across all dimensions within the Planning for Diverse Learners section of the 2012-2013 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 2.c (Resources and Technology: “Paraprofessionals and volunteers are used effectively”) and 4.b (Use of Questions: “Regularly uses probing, ‘higher level thinking’ questions . . .”). A number of specific indicator scores assessing the instruction utilized by math and social studies pre-service teachers fell below the Program expectation.

**Table 3.4**  
**Mean Scores Across Student Teaching Rubric**  
**Claim 3: Teaching Skill (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence and Childhood Programs**

Category	Childhood N=4 Score Range 1-4 Mean	Adolescence N=6 Score Range 1-4 Mean
Planning	3.4	3.2
Instruction	3.2	3.2
Assessment	3.3	3.3
Reflection	3.5	3.5

Table 3.4 provides a quick look at the means across five sections of the 2012-2013 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric. 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**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Means**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Continuous Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N= 6 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=6 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3
	Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.5

**Table 4.2**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric Means**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation:	
	Reflection & Cont. Growth Section	Professionalism & Collaboration Criterion #6.c
	N= 4 Score Range 1-4	N=4 Score Range 1-4
	Performance Standard: Level 3	Performance Standard: Level 3
Learning How to Learn	Mean 3.5	Mean 3.6

**Table 4.3**  
**Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Reflection**  
**Claim 4: Cross-Cutting Theme - Learning How to Learn**  
**Adolescence and Childhood Programs**

	Childhood (total)	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Math	Adol. Social Studies	Adol. English	Adol. French	Child./Adol. Combined	
	N=4 Mean (1-4)	N=6 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=3 Mean (1-4)	N=1 Mean (1-4)	N=10 Mean (1-4)	
Reflection and Continuous Growth	1.Reflection on Teaching							
	1.a	3.4	3.4	2.5	3	3.7	4	3.4
	1.b	3.5	3.4	3	3	3.7	3.5	3.5
	1.c	3.5	3.6	2.5	3.5	3.8	4	3.6
	2.Consideration of New Ideas							
	2.a	3.8	3.5	3	3	3.7	4	3.6
	2.b	3.5	3.6	4	3	3.6	4	3.6
	3.Goal Setting							
	3.a	3.4	3.5	2.5	3.5	3.6	4	3.4

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. Scores on specific indicators for the math completer relating to Reflection on Teaching and Goal setting fell short of the standard.



**Table 4.4**  
**Student Teacher Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives (Data 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

<b>Cross Cutting Theme</b>	<b>Categories of Evidence</b>	
	<b>Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners</b>	<b>Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners</b>
	N= 6 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=6 Score Range 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
<b>Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives</b>	Mean 3.2	Mean 4.94

**Table 4.5**  
**Student Teaching Rubric: Planning for Diverse Learners**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives (Data 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

<b>Cross Cutting Theme</b>	<b>Categories of Evidence</b>	
	<b>Student Teaching Evaluation: Planning for Diverse Learners</b>	<b>Exit Interview: Planning for Diverse Learners</b>
	N= 4 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=4 Score Range 1-5  Performance Standard: Level 4
<b>Diversity/Multicultural Perspectives</b>	Mean 3.4	Mean 4.42

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

		Childhood	Adolescence (total)	Adol. Math	Adol. Social Studies	Adol. English	Adol. French	Child./Adol. Combined
		N=4	N=6	N=1	N=1	N=3	N=1	N=10
		Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)	Mean (1-4)
3.a Developmental Characteristics	<b>3. Knowledge of Students</b>							
	3.a	3.1	3.3	3	2.5	3.5	4	3.3
	3.b	3.6	3.1	2.5	2.5	3.2	4	3.3
	3.c	3.5	2.9	2	2.5	3.2	3.5	3.2

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 2012-2013 Student Teaching Evaluation Rubrics and the Exit Interview were analyzed. Overall mean scores for relevant sections met or surpassed the performance standard (Tables 4.4 and 4.5). Specific indicators within the Knowledge of Students section of the rubric, measuring performance for our math and social studies completers, were scored below the program standard. These indicators focused on developmental characteristics, learning styles and backgrounds/cultures. As a result, the overall mean for the Adolescence Program in the Knowledge of Students fell below the program standard.

**Table 4.7**  
**Student Teaching Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learner**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Adolescence Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Resources and Technology Criterion #2b	WebQuest Project
N=6 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: Level 3	N=6 Score Range: 0-4.3  Standard: 2.7	
Technology	Mean 3.3	Mean 3.57

**Table 4.8**  
**Student Teaching Rubric: Instruction for Diverse Learner**  
**Claim 4: Cross Cutting Theme - Technology (Data from 2012-2013 Academic Year)**  
**Childhood Program**

Cross Cutting Theme	Categories of Evidence	
	Student Teaching Evaluation: Instruction for Diverse Learners: Resources and Technology Criterion #2b	WebQuest
	N=4 Score Range 1-4  Performance Standard: 2.7	N=4 GPA Range: 0-4.3  Standard: 2.7
Technology	Mean 3.4	Mean 3.5

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 2012-2013 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 meet 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. In addition, faculty meet annually to look at assessments results across the academic year. This spring, on May 22<sup>nd</sup>, the faculty meet to discuss the assessment results accumulated over the 2012-13 academic year.

The Wells College Education faculty makes four claims about our programs. Were these claims supported by the results? 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 substantial 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. Looking across certification programs and subject areas, this evidence includes mean major and overall GPAs that exceed the Wells standard; mean NYS CST scores that exceed the New York State established cut score; and mean scores

on the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (Content Knowledge) that exceed the Wells performance standard. However, when looking more closely at the individual content areas, concerns surface in the certification areas of math and social studies. Students in these areas scored below the Wells standard on a number of indicators within the content knowledge section of the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric. With only one student in each program, however, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the program.

*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 NYS ATS-W scores that exceed the New York State established cut score; and mean scores on the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric (Planning/Preparation) that exceed the Wells performance standard. The problem again surfaces when looking at the Adolescence Programs in math and social studies, specifically the data collected from the student teaching evaluation rubric, *Planning for Diverse Learners* section. The mean scores on the indicators (combined scores from two cooperating teachers) frequently fell below the Wells level 3 standard.

*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. The means for two areas across all programs within the Adolescence Program fell short of the Wells standard of 3.0: “Paraprofessionals and volunteers are used effectively,” and “Regularly uses probing, higher level thinking questions . . . .” As seen before, specific indicators measuring the performance of math/social studies pre-service teachers within the Student Teaching “Instruction” section, fell short of our 3.0 goal.

*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. Addressing the cross-cutting themes of diversity and reflection, the Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric again show areas of weakness in our math and social studies pre-service teachers.

The discussion that followed the analysis of the data focused on a couple of key questions. The data represented only one pre-service teacher in math and social studies. Did the lower scores reflect issues within the Education Program or did they simply reflect areas of struggle unique to each 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?

It was acknowledged by the faculty that both students were responsible, hard-working students, but both struggled in developing the broad content base needed to teach high school courses. Both of the students had placements with cooperating teachers who appeared to lack effective coaching skills and struggled with

scaffolding the student teaching experience in a way that would lead the pre-service teacher to success. Finding quality teachers to serve in the role of cooperating teachers for our students has been challenging.

As a result of the discussion a few goals surfaced:

- 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.
- 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.
- Directly teach the effective use of paraprofessionals and volunteers in the *Student Teaching Reflective Seminar*.
- Refine the new Portfolio Defense Rubric to allow us to more easily collect data from this rubric for next year. See attached.