DATA SUMMARIES OF SIUE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

2013-2014

Contents:

This document is a compilation of the 2013-2014 assessment data summaries for Initial, Advanced and Non-Traditional Teacher Education Programs at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville.

TRANSITION POINT: ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Self-Assessment)
The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year. Teacher candidates performed a self-evaluation of themselves as students in their teacher preparation coursework and as candidates in their field placements.
Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale:

Response Set	Criteria – out of a score of 50
1=Not at all characteristic	
2	Needs support= 34 and below
3=somewhat characteristic	Developing= 35-39
4	Meets=40-45
5=extremely characteristic	Exceeds=46-50

Findings:
Teacher Candidate Self-Assessment in on-campus coursework (TC1): Nearly, all candidates met or exceeded expectations. Six candidates (2 Secondary, 4 Elementary) identified areas which fell into the developing category. There was no clear trend in the areas these candidates identified as low. However, class participation and preparation stood out as receiving lower scores of 3 than other areas when looking at the data overall.
Teacher Candidate Self-Assessment in field placements (TC2): With the exception of two candidates in Secondary Education, candidates reported as meeting the criteria. Although there were no clear indicators with consistent scores of 3, candidates did indicate lower scores in professional development and involvement.
What did we learn about our candidates? Candidates perceived themselves as displaying these dispositions. Candidates are also beginning to self-identify their majors early so findings are program-specific. Off-campus candidates are also completing the survey.
Actions to Take Based on Data: Candidate scores are still inflated as they were with the previous survey. The purpose of these surveys is two-fold: 1) to alert candidates of the dispositions which they will be held accountable, and 2) to provide candidates with the opportunity to alert faculty of areas in which they needs support. This evaluation would be more useful if faculty alerted candidates to these purposes and ensured candidates that these evaluations are not tied to grades in currently enrolled coursework. This data will reported to program chairs earlier than the original plan, so faculty can plan support for candidates who acknowledge that they need it.

Assessments: Admission Grade Point Average (GPA), Test of Academic Proficiency Test Score or ACT of 22 with writing, and CI200/SPE 200/400 Grade
Criterion for passing: Each program determined the required grade point average for admission to a program. For most programs, the required GPA is 2.5. All candidates must pass the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) (previously known as the Illinois Basic Skills Test) or a score of 22 or higher on the ACT with writing, prior to admission to teacher education. Programs specify the required grade for the entry-level course, CI 200 or SPE 200. Most

programs require a grade of "C" in one of these courses. Two programs, physical education and special education, require a grade of "B".

Findings:

Early Childhood

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program.

Admission GPA[1]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean	
Fall 2005	27	2.83 – 3.95	3.35	
Fall 2006	30	2.53 – 4.00[2]	3.21	
Fall 2007	21	2.63 – 3.57	3.12	
Fall 2008	30	2.71 – 3.93	3.28	
Fall 2009	46	2.51 – 3.83	3.08	
Fall 2010	30	2.57 – 3.86	3.23	
Fall 2011	19	2.60 – 4.00	3.20	
Fall 2012	20	2.53 – 3.84	3.10	
Fall 2013	17	2.5 – 4.00	3.32	
Fall 2014	14	2.67 – 4.00	3.25	+10 non-licensure students

Admission GPA[3] - Off Campus Cohort (EChOs)

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean	ADDL Admit as non TE
Fall 2008	10	2.52 – 3.85	2.96	0
Fall 2009	15	2.46 – 3.67	3.07	0
Fall 2010*	9*	2.36 – 3.58	2.73	16
Fall 2011	3**	2.92 – 3.14	3.06	12
Fall 2012	1***	2.95	2.95	9
Fall 2013	3****	2.62-3.11	2.85	12
Fall 2014	1*****	3.30	3.30	9

*16 additional student were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2010
**12 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2011
***9 additional student were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2012
****12 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2013
*****9 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2014

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students using ACT
Fall 2005	242 – 286	260.48	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2006	240 – 280	260.50	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2007	244 – 280	256.91	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2008	241 – 290	261.33	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2009	240 – 286	257.52	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2010	241 – 285	263.36	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2011	244 - 278	258.58	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	244 – 268	254.05	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2013	245-268	256.75	240	100%	13
Fall 2014	248	248	240	100%	13

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score – Off Campus Cohort (EChOS)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students

---

[1] Entering GPA for Early Childhood Education students includes any transfer work and is calculated at the time the student is admitted to the teacher education program.
[2] Entering GPA for the Fall 2006 cohort is slightly lower because a change was made in the way late applications were handled. There were several students who applied after the deadline who had a higher GPA, but they were placed on a waiting list.
[3] Students in this cohort are not required to take CI200 if they are entering as a graduate degree seeking student.

					Using ACT instead of TAP
Fall 2008	246 – 290	262.10	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2009	240 – 295	258.93	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2010	241 – 272	254.66	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	251 - 253	258	240	100%	1
Fall 2013	245	245	240	100%	2
Fall 2014	0	0	0	0	1

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
Fall 2005	20	1	0	6
Fall 2006	16	2	0	12
Fall 2007	14	1	1	5
Fall 2008	21	1	0	8
Fall 2009	31	2	0	13
Fall 2010	18	3	0	8
Fall 2011	12	2	0	5
Fall 2012	14	1	0	5
Fall 2013	16	0	1	0
Fall 2014	6	2	6	0

CI 200 Grade – Off Campus Cohort (EChOS)*

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer	Degree[4]
Fall 2008	1	0	0	3	6
Fall 2009	3	0	0	3	9
Fall 2010	1	0	0	4	4
Fall 2011	0	0	0	1	2
Fall 2012	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2013	0	1	2	0	0
Fall 2014	1	0	0	0	0

*16 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students.

Elementary Education
NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program.
Entering GPA[5]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
Fall 2005	115	2.69 – 4.00	3.30
Fall 2006	120	2.62 – 4.00	3.35
Fall 2007	114	2.55 – 4.00	3.29
Fall 2008	120	2.66 – 4.00	3.34
Fall 2009	114	2.50 – 3.96	3.21
Fall 2010	115	2.51 – 4.00	3.27
Fall 2011	78	2.51 – 4.00	3.18
Fall 2012	74	2.57 – 4.00	3.30
Fall 2013	82	2.58 - 4.00	3.30
Fall 2014	78	2.50 – 4.00	3.32

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

---

[4] Students in this cohort are not required to take CI200 if they are entering as a graduate degree seeking student.

[5] Entering GPA for Elementary Education students includes any transfer work and is calculated at the time the student is admitted to the teacher education program.

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students Using ACT Instead of TAP
Fall 2005	240 – 299	261.30	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2006	241 – 293	263.02	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2007	240 – 297	264.61	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2008	240 – 286	262.48	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2009	240 – 287	264.14	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2010	240 – 292	263.71	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2011[6]	240 – 288	259.62	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	241 – 287	256.63	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2013	240 - 284	258	240	100%	54
Fall 2014	240 – 252	248	240	100%	74

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
Fall 2005	73	9	0	33
Fall 2006	76	8	1	31
Fall 2007	68	5	1	40
Fall 2008	88	5	1	66
Fall 2009	74	6	0	34
Fall 2010	83	3	0	29
Fall 2011	51	3	0	24
Fall 2012	51	6	0	17
Fall 2013	45	2	0	35
Fall 2014	41	4	1	32

Special Education

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program. Up until the Fall 2007 cohort, students progressed at their own pace with students reaching the student teaching semester at different times. Beginning in Fall 2007, students' progress through the program at the same pace.

Entering GPA[7]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2005-2006	45	2.50 – 4.00	3.04
2006-2007	29	2.50 – 4.00	3.12
2007-2008	46	2.50 – 4.00	3.13
2008-2009	44	2.50 – 3.90	3.12
2009-2010	35	2.50 – 3.80	3.11
2010-2011	29	2.50 – 3.90	3.12
2011-2012	31	2.50 – 4.00	3.06
2012-2013	15	2.50 – 3.50	3.10
2013-2014	35	2.50 – 4.00	3.09

Entering GPA[8] - Off Campus Cohort (Grow Your Own-E. St. Louis)

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2009*	6	2.5 – 3.5	2.88

*no new cohorts since this date

---

[6] Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

[7] Entering GPA for Special Education students includes any transfer work.

[8] Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

[9] Beginning in Fall 2006, the Special Education Program began offering a SPE 200 course as an introduction to Special Education. The program had previously used the grade in SPE 400, Exceptional Child, as the course required for admission to the program.

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students Using ACT instead of TAP
2005-2006	242 – 286	259.33	240	100%	n/a
2006-2007	240 – 283	258.07	240	100%	n/a
2007-2008	240 – 281	260.30	240	100%	n/a
2008-2009	241 – 285	263.69	240	100%	n/a
2009-2010	240 - 287	259.00	240	100%	n/a
2010-2011	242 – 290	260.86	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	242 - 278	257.94	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	246 - 274	254	240	100%	15
2013-2014	242 - 263	251	240	100%	24

Basic Skills Score – Off Campus Cohort (Grow Your Own-E. St. Louis)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate
2009*	240 – 277	247.66	240	100%

*no new cohorts since this date

SPE 400/SPE 200 Grade[9]:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2005-2006	34	9	0	2
2006-2007	22	5	0	2
2007-2008	20	14	0	12
2008-2009	17	17	0	10
2009-2010	14	10	0	11
2010-2011	19	7	0	1
2011-2012	9	11	0	11
2012-2013	10	5	0	0
2013-2014	8	21	0	6

SPE 400/SPE 200 Grade[9]- Off Campus Cohort (Grow Your Own-E. St. Louis)

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2009	0	0	0	6

Secondary Education (Excludes PE and Health)

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the student teaching semester of the various Secondary education programs.

Entering GPA[10]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2005-2006	132	2.50 – 4.00	3.31
2006-2007	122	2.50 – 4.00	3.31
2007-2008[11]	138	2.50 – 4.00	3.16
2008-2009	132	2.50 – 4.00	3.25
2009-2010	123	2.50 – 4.00	3.27
2010-2011	117	2.50 – 4.00	3.27
2011-2012	112	2.50 – 4.00	3.32
2012-2013	85	2.60 – 4.00	3.35
2013-2014	57	2.63 – 4.00	3.41

---

[10] Entering GPA for Secondary Education students excludes any transfer work.

[11] Data for 2005 – 2008 includes all secondary education programs (including PE and Health Ed). Data for 2008-2009 and forward includes just the programs that fall under Secondary Education (Art, Biology, Chemistry, Earth and Space, English, Foreign Languages, Geography, History, Math, Music, Physics, Political Science and Theater)

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of Students Taking the ACT instead of TAP
2005-2006	240-290	265.51	240	100%	n/a
2006-2007	244-296	263.77	240	100%	n/a
2007-2008	240-289	262.49	240	100%	n/a
2008-2009	242-296	268.51	240	100%	n/a
2009-2010	240-296	268.31	240	100%	n/a
2010-2011[12]	242–291	271.25	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	240-296	269.58	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	244-286	264.44	240	100%	n/a
2013-2014	240-283	260.68	240	100%	9

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2005-2006	83	14	0	35
2006-2007	78	10	0	34
2007-2008	90	19	0	29
2008-2009	111	10	1	10
2009-2010	98	6	0	19
2010-2011	94	2	1	20
2011-2012	76	14	1	21
2012-2013	72	9	2	1
2013-2014	46	7	2	2

1

Physical Education

Entering GPA[13]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2008-2009	28	2.5 – 4.0	2.98
2009-2010	36	2.3 – 4.0*	2.95
2010-2011	32	2.5 – 4.0	3.15
2011-2012	25**	2.5 – 4.0	3.06
2012-2013	8	2.6 - 3.6	3.07
2013-2014	Program discontinued		

*2 students with low GPAs from previous institutions were given conditional admission. Both have earned over 3.0 GPAs since that time.

** Includes students admitted F11, SP12, F12 to final PE cohort.

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students using ACT
2008-2009	240 – 284	256	240	100%	n/a
2009-2010	240 – 287	260.16	240	100%	n/a
2010-2011[14]	241 – 285	257.31	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	241- 294	256	240	100%	1
2012-2013	246 - 257	252.66	240	100%	2
2013-2014	Program discontinued				

---

[12] Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

[13] Entering GPA for Physical Education students excludes any transfer work.

[14] Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2008-2009	16			12
2009-2010	20	1	1	14
2010-2011	22	10	0	0
2011-2012	14	6	5	0
2012-2013	5	2	1	0
2013-2014	Program discontinued			

Health Education

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the student teaching semester of the various Health Education program.

Entering GPA[15]:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2008-2009	9	2.6 – 3.7	3.18
2009-2010	9	2.5 – 3.9	3.40
2010-2011	5	2.7 – 3.7	3.03
2011-2012	5	2.7 – 3.2	3.01
2012-2013	2	2.7 – 2.8	2.76
2013-2014	No students admitted – program closed		

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate
2008-2009	243 – 276	257.78	240	100%
2009-2010	242 – 277	261.44	240	100%
2010-2011	240 – 276	257.40	240	100%
2011-2012	261 - 280	269.80	240	100%
2012-2013	258 – 276	267.00	240	100%
2013-2014	No students admitted – program closed			

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2008-2009	6	1	0	2
2009-2010	5	0	0	4
2010-2011	5	0	0	0
2011-2012	5	0	0	0
2012-2013	2	0	0	0
2013-2014	No students admitted – program closed			

Unit aggregate
Entering GPA

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2008-2009	373	2.5 – 4.0	3.15
2009-2010	384	2.3* – 4.0	3.12
2010-2011	337	2.36 - 4.0	3.11
2011-2012	273	2.5 – 4.0	3.12
2012-2013	224	2.5 – 4.0	3.11
2013-2014	185	2.5 – 4.0	3.30

*Conditional admission

---

[15] Entering GPA for Health Education students excludes any transfer work.

Test of Academic Proficiency/ACT/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# taking ACT
2008-2009	240 - 296	261.69	240	100%	n/a
2009-2010	240 - 296	259.64	240	100%	n/a
2010-2011	240 - 291	261.22	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	240 - 296	261.36	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	241 - 287	256.64	240	100%	4
2013-2014	240 - 283	251.92	240	100%	121

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2008-2009	260	34	2	111
2009-2010	245	25	1	104
2010-2011	242	25	1	62
2011-2012	162	36	6	62
2012-2013	156	23	6	18
2013-2014	102	34	9	40

What did we learn about our candidates?

Since 2010, the number of candidates entering teacher education has drastically declined. This is due to the Illinois State Board of Education's institution of higher standards for entry into teacher education programs. Candidates now have to pass either the Test of Academic Proficiency with a score of 240 or an ACT composite score of 22 or higher with a writing component score of 19 or higher. The majority of candidates are using the ACT option.

Candidates continued to display high grades in the required early entry course, CI 200 or SPE 200. The mean GPA of entering candidates remains over 3.0. Although the number of Secondary education candidates is at an all-time low, their GPA increased this year. This data suggests that our candidates display strong general education knowledge and skills that form the foundation for educator preparation.

Actions to take based on data:

The SOE Student Services Office is counseling candidates to take the ACT with writing over the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP). More candidates are eligible to enter programs since the TAP equates to an ACT of 26. For those candidates who have not been able to meet these testing requirements, the EChOS program offers a non-certification option. Candidates in the EChOS program have the option to move to the certification track once they pass all the testing requirements.

At this time, our cohort group numbers remain lower in all programs. It should also be noted that the school health education program has been discontinuation due to lack of interest in School Health Education and increasing interest in community health education and exercise science programs. Candidates who are interested in teaching health education in a school setting are adding this endorsement to a certificate in another teaching area. The Physical Education Teacher Education program has also been approved to close its undergraduate program, citing the dismal prospects for school district hiring in this area. The School Health Education program has graduated its last candidates and the PETE program has a few candidates remaining.

TRANSITION POINT: ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING

Assessment: Content Area Test (2013-2014)

The data provided in the tables below reflect the scores of students who passed the IL Content Test and were then eligible to enter student teaching.

Assessment	Criterion for passing	Findings	What did we learn about our candidates?	Actions to Take Based on Data
IL Content Test - standardized criterion-references tests (by content area) that are tied to State standards	Must pass – overall score must be 240 or above	100% pass rate; See chart below for overall means by content area; Subscores for each content area are listed in the shared drive (SOE Data) – listed by program.- see also appeals by students to continue to student teaching if not passed content test (1out of 7 students allowed to have extended field experience until test passed)	Candidates possess appropriate content knowledge	None at the unit level; program level faculty should review objectives associated with subtest scores below 240; clarify and consistently apply rule about not student teaching without passing the content test; remind students earlier in the program about test dates

Contest Test Data (includes all test results reported between August 31, 2013 and September 1, 2014)

Content Area and Number of Candidates** (Programs not listed did not have test scores)	Findings – Overall mean* (areas listed have scores <240)
Biology (n=3)	254 (area 5 'Cell Biology, Heredity, and Evolution')
Chemistry (n=5)	253 (area 2 'life science')
Early Childhood (n=25)	260 (all subscores above 240)
Earth and Space Science (n=1)	269 (all subscores above 240)
Elementary (n=71)	265 (all subscores above 240)
Foreign Language-Spanish (n=1)	276 (all subscores above 240)
Foreign Language-French (n=0)	No data
Foreign Language-German (n=0)	No data
English/Language Arts (n=17)	266 (all subscores above 240)
Geography (n=0)	No data
**Health Education (n=0)	No data – program closed
History (n=9)	259 (all subscores above 240)
Mathematics (n=4)	264 (all subscores above 240)
Music (n=10)	280 (all subscores above 240)
**Physical education (n=7)	258 (all subscores above 240)
**Physics (n=1)	284 (all subscores above 240) Note: this program will be discontinued because of low enrollment
Political science (n=0)	No data
Special Education (n=26)	267 (all subscores above 240 on LBS1) 258 (area 'Social Sciences' on Gen Curriculum)
Theater (n=3)	273 (all subscores above 240
Visual arts (n=8)	265 (all subscores above 240)
Unit aggregate (n =191)	**265.7**

*Note: Means below 240 may indicate area of relative weakness and are considered "red flag"
**Note: This program is being discontinued because of low enrollment or lack of employment in the field

Additional Review of Subareas within the Content Test: All candidates must pass the Illinois Content Test within their areas of certification, as stated above. Each content test is divided into subareas. Subarea scores below 240 might indicate areas of relative weakness.

All programs had overall mean subscores of 240 or above. 3 of 20 programs recorded 1 area of weak subscores. This is the best overall record in recent years. It is recommended that the program faculty of these 2 programs review the objectives associated with mean subarea scores below 240 to determine possible reasons for these scores. Appropriate action, if needed, can then be considered by program faculty.

The subarea mean scores are listed by program on the SOE shared drive (SOE Data for all programs and secondary education content areas). This documentation also includes failed attempts and frequency of failed attempts by candidates.

Assessment: Candidate ability to plan instruction in the field

Each program administers an assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction that is aligned to the program's standards. Data was reported as the number of candidates who exceeded, met, or did not meet the program expectations. This year the data varies from program to program, depending on whether they submitting SPA reports to NCATE/CAEP. For those programs who did submit response to conditions reports, the data will reflect what they provided to their SPA. Program descriptions of these assessments and their data tables are located on the SOE Shared Drive (under SOE Data).

Criterion for passing:

It is expected that at least 80% of each program's candidates meet or exceed expectations.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Location of Program	Findings by candidate or standard*
*Early childhood (n=32)	SIUE and EChOS	95% of NAEYC Standards were exceeded or met
*Elementary education (n=70)	SIUE	92% of ACEI Standards were exceeded or met expectations
Physical education (n=0)	SIUE	No candidates completing this assessment
*Special education (n=10)	SIUE-On Campus	97% of CEC Standards were exceeded or met expectations
Unit aggregate (n=112)	**Combined**	**93.3% of candidates exceeded or met the standards of their SPA.**

*% are based on data taken from NCATE SPA reports and is an average of the standard element scores.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Across all programs, candidates were able to plan instruction for students in school settings. Elementary Education candidates performed above the 80% acceptable level this year. In Spring 2013, the program used the revised edTPA Task #1 which will be required for licensure for all teacher candidates completing a teacher education program after September 2015. Faculty performed local scoring of all elementary education and early childhood education candidates' edTPA portfolios. Faculty used what they learned in local scoring training to modify course assignments/activities that prepare candidates for the intensity and demands of this assessment and the improvement in scores is evident. Special Education candidates successfully completed the Instructional Planning Project in their field placement or with a case example. They demonstrated expertise in determining baseline data, student strengths and weaknesses, and an intervention plan targeting areas of concern.

Actions to take based on data:

All programs should continue to refine assessments to increase validity and reliability and alignment with specialized professional association and State standards. Revise and refine

curriculum to include activities and assignments that will prepare teacher candidates for the high-stakes assessment of edTPA. The teacher education programs will conduct a calibration of scoring by comparing local scorer results with that of selected portfolios that will be sent to Pearson.

Assessment: Disposition Checklist (Faculty) (2013-2014)

The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year. Faculty rated candidates' dispositions on-campus and in their field placements.

Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale:

Response Set	Criteria – out of a score of 50
1=Not at all characteristic	
2	Needs support= 34 and below
3=somewhat characteristic	Developing= 35-39
4	Meets=40-45
5=extremely characteristic	Exceeds=46-50

University Faculty On-Campus (UF1) Findings:

Note: Column 1 names the program and the number of evaluations performed. Numbers in column 2 represent the range of evaluation scores, not number of candidates.
Numbers in columns 3 and 3 represent the number of candidates scoring in lower ranges.

Program*	Range of scores	# of candidates Needing Support	# of candidates in Developing Stage
Early Childhood (All Locations) n=90*	31-50	1	5
Elementary n=112*	36-51**	0	14
Physical Education n=1	40	0	0
Special Education n=24	26-50	1	2
Secondary Art n=17	41-51**	0	0
Secondary Biology n=10	40-51**	0	0
Secondary Chemistry n=5	40-50	0	0
Secondary Earth/Space Science n=2	45-50**	0	0
Secondary English n=52	34-51**	1	7
Secondary French n=3	37-51**	0	1
Secondary German n=0			
Secondary Spanish n=15	33-51**	0	1
Secondary Geography n=0			
Secondary History n=27	37-51**	0	1
Secondary Mathematics n=16	38-51**	0	1
Secondary Music n=29	22-51**	1	0
Secondary Political Science n=8	40-50	0	0
Secondary Physics n=1	51**	0	0
Secondary Theater n=0			
Unit aggregated n = 412 evaluations	26-51**	4	32

University Faculty Supervising Field Placements (UF2) Findings:

Program*	Range of scores	# of candidates Needing Support	# of candidates in Developing Stage
Early Childhood (All Locations) n=75*	21-50**	5	3
Elementary n=186*	26-51**	15	6
Physical Education n=2	40-41**	0	0
Special Education (All Locations) n=94	33-52**	2	3
Secondary Art n=11	38-51**	0	1
Secondary Biology n=13	41-51**	0	0

Secondary Chemistry n=9	40-56**	0	0
Secondary Earth/Space Science n=1	40	0	0
Secondary English n=54	31-52*	2	1
Secondary French n=0			
Secondary German n=0			
Secondary Spanish n=5	34-51*	1	0
Secondary Geography n=0			
Secondary History n=15	47-51**	0	0
Secondary Mathematics n=21	39-52**	0	1
Secondary Music n=9	43-52**	0	0
Secondary Political Science n=1	51*	0	0
Secondary Physics n=3	46-56***	0	0
Secondary Theater n=9	47-50**	0	0
Unit aggregated n = 508 evaluations	21-56**	25	15

*Results are based on number of *evaluations completed*, **not necessarily number of *candidates*** in the program. In some programs, several faculty complete evaluations on one candidate.
** Totals include "not observed" which reflects some scores of 6.
*** An unusual number of "not observed" - names sent to program chair

What did we learn about our candidates?

It must be noted that this is a new assessment, which also has a new timetable for evaluating candidates. With that said, some program candidates were evaluated by more than one faculty member and others by only one faculty member. The programs are encouraged to use this check system at various points in the program. The majority of candidates display appropriate dispositions as rated by faculty. Candidates in elementary education were identified more often, than in other programs. The names of the candidates who need support or who are developing were sent to the program chairs.

Action to Take Based on Data:

Through working with JCTP, this new disposition system was developed. During the 2013-2014 school year, each program implemented the system. At the end of fall and spring semesters a report was sent to program chairs which identified the candidates who needed additional support. We found that this information was needed sooner in the semester. The Associate Dean will notify program directors during the second week in October and in March that a window for online evaluation is open. Faculty will be given a two week window to complete evaluations on their candidates, then reports of candidates needing help will be generated and sent to program chairs.

Additional Data-Tracking Complaints and Dispositions Alerts

Tracking of Complaints by the Associate Dean
Criterion for passing: Fewer than 25 complaints with no noticeable pattern
Findings: There were 12 complaints/issues originating in 3 initial programs and 1 advanced program. Six disposition alerts were issued. Twelve requests for clinical placement changes were submitted (11 from initial programs and 1 from an advanced program). See columns below for enhanced explanations of findings, outcomes, and actions to take based on data.
Overall, program faculty are doing a good job of monitoring students' dispositions on campus and in their field placements. They identify behaviors that are not appropriate in school settings. An ad hoc committee is being formed to review departmental operating paper language about handling complaints, academic and dispositional issues, and their repercussions.

Table of Complaints and Dispositions Alerts (2013-2014)

Assessment	Criterion for passing	Findings	What did we learn about our candidates?	Actions to Take Based on Data

Tracking of Complaints- Associate Dean	Fewer than 25 complaints overall with no noticeable pattern (program where complaint originated, type of complaint)	**Total # Issues=12**
		
		Program where issue originated:
		Elem.Ed.Initial: 7
		KHE.Initial: 2
		Special.Ed.Initial: 2
		Special.Ed.Adv.: 1
		
		Type of issue:
		  Academic Miscounduct-5
		  Inappropriate dispositions - 3
		
		Other:
		  Advisement complaint-1
		  Unhappy with clinical placement-1
		  Clinical-unable to meet standards-1
		  Complaint about state licensure rule change-1
		
		Formal Dispositions Alert Issued: 6
		
		Resolution*
		  Informal resolution=5
		  Formal grievance=2 (carry over to 2014-15)
		  Removal from program=3
		  Appeal denied=1
		  State rule changed; resolved-1
		  Fail course-4
		*NOTE: Some conflicts resulted in more than one resolution
			Most complaints from initial elementary education; Disposition issues occurred in clinical sites; Students dropped from program were in special education (initial & advanced); Grievances were from special education; Most issues resolved informally; Increase in academic misconduct	Monitor why students are dropped from special education (2 resulted from academic misconduct & 1 was unable to meet standards in student teaching)

Candidate appeal of clinical or field placements	Individual review of each situation by faculty, program director, administrators; decision by consensus; if no extenuating circumstances, consistently apply policy to deny requests	Total # of requests for field/clinical placement changes: 12 (11 initial; 1 advanced) Total # approved: 8 Total # denied: 3 Other: 1 (refer for financial issues)	Majority of appeals were from early childhood (initial); Majority were for personal/medical reasons	None; all approvals had extenuating circumstances (e.g., single parent with child care issues); denials did not demonstrate extenuating circumstances (e.g., don't want a

13

				particular grade level)

Note: Some complaints are listed in more than one category

Assessment: Professional Education Grade Point Average (GPA)

Note: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the candidate was admitted to the particular program.

Each program determines the cluster of professional education coursework required and the required grade point average for retention in the program.

Criterion for passing:

Candidates must have 3.0 GPA (Special Education) or 2.5 (all other programs) in professional education coursework to be retained in the program.

Findings:

Early Childhood

Professional Education GPA[16]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
Fall 2005	3.19 – 4.00	3.76	28
Fall 2006	3.21 – 4.00	3.85	28
Fall 2007	3.33 – 4.00	3.78	19
Fall 2008	2.88 – 4.00	3.82	28
Fall 2009	3.00 – 4.00	3.77	45
Fall 2010	3.38 – 4.00	3.88	24
Fall 2011	3.26 – 4.00	3.79	18
Fall 2012	3.10 - 4.00	3.67	23
Fall 2013	3.00 – 4.00	3.82	17
Fall 2014			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015

Professional Education GPA (Off-Campus Cohort-Echoes)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Student who have reached this point
Fall 2008	2.57 – 4.00	3.89	9
Fall 2009	3.38 – 4.00	3.74	12
Fall 2010	3.68 – 4.00	3.91	5
Fall 2011	3.68 - 3.89	3.78	2
Fall 2012	4.00	4.00	1
Fall 2013			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015
Fall 2014			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2016

Elementary Education

Professional Education GPA[17]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
Fall 2005	3.44 – 4.00	3.86	115
Fall 2006	3.21 – 4.00	3.85	117
Fall 2007	3.07 – 4.00	3.86	109
Fall 2008	2.95 – 4.00	3.86	113
Fall 2009	3.50 – 4.00	3.89	108
Fall 2010	3.22 – 4.00	3.87	97

---

[16] Professional Education GPA for Early Childhood Education students is calculated using CI 421, SPE 400, SPPA 490, EPFR 320, EPFR 315, CI 316, CI 301, SPE 440, CI 316, CI 317, CI 323, CI 316, CI 324, CI 343, CI 426 and CI 414. Professional Education GPA will be collected after the Fall semester prior to the Spring student teaching semester.

[17] Professional Education GPA for Elementary Education students is calculated using SPE 400, ART 300A, KIN 330, EPFR 320, EPFR 315, CI 311, CI 312, CI 337, CI 413, CI 415, CI 442, CI 411, CI 307, CI 338, CI 343 and CI 445. Professional Education GPA will be collected after the Fall semester prior to the Spring student teaching semester.

Fall 2011	3.50 – 4.00	3.89	71
Fall 2012	3.10 - 4.00	3.80	93
Fall 2013	3.13 – 4.00	3.84	79
Fall 2014			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015

Secondary Education
Professional Education GPA[18]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students how have reached this point
2005-2006	2.33-4.00	3.72	---
2006-2007	2.67-4.00	3.74	---
2007-2008	2.33-4.00	3.69	---
2008-2009	2.98-4.00	3.71	125
2009-2010	3.00-4.00	3.78	115
2010-2011	3.00-4.00	3.78	115
2011-2012	2.60-4.00	3.72	102
2012-2013	3.75–4.00	3.78	80
2013-2014	2.93 – 4.00	3.84	53

Special Education
Professional Education GPA[19]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2005-2006	3.60 – 4.00	3.85	37
2006-2007	3.10 – 4.00	3.80	27
2007-2008	3.40 – 4.00	3.82	44
2008-2009	3.00 – 4.00	3.73	41
2009-2010	3.30 – 4.00	3.82	41
2010-2011	3.30 – 4.00	3.81	34
2011-2012	3.00 - 4.00	3.78	32
2012-2013	3.06 – 3.94	3.61	15
2013-2014	3.20 – 4.00	3.66	16
2014-2015			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015

Professional Education GPA (Off-Campus Cohort-Grow Your Own-E. St. Louis)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2009*	3.2 – 3.8	3.6	3

*no new cohorts since this date

Physical Education
Professional Education GPA[20]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2007-2008	2.33 – 4.00	3.31	---
2008-2009	3.00 – 4.00	3.68	---
2009-2010	2.50 – 4.00	3.54	---
2010-2011	2.67 – 4.00	3.64	27
2011-2012	2.75 – 4.00	3.61	18
2012-2013	3.25 – 4.00	3.66	6

[18]Professional Education GPA for Secondary Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, SPE 400, CI 440 and CI 315a. Art Education and Kinesiology students do not take CI 440 or CI 315a. Health Education and Music Education students do not take CI 315a.

[19] Professional Education GPA is calculated the term prior to student teaching. Professional Education GPA for Special Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, KIN 325, SPE 405, SPE 412, SPE 415, SPE 416, SPE 430, SPE 450, SPE 470, SPE 471, SPPA 490, SPE 417a, SPE 417b, SPE 418 and SPE 421.

[20] Professional Education GPA for Secondary Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, SPE 400, CI 440 and CI 315a. Art Education and Kinesiology students do not take CI 440 or CI 315a. Health Education and Music Education students do not take CI 315a.

2013 -2014	3.00 – 4.00	3.60	8

Professional Education GPA[21]:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point	
2008-2009	3.00 – 4.00	3.64	8	
2009-2010	3.35 – 4.00	3.81	8	
2010-2011	3.25 – 4.00	3.71	5	
2011-2012	3.14 – 4.00	3.94	4	
2012-2013	3.75 – 4.00	3.87	2	
2013-2014	Program closed			

Unit aggregate

Professional Education GPA:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2008-2009	2.57- 4.0	3.76	324*
2009-2010	2.5 - 4.0	3.73	329*
2010-2011	2.67 - 4.0	3.79	210
2011-2012	2.75 - 4.0	3.79	247
2012-2013	2.6 – 4.0	3.74	219
2013-2014	2.93 – 4.0	3.81	179
2014-2015	Incomplete data set – 2-year program data not available until after fall semester 2015		

*Incomplete data – PETE candidates not included

What did we learn about our candidates?
Almost all candidates met or exceeded requirements for Professional Education grade point average. Data indicated that candidates displayed strong professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.
Actions to be taken based on data:
Continue to monitor retention of candidates based on these assessments. Please note that the school health education program has been approved for discontinuation.

TRANSITION POINT: PROGRAM COMPLETION

Assessment: Student Teaching Evaluation (2013-2014)
Unit student teaching evaluation; Faculty & Cooperating Teacher(s) complete an online evaluation consisting of a base of set of 25 forced choice statements, along with space for comments.* Programs were encouraged to add SPA specific questions to the base 25 questions and some programs did this.
Criterion for passing: Candidates are evaluated with a five-level scale:
        Level 5 - Outstanding foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher (top1%)
        Level 4 - Advanced foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher
        Level 3 - Acceptable skills for a beginning teacher
        Level 2 - Developing skills, but needs more practice to teacher-of-record.

---

[21] Professional Education GPA for Secondary Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, SPE 400, CI 440 and CI 315a. Art Education and Kinesiology students do not take CI 440 or CI 315a. Health Education and Music Education students do not take CI 315a.

Level 1 - Struggling candidate, not ready to teach and not observed

Level 5 = exceeds
Levels 4 and 3 = meets
Levels 2 and 1 = does not meet
'Not observed' is not counted against the candidate.

Program Name	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet	Not observed	Areas not observed (>9% per question)
ECH (all) (n=85)	**27.91%**	**66.87%**	**2.54%**	**2.68%**	Q: 4, 16, 17
ECH campus	30.69%	64.19%	3.00%	2.13%	
ECH ESTL	50.00%	50.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
ECH So. Roxana	13.41%	81.41%	1.41%	3.76%	
ELEM (n=116)	**32.01%**	**65.68%**	**1.50%**	**0.80%**	
SPED (n=52)	**30.54%**	**58.08%**	**8.54%**	**2.85%**	Q: 12
PETE (n=23)	**26.09%**	**56.70%**	**6.43%**	**10.78%**	Q: 4, 6, 8, 12, 15, 17, 18, 21
MAT (ALL) (n=14)	**24.00%**	**74.86%**	**0.86%**	**0.29%**	
MAT English	46.00%	52.00%	0.00%	2.00%	
MAT History	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
MAT Math	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
MAT Biology	12.00%	84.00%	4.00%	0.00%	
MAT Chemistry	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
MAT Earth/Space	8.00%	92.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
MAT Physics	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
MAT Spanish	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
Secondary (All) (N=155)	**22.99%**	**71.87%**	**1.47%**	**3.66%**	Q: 4, 17, 21, 22
English (n=54)	11.63%	82.74%	2.22%	3.41%	
Math (n=18)	19.11%	78.22%	0.22%	2.44%	Q: 3,4,17,21
Music (n=9)	48.44%	45.78%	0.00%	5.78%	Q: 2, 4, 5, 7, 12, 16, 17, 22
Theater and Dance (n=9)	27.56%	68.00%	0.00%	4.44%	Q: 4,16,17
Visual Arts (n=20)	54.80%	37.80%	0.80%	6.60%	
All Sciences	**26.60%**	**72.40%**	**0.00%**	**1.00%**	
Biology (n=7)	30.29%	66.86%	0.00%	2.86%	Q: 3,4,12,16,21
Chemistry (n=11)	26.18%	73.82%	0.00%	0.00%	
Earth Space Science (n=2)	16.00%	84.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All Social Sciences	**12.55%**	**79.09%**	**4.00%**	**4.36%**	
Geography (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
History (n=22)	12.55%	79.09%	4.00%	4.36%	Q: 4, 11, 17, 19, 21, 22
Political Science (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All Foreign Languages	**1.33%**	**98.67%**	**0.00%**	**0.00%**	

Spanish (n=3)	1.33%	98.67%	0.00%	0.00%	
French (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
German (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All initial programs combined (including MAT) (n=422**)	**26.35%**	**65.68%**	**2.46%**	**2.45%**	**Q4: 6.40% Q17: 9.24% Q21: 7.82%**

*Does not include PETE evaluations plus three incomplete ELEM evaluations

Findings*: This was the second year for the new student teaching evaluation form based on the 2013 Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The evaluation results were combined by program to show the percentage of evaluations which were scored in the ranges explained above. The data includes the 25 standard questions that all programs use for evaluation. Some programs have additional questions related to their SPA requirements. Minor confusion on how to complete the online evaluation was still present, even though instructions were sent through supervisors.

> *Findings reported as overall mean and percent of *evaluations completed* that exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations. Some candidates had multiple evaluations because of several placements.
> NOTE: Scores for each question for each program are available on the SOE shared drive for program faculty review

What did we learn about candidates? Candidates displayed the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful during student teaching.

Actions to Take Based on Data: The previous student teaching evaluation did not have the option, "not observed," the new instrument revealed interesting data from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Last year the top 4 questions were identified as not being observed – Q2, 21, 12, 17. The "not observed" average was 6.79%. This year fewer questions were answered with "not observed" with an average of 2.45%. The following questions were identified this year as ones that were "not observed":

- *Q4. Addresses goals and objectives when planning, assessing, and implementing plans developed under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, individualized education programs (IEP), or individual family service plans (IFSP) for students with special needs, ELLs, and students who are gifted.*
- *Q17. Maintains, accurately interprets, and clearly communicates records of student work and performance to students, parents or guardians, colleagues, and the community in a confidential manner that complies with the requirements of the Illinois School Student Records Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).*
- *Q21. Engages in self-assessment and adjusts practice to enhance personal growth and development; participates in professional development, professional organizations, and learning communities.*

This is due to acclamation to the new evaluation form and its questions. Faculty should continue to review the questions where candidates could not be evaluated. Some suggestions for actions: (a) Faculty could modify the experiences required in student teaching, (b) they could change assignments/lesson plans to cover the items "not observed" and/or (c) require university supervisors to verify that these experiences are being included through writing or oral communications.

Assessment: Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT)
All candidates must pass the State-administered Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) prior to certification. The APT is designed to assess candidates' pedagogical knowledge. The six subareas addressed include: foundations, characteristics, and assessment; planning and delivering instruction; managing the learning environment; collaboration, communication, and

professionalism; language arts; and educational technology. In addition, candidates must respond to constructed response questions focusing on pedagogy knowledge and skills.

Criteria for passing:
Overall scores of 240 or above are considered passing. Because subarea (100-300) scores are on the same scale, subarea scores below 240 could suggest areas of relative weakness.

Findings:

Program	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6	Area 7	Mean
Early Childhood (n=23)	274	280	279	275	276	277	**235** **(13 out of 23 passed this section)**	268.22
Elementary Education (n=72)	268	280	267	273	265	267	257	267
Physical Education (n=4)	279	252	274	269	255	257	**218** **(1 out of 4 passed this section)**	256
Special Education (n=26)	274	274	271	279	266	259	244	264
Secondary Education (n=121)	266	266	268	275	268	267	248	265
Unit aggregate* (n=246)	**269**	**273**	**269**	**274**	**267**	**267**	**247**	**265**

*Includes all attempts by every teacher candidates

All Subarea scores by program are located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data)
Note: Scaled Score of 240 or above indicates satisfactory performance
Subarea 1=Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessment; Subarea 2=Planning and Delivering Instruction; Subarea 3=Managing the Learning Environment; Subarea 4=Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism; Subarea 5=Language Arts; Subarea 6=Educational Technology; Subarea 7=Constructed Response on Pedagogy

What did we learn about our candidates?
There appeared to be a pattern of low candidate scores in Subarea 7, Constructed Response in Pedagogy. No other unit-level pattern of Subarea scores was apparent.

Actions to take based on data:
All program faculty need to review their specific program's data for the APT on the shared drive, as the aggregated data may not represent their program. All programs should review the objectives associated with each Subarea, especially Subarea 7, Constructed Response in Pedagogy. If appropriate, action at the program level should occur to increase these scores. Faculty should also review program-level data for other Subareas, review associated test objectives, and determine what, if any, action should occur. See http://www.il.nesinc.com/ for test information.

TRANSITION POINT: FOLLOW-UP

Initial candidates in teacher education programs assess the quality of their programs via a 26-item inventory. The exit survey is completed just prior to graduation. On statements 1-16, candidates provided opinions on a Likert scale, where A=Strongly Disagree (1), B=Disagree (2), C=Agree (3), and D=Strongly Agree (4). On statements 17-26, candidates were asked to reflect on their level of preparation in a variety of areas using a Likert scale, where A=No Preparation (1), B=Minimal Preparation (2), C=Adequate Preparation (3), and D=Extensive Preparation (4). Means were computed for each statement across all programs. Data was also sorted into the following categories: Does not meet criteria-means less than 3.0; Meets criteria-means of 3.0-3.49; Exceeds criteria-means greater than 3.49.

Criteria for passing:

Means for each item, by program, should be at least 3.0 (i.e., agree or adequate preparation) *AND* at least 75% of candidates should have means of at least 3.0. Questions that were flagged for faculty review were those where 25% or more respondents did not meet expectations AND the overall mean for the question did not meet expectations.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Exit surveys were completed by 105 graduating candidates. The range of scores spanned 2.84 to 3.62, with only question #7 below the 3.0 mark. Question 7: *The general education courses were helpful in my overall preparation for teaching* continues to be a problem. The majority of candidates rated their experiences and preparation favorably. The following programs had no red flags: Physical Education, English Education, and Mathematics Education.

Three questions received ratings at or just above 3.0:

- Q5: It appeared that the teacher education program was comprised of students from diverse backgrounds

Level of preparation questions:

- Q17: Integrate theory and practice.
- Q19: Effectively use learning technologies.

Actions to take based on data: Across all programs, candidates met the criteria for passing this assessment. With the exception of the programs listed above having no scores below 3.0, all other programs should review the questions and comments made by candidates exiting their programs.

With the new Lincoln (General Education) Program gradually being phased in, we hope to see changes in the response to question 7. Candidates entering their programs in 2013 have experienced a modified version of the new curriculum whereas candidates entering the program in 2014 will have experienced the entire new curriculum. By 2016, we hope to have a better response to this question.

It might also be helpful to define what is meant by *general education* courses. It is possible that some candidates define general education courses as those during the first two years at the university and others view these courses as the core courses in professional education. Until this shared definition is communicated, it is difficult to interpret results. The implementation of the Lincoln Plan may also help to improve candidates' view of their general education courses.

Assessment: Illinois Public Colleges Teacher Graduate Survey – One year after graduation-2012 Survey Results-based on 2010-2011 graduates

Note: Due to the change from certification to licensure, the survey will not be sent to new teachers until late in the fall 2013.

Initial program completers state-wide who are teaching in Illinois public schools and their supervisors are surveyed during the spring of the first year of full-time teaching. Aggregate responses are available for all public state universities and institution-specific data is disaggregated.

Criterion for passing:
This survey provides qualitative data about relative strengths and weaknesses in our teacher education programs. Relative strengths are areas where more than 90% of candidates were satisfied or felt prepared. Relative weaknesses are areas where less than 75% of candidates were satisfied or felt prepared. Patterns of increase or decrease in levels of satisfaction or perceived preparation are also indicative of relative strength or weakness.

Select Findings (with comparisons to previous surveys; SIUE graduates):
Note: These items represent some highlights. The entire survey results are available in the Dean's office.
Extent to which your teacher education program prepared you to (% extremely or mostly prepared)

Question	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Accommodate students with exceptionalities	78.4%	67.6%	72%	72%	77%	77%	76%	65%	83%
Teach English language learners	24.3%	26.9%	18.3%	16%	20%	14%	12%	32%	6%
Use strategies for multicultural education	59.5%	58.8%	60%	62%	53%	58%	57%	57%	53%
Use technology for classroom instruction	56.8%	66.2%	64%	70%	68%	70%	60%	43%	24%
Address issues of socioeconomic diversity	64.9%	47.1%	60%	67%	60%	70%	66%	67%	77%
Teach reading skills in your subject area	75.7%	70.6%	72%	64%	59%	80%	74%	74%	53%
Work with school administration	45.9%	35.8%	46%	51%	53%	43%	53%	67%	53%
Work with parents or guardians	48.6%	33.8%	52%	64%	57%	51%	66%	47%	47%
Work in a high accountability environment	57.4%	54.4%	56%	67%	71%	67%	69%	61%	64%
Manage student behavior					77%	71%	68%	54%	58%

What did we learn about our SIUE candidates one year after completion?
Note: These items represent some highlights. The entire survey results are available in the Dean's office.

- Some Relative Strengths
  - 95 % were satisfied with the decision to become a teacher (94%-2012; 100%-2011; 97%-2010)
  - 100% were satisfied with their teacher preparation faculty (up from 90% in 2012)
  - 83% were satisfied with the overall quality of the teacher education program (90%-2012; 92%-2011)
  - 94% were satisfied with the student teaching supervisor (90%-2012; 95%-2011)

- Some Relative Weaknesses (except where noted, results were fairly consistent over the past 7 years)
    - 6% felt prepared to teach English language learners (a marked decrease from 32% in 2012 and previous years and also the lowest score on record)
    - 53% felt prepared to use strategies used in multicultural education a decrease from 57% in 2012
    - 24% felt prepared to use technology for classroom instruction (marked decrease from the 2012 score of 43% and also the lowest score on record.)
    - 77% felt prepared to address issues of socioeconomic diversity showing improvement over the 2012 score of 67% and the highest score to date.
    - 53% felt prepared to work with school administration (decrease from 201s's 67%)
    - 47% felt prepared to work with parents/guardians (keeping the same rating for the past two years)
    - 64% felt prepared to work in high accountability environments (an increase over 2012's 61%)
    - 58% felt prepared to manage student behavior (a minimal increase from 2012)

Actions to take based on data:
The elementary education faculty redesigned their program to address many of these areas needing improvement: teaching English language learners, use of technology for classroom instruction, use of strategies used in multicultural education, how to address issues of socioeconomic diversity, working with school administrators, working with parents/guardians, preparation for working in a high accountability environment, and managing student behavior. New courses in diversity, technology, assessment, differentiated instruction, and communication were created as a core which the majority of candidates will be required to take regardless of their educational program option.

Faculty are also engaged in revising curriculums to include new 1) the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA) and 2) the Illinois Professional Teaching Standards (IPTS), many of which are reflected in the relative areas of weakness identified in this survey. The edTPA integration into programs will be completed and required by September 2015. The edTPA includes a study of students' academic and demographic backgrounds, and the use of technology to analyze teaching, as well as intense assessment of student work and modification of curriculum to ensure student learning.

Additional Program Assessment Data

As part of an effort to align SIUE Assessment Plans for all programs with the Unit Assessment Plan and to comply with NCATE (i.e., summarize more data across programs), the following assessment data was collected: *Effect on Student Learning*, *Senior Assignment*, and *Planning Instruction* which are program-specific. The assessment, *Planning Instruction,* was reported above under *Admission to Student Teaching*, Transition Point 2). These additional assessments allowed the Unit to evaluate important issues across all programs. These assessments are fully described (by program) on the SOE Shared Drive (under SOE Data).

Assessment: Candidate Effect on Student Learning

Each program developed and administered an assessment of candidate effect on student learning. Data was reported by program as the number of candidates who exceeded, met, or did not meet program expectations for this assessment.

Criterion for passing:
Each program specified the criterion for candidates to exceed, meet, or not meet program expectations for this assessment. It was expected that at least 80% of all candidates would meet or exceed expectations.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Findings
Early childhood (n=31 all locations)	95% of candidates exceeded or met NAEYC Standards for impact on student learning
Elementary Education (n=70)	85% of candidates exceeded or met ACEI Standard 4

Physical education (n=4)	100% of candidates exceeded or met expectations based on the AAHPERD Standards for impact on student learning
Special education (n=32)	81% of CEC Standards for impact on student learning were exceeded or met
Unit aggregate (n =137)	**86.8% of candidates exceeded or met expectations for impact on student learning**

*Assessment includes projects that we completed. 14 students were unable to videotape or their videos were not uploaded properly.
Note: Data from secondary content area majors was collected by the content department

What did we learn about our candidates?
All candidates demonstrated the ability to impact student learning by surpassing the goal of 80% meeting or exceeding program-specific expectations. Early Childhood and Elementary Education programs used edTPA Task #3 and Special Education used their Behavior Change Project for this assessment. The Physical Education program assessed its last few candidates this year.

Actions to take based on data:
Faculty should continue to study this data for the purpose of preparing teacher candidates to be effective educators. The focus of student learning needs to be highlighted when these assessments are introduced to candidates. Teacher candidates need a rich experience which focuses on using data to improve instruction.

Assessment: Senior Assignment
Each undergraduate program developed and administered a Senior Assignment, which was connected to and aligned with the candidate's major area of study and general education skills and competencies. Data was reported by program as the number of candidates who exceeded, met, or did not meet program expectations for this assessment.

Criterion for passing:
Each program specified the criterion for candidates to exceed, meet, or not meet program expectations for this assessment. It was expected that at least 80% of all candidates would meet or exceed expectations.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Findings
Early childhood (n=20)	95% of candidates exceeded or met expectations
Elementary education (n =78)	95% of candidates exceeded or met expectations
Physical education (n=4)	100% of candidates exceeded or met expectations
Special education (n= 27)	89% of candidates exceeded or met expectations
Unit aggregate (n=129)	**94% of candidates exceeded or met expectations**

Note: Data from secondary content area majors was collected by the content department.

What did we learn about our candidates?
Across programs, candidates met or exceeded expectations; most candidates demonstrated skills and competencies in major area of study and general education coursework.

Actions to take based on data:
Continue to improve and refine quality of Senior Assignments as related to measurable objectives and connection between the major area of study and general education skills and competencies. Faculty are currently analyzing their program's senior assignments in light of the state-required edTPA. In some programs, there is the potential that the edTPA may become the senior assignment.

Contributors to this report: Barbara O'Donnell, Associate Dean, Mary Weishaar, Associate Dean, Gretchen Fricke, Director, OCECA, Binod Pokhrel, Director of Technology, School of Education
October, 2014

TRANSITION POINT: Entry to Graduate Education

Assessment: Minimum grade point average (GPA) in undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) degrees (2013-2014)
Must hold bachelor's degree. Entry grade point average for each program and location is summarized annually.
Criterion for passing: Candidates must hold at least 2.5 GPA and a bachelor's degree to enter a graduate program.
Findings: Data disaggregated by program is located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced programs).

Program	Number of Candidates	Mean Grade Point Average
Curriculum and Instruction (**pedagogy-on campus**)	25	3.305
Educational Administration (EDAD MSED- **Belleville)**	6	3.477
Educational Administration (EDAD MSED- **on-campus**)	7	3.497
Educational Administration (Principal-MSED, Cert. only- **on-campus**)	3	3.001
Educational Administration (Specialist General – **on-campus**)	11	3.224
Educational Administration (Specialist General – **Belleville**)	4	2.863
Educational Administration (Superintendent-**on campus**)	6	2.910
Educational Administration (Superintendent-**Belleville**)	4	3.126
Educational Administration - **Doctorate**	9	3.149
Instructional Technology (**on-line**)	36	3.217

Learning, Culture, Society (on campus)	14	3.068
Literacy (on campus)	12	3.481
Literacy Post-Masters (on campus)	6	3.383
Special Education (master's)	22	3.329
Special Education (post master's)	1	2.892
Aggregate Data	**166**	**3.248**

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates met or exceeded the required grade point average requirements and all candidates held a bachelor's degree upon entry to their programs. There were no observable differences in locations off-campus or programs on campus. Candidates admitted to each program displayed adequate content knowledge necessary to pursue advanced study in their fields.

Actions to take based on data: None

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Self-Assessment) (2013-2014)

Upon entry to their programs, candidates complete an online self-assessment survey on four dispositions.

Rubric: 1=I display this disposition; 2=I do not display this disposition; 3=I do not know if I display this disposition.

Dispositions: 1. I act on the belief that all individuals can learn; 2. I respect the diversity of all learners; 3. I treat learners equitably and fairly; 4. I have a sense of professional responsibility and value life-long learning

Criterion for Passing: Candidate self-assessment of 4 dispositions; All candidates must meet 100% of dispositions

Findings:

Program	Number of Candidates	Percent of Candidates who met dispositions*
Curriculum and Instruction-pedagogy	13	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Curriculum and Instruction-secondary	1	100% of candidates met all dispositions (with 1 candidate 'not knowing' in area D)
Educational Administration - Principal	13	100% of candidates met all dispositions; 1 candidate 'did not meet in area B: Respecting the diversity of all learners
Educational Administration - Superintendent	4	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Instructional Technology	21	95% of candidates met all dispositions (with 1 candidate 'not

		knowing' in area B and 1 in area D);
		1 candidate 'did not meet' in area
		C: Treating learners equitably and fairly.
Learning Culture Society	5	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Literacy	5	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Special Education (general and subsequent certification)	4	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Special Education (LBS II)	0	No data
Aggregated data	**66**	**64 out of 66 candidates met all dispositions with 1 candidate 'not meeting' in area B: Respecting the diversity of learners and 1 candidate 'not meeting' in area C: Treating learners equitably and fairly.**

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates who took this assessment perceived themselves as displaying these dispositions; Candidates displayed awareness of the expected dispositions.

Note: The number of dispositions self-evaluations is down from 238 (2011-2012) to 66, which indicates that graduate programs have fewer candidates entering their programs or candidates are not completing this evaluation. Educational Administration had a record number of candidates in 2011-12, due to many candidates wanting to finish before new state guidelines for principal preparation are being enacted.

Actions to take based on data:

The associate dean will check with program chairs about incoming candidates completing this evaluation. Additionally, recruitment of new graduate students needs to be a priority. The new teacher leader endorsement has the potential to bring in new candidates when it is approved by institution and the state.

TRANSITION POINT: Mid-Point Check

Assessment: Content knowledge – 15 Hour Grade Point Average Check

After taking 15 semester hours, program directors and the graduate coordinator are notified by the graduate school about students who do not maintain the minimum 3.0 grade point average. Program directors individually work with candidates who fall behind.

Criterion for passing: Candidates must hold minimum of grade point average 3.0 for the master's degree and 3.25 grade point average for specialist's degree after 15 semester hours.

Findings:

Program	Total number of candidates at the 15 hour checkpoint	Number of candidates who *did not* meet the minimum requirements*
Curriculum and Instruction	60	0
*Educational Administration	156	1
Instructional Technology	43	1
Learning Culture Society	12	0
Literacy	26	0
*Special Education	39	0
Aggregated data	**336**	2

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?
Almost all candidates displayed the necessary content knowledge after 15 semester hours, based upon GPA. Fewer candidates in most programs could also be a factor.
Actions to take based on data: There is no specific trend in the data. Program directors need to take note of any candidates who are struggling in their classes, notify their instructors and offer options to successfully finish their program.

Assessment: Ability to plan instruction or learning environment (for non-teaching programs) (2013-2014)
This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment)
Criterion for passing: Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to plan instruction or the learning environment (for non-teaching programs).
Findings:
Note: Detailed data is located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced programs).

Program	# of Candidates	# who Did Not Meet Expectations	# who Met Expectations	# who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	18	0	16	2
*Educational Administration	78	0	7	71
Instructional Technology	18	2	13	3
Learning Culture and Society	6	0	1	5
Literacy	13	0	8	5

Special Education	9**	2	4	3
Aggregated data	**142**	**4 (3%)**	**49 (35%)**	**89 (62%)**

*averaged from disaggregated data

** includes 3 candidates not in an SPA reported program

<u>What did we learn about our candidates?</u> With the exception of four candidates, the remainder of the candidates met or exceeded expectations. It is important to note that some candidates have not progressed in their programs to the point where this assessment is administered, hence the numbers in this data table may differ from other assessments.
<u>Actions to take based on data:</u>
Continue to monitor assessment completion.

<u>**Assessment: Internship/Field evaluation (2013-2014)**</u>
This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment). Candidates carry out a project or experience within a field or internship setting.
<u>Criterion for passing:</u>
Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates either meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to succeed in a field or internship project or placement.
<u>Findings:</u>
Note: Findings by location are located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced programs, Summary)

Program	# Candidates	# Candidates who Did Not Meet Expectations	# Candidates who Met Expectations	# Candidates who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	15	0	14	1
*Educational Administration	74	0	19	55
Instructional Technology	4**	0	2	0
Learning Culture Society	5	0	3	2
Literacy	6	0	2	4
*Special Education	2	0	2	0
Aggregated data	**106****	**0**	**42**	**62**

*aggregated from disaggregated data
**students complete the internship in three courses, so two of the students' work is in progress.

<u>What did we learn about our candidates?</u>
Of those candidates who were assessed, all candidates met or exceeded expectations.
<u>Actions to take based on data:</u>
Continue to monitor completion of this assessment for all program candidates.

This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment)

Criterion for passing: Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates either meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to effect student learning.

Findings:

Providing a Supportive Environment for Student Learning

Program	# Candidates	# Candidates who Did Not Meet Expectations	# Candidates who Met Expectations	# Candidates who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	15	0	14	1
*Educational Administration	79	0	7	72
Instructional Technology	18	2	13	3
Learning Culture Society	5	0	3	2
Literacy	9	0	4	5
*Special Education	7	1	3	3
Aggregated data	**133**	**3 (2.3%)**	**44 (33%)**	**86 (64.6%)**

*averaged from disaggregated data

Note: Findings by location are located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced programs, Summary)

TRANSITION POINT: Program Completion

Candidate self-assesses 4 dispositions using an online form at the start of their program. Faculty complete a dispositions evaluation near program completion.

Rubric: Candidate displays disposition; Candidate does not display disposition; No opportunity to observe Dispositions: 1. (A) Acts on belief that all students can learn; 2. (B) Respects the diversity of all learners; 3. (C) Treats learners equitably and fairly; 4. (D) Has a sense of professional responsibility and values life-long learning

Criterion for Passing: All candidates must meet 100% of dispositions.

Findings:

Table 15d. Advanced Program Dispositions Data

Program	Findings
Curriculum and Instruction-general (n=36)	100% of candidates met all dispositions (27 'not observed' in area C)
*Educational Administration (n=113)	94% of candidates met all dispositions: 106 met all dispositions (1 'not observed' in area D),

30

	7 'did not meet' area D: Professional Responsibility
Instructional Technology (n=4)	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Learning Culture Society (n=5)	4 candidates met all dispositions (1 'not observed' in area B & 2 'not observed' area C), 1 'did not meet' area D: Professional Responsibility
Literacy (n=13)	100% of candidates met all dispositions
*Special Education (n=11)	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Aggregated Data (n=182)	**Out of 182 candidates, 8 candidates did not meet one disposition, 31 candidates were rated "not observed" one or more of the four areas.**

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?

Eight candidates struggled with one of the four dispositions, area D: Candidate has a sense of professional responsibility and value life-long learning, recording the largest number of "does not display." All but one candidate is in the Educational Administration programs. The data on the shared drive shows that four of these candidates are in the general administrative program and three are in the superintendent program.

Actions to take based on data:

Faculty are aware of these candidates and are supporting their efforts to improve their sense of professional responsibility. The completion of this assessment by faculty has improved over last year – more assessments are being completed, but the unit will continue to monitor assessment completion.

Assessment: Exit Survey

Graduate students (including those in non-teacher education programs) assess the quality of their graduate program via a 17-item inventory. The exit survey is completed just prior to graduation, following completion of an exit project or examination. In addition to 16 items tapping specific aspects of the program, the final item asks respondents to rate their overall graduate education experience at SIUE. Therefore, two different Likert scale response formats are used:

Questions 1-16
- 1=Strongly Disagree
- 2=Disagree
- 3=Agree
- 4=Strongly Agree

Question 17 (Overall rating of graduate program)
- 1=Very Poor
- 2=Poor
- 3=Fair
- 4=Good
- 5=Excellent

Criteria for passing: Questions 1-16: Means for each question, across all programs, and for each program are at least 3.0. (Does not meet=less than 3; Meets=3.0-3.49; Exceeds=greater than 3.49).

Findings:

NOTES ON DATA CHARTS BELOW: Data disaggregated by *program* is located on the shared drive under each program's summary data**. The charts below summarize all graduate programs and locations. The number of surveys in the data set is 89.**

1. In general, the quality of instruction I received in my program area was very high.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.63/4.0	1	2	26	60

2. In general, my professors were well prepared and competent.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.69/4.0	1	1	23	64

3. My professors shared information from updated, useful research and best practice.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.74/4.0	1	3	14	71

4. Faculty members were available and interested in helping me pursue my academic and career interests.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.65/4.0	1	0	28	60

5. There seemed to be sufficient resources (e.g., library materials, laboratory facilities, audio visual aids, computers) to support my program of study.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.54/4.0	1	2	34	52

6. My program improved my ability to think critically/analytically about issues related to my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.69/4.0	1	3	19	66

7. My program addressed the major theories, concepts, models, and issues related to my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.72/4.0	1	2	18	68

8. My program provided instruction on the methods and techniques employed in my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.71/4.0	1	1	21	66

9. I was regularly engaged in discussions examining the values, ethics, and best practices of my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.69/4.0	1	2	21	65

10. My program was designed in such a way that I could readily apply knowledge and skills to problems and issues I will experience in my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.66/4.0	1	3	21	64

11. My program adequately prepared me (in terms of breadth and depth of knowledge) for employment in the field for which I was being prepared.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.58/4.0	1	2	30	56

12. My program improved my ability to communicate knowledge (written, oral) concerning my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.74/4.0	1	0	20	68

13. The days, times, and locations of course offerings were convenient for me.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.54/4.0	1	7	24	57

14. The exit requirement in my program was an appropriate learning experience.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.62/4.0	1	3	25	60

15. Advisors were helpful and available.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.63/4.0	3	0	24	62

16. Requirements for program admission and completion were clearly communicated.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.46/4.0	4	3	30	52

17. My overall rating of my graduate degree is:

Mean	# Very Poor	# Poor	# Fair	# Good	#Excellent
4.67/5.0	0	0	5	19	65

<u>What did we learn about our candidates?</u> Across all locations and type of instruction (i.e., online), means are 3.0 or above. Although there are less graduate students this year we received more exit surveys than last year. Candidates indicated that they were pleased with their program of study and their professors. All scores increased in each category over last year's data, demonstrating that SIUE offers effective programs in teacher education.

<u>Actions to Take Based on Data:</u> Across locations and programs and by type of instructional delivery (i.e., online), programs were perceived as quality programs by candidates. Continue providing candidates worthwhile experiences and programs.

The following people contributed to this report:
Barbara O'Donnell, Associate Dean
Binod Pokhrel, Technology Specialist
Angie White, Graduate Coordinator
Gretchen Fricke, Director of OCECA
December, 2014

TRANSITION POINT: ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Assessment: Basic Skills Test/Test of Academic Proficiency/ACT
All candidates must pass the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) (previously known as the Illinois Basic Skills Test) or a score of 22 or higher on the ACT with writing, prior to admission to teacher education.
Criterion for passing: All candidates must pass the Illinois Basic Skills Test prior to admission to teacher education.
Findings:
Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	ACT 22 + writing
2009	264-293	276.6	240	100%	
2010	243-300	273.2	240	100%	
2011 (test 300)	250-289	269	240	100%	
2011 (test 96)	241-286	263	240	100%	
2012	244-292	265.9	240	100%	0
2013	249-282	265	240	100%	5

What did we learn about our candidates?
Across all content areas, candidates met Test of Academic Proficiency test score requirements. This information suggests strong *general* education and content knowledge and skills that form the foundation for educator preparation. After ISBE changed the scoring of the TAP test (raising the number of items needed to meet the minimum cut score), the admission of minority candidates dropped. In response to pending lawsuits, ISBE allowed the option of the using the ACT for admission which can be evidenced in the 2013 numbers.
Actions to take based on data:
Monitor effect of new testing options on enrollment in this program. See initial programs summary report for more details.

Assessment: Admission Grade Point Average (GPA)
A transcript analysis of each candidate's undergraduate and/or graduate coursework is performed prior to admission to the program.
Criterion for passing: Each candidate must hold the required GPA of 2.5 in undergraduate coursework (or graduate, if appropriate).
Findings:

Entering GPA:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2009	16	2.3-4.0	3.4
2010	27	2.07-4.0	2.95
2011	19	2.4-3.86	3.22
2012	25	2.45-4.0	3.26
2013	16	2.6-4.0	2.97

What did we learn about our candidates?

Undergraduate GPA is indicative of the candidate's content knowledge. Overall, the MAT candidates possess adequate content knowledge.

Actions to take based on data:

When accepting candidates into the program with a GPA, which is borderline acceptable, GPA should continue to be monitored.

Assessment: Content Area Test

Assessment	Criterion for passing	Findings	What did we learn about our candidates?	Actions to Take Based on Data
IL Content Test - standardized criterion-references tests (by content area) that are tied to State standards	Must pass – overall score must be 240 or above	100% pass rate; See chart below for overall means by content area; Subscores for each content area are listed in Appendix A	Overall, candidates display the required content knowledge to become successful teachers	Program level faculty should review objectives associated with subtest scores below 240

Content Test Data (Includes candidates who passed the test and were admitted to the program.)

Content Area and Number of Candidates*	Findings – Overall mean (Note: Means below 240 may indicate area of relative weakness)
Biology (4)	256 (2 subscores below 240: Physical Science 227; Earth Systems and the Universe 232)
Earth Space Science (1)	259 (1 subscores below 240: Science and Technology)
English/Language Arts (5)	268 (all subscores 240 or above)
History (4)	258 (all subscores 240 or above)
Mathematics (1)	291 (all subscores 240 or above)
Aggregated Data (n=15)	**263.33**

*Content tests vary, they may have 4, 5, or 6 test sections

Criterion for passing: Candidates must have a mean score of 240 or higher.

Findings: Two students had failed attempts in their content area test: 1 student had one failed attempt and passed on his second try, and 1 student had four failed attempts and passed on her fifth try.

What did we learn about our candidates? We found that some candidates may be taking the content test multiple times in order to pass and be admitted to the program. This raises the concern that they may not know their content as well as we expect.

Actions to Take Based on Data: It is imperative for the program to review candidate scores on the content area test. The program needs to adhere to the strict policy that candidates must pass the test with a mean score of 240. Even so, the program needs to review candidates' subscores below 240 and provide ways (mentoring, more content coursework, cultural immersion, etc.) for candidates to increase their understanding of the content in these areas. Another option is require candidates to pass all subtests with a score of 240 or higher. This program was placed on moratorium to allow time for redesign. No students were admitted in 2014.

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Self-Assessment)

The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year. Candidates assess themselves using the TC1 (on-campus) or TC2 (field placement).

Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale.

Response Set	Criteria – out of a score of 50
1=Not at all characteristic	
2	Needs support= 34 and below
3=somewhat characteristic	Developing= 35-39
4	Meets=40-45
5=extremely characteristic	Exceeds=46-50

Findings:

Teacher Candidate Self-Assessment in on-campus coursework (TC1): All candidates met or exceeded expectations. Scores ranged from 44 to 48 out of a possible 50 points.

Teacher Candidate Self-Assessment in field placements (TC2): Only two candidates assessed themselves with the new field dispositions form. Both candidates placed themselves in the acceptable range. The scoring range was 42 to 48. #1 and #9 registered scores at a 3.

What did we learn about our candidates? Candidates perceived themselves as displaying these dispositions.

Actions to Take Based on Data: Faculty need to require candidates to self-assess with the TC2. The rate of return was low and scores are still inflated as they were with the previous survey. The purpose of these surveys is two-fold: 1) to alert candidates of the dispositions which they will be held accountable, and 2) to provide candidates with the opportunity to alert faculty of areas in which they needs support. This evaluation would be more useful if faculty alerted candidates to these purposes and ensured candidates that these evaluations are not tied to grades in currently enrolled coursework. This data was reported to program chairs earlier than the original plan, so faculty could plan support for candidates who acknowledge that they need it.

TRANSITION POINT: ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING

Assessment: Minimum GPA (2013-2014)

Candidates must maintain a 3.0 GPA to continue in the program and enter into student teaching.

Criterion for Passing: Candidates must maintain a minimum of at least 3.0 GPA after completion of 15 semester hours.

Findings: All 14 candidates met the minimum GPA requirement after 15 semester hours.

What did we learn about our candidates? Overall, candidates continue to display the knowledge and skills to be successful in both the content and pedagogy prior to student teaching.

Actions to take based on data: None

Assessment: Candidate ability to plan instruction – edTPA Task #1 planning (fall semester 2013)

Candidates must complete Task #1 of the edTPA which is evaluated on the following elements: Planning for content understanding, planning to support varied student learning needs, using knowledge of students to inform teaching and learning, identifying supporting language demands, and planning assessments to monitor and support student learning.

They must understand the learning context, construct appropriate lesson plans, use instructional materials effectively, plan for assessment of the lesson, and provide commentary for their planning task.

Criterion for passing:

Exceeds expectations=scores of 4(Outstanding)

Meets expectations=Score of 3(Competent)

Does not meet expectations=scores of 0(Not evident), 1(Initial attempts), 2(Developing)

Findings:

Number of Candidates	# Exceed Expectations	# Meet Expectations	# Did Not Meet Expectations
15	4	9	2

What did we learn about our candidates?

Across all content areas, 87% of candidates met or exceeded expectations, showing that they are able to effectively plan instruction and meet the needs of students.

Actions to take based on data:

None

Assessment: Disposition Evaluation (Faculty)

The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year. Faculty rated candidates' dispositions on-campus and in their field placements.

Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale:

Response Set	Criteria – out of a score of 50
1=Not at all characteristic	
2	Needs support= 34 and below
3=somewhat characteristic	Developing= 35-39
4	Meets=40-45
5=extremely characteristic	Exceeds=46-50

University Faculty On-Campus (UF1) Findings:

Note: Column 1 names the program and the number of evaluations performed. Numbers in column 2 represent the range of evaluation scores, not number of candidates.
Numbers in columns 3 and 3 represent the number of candidates scoring in lower ranges.

Program	Range of Scores	# of candidates needing support	# of candidates in developing stage
MAT (all content areas) n=67	37-50	0	11

University Faculty Supervising Field Placements (UF2) Findings:

Program	Range of Scores	# of candidates needing support	# of candidates in developing stage
MAT (all content areas) n=31	37-50	0	1

What did we learn about our candidates?
Many candidates were identified as being in the developing stage early in the program. Faculty offered support. Candidates dispositions in the field are much improved over their on campus early evaluation.

Action to Take Based on Data:
This program is now on moratorium and will be undergoing redesign. This data will be used in the design of the new program.

TRANSITION POINT: PROGRAM COMPLETION

Assessment: Student Teaching Evaluation
Unit student teaching evaluation; Faculty & Cooperating Teacher complete an online evaluation consisting of 25 forced choice statements, along with space for comments*.
The MAT program had the option to add more questions in order to address IL/PB standards, but declined to do so.

Criterion for passing: Candidates are evaluated with a five-level scale:
> Level 5 - Outstanding foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher (top1%)
> Level 4 - Advanced foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher
> Level 3 - Acceptable skills for a beginning teacher
> Level 2 - Developing skills, but needs more practice to teacher-of-record.
> Level 1 - Struggling candidate, not ready to teach
> And not observed
>
> Level 5 = exceeds
> Levels 4 and 3 = meets
> Levels 2 and 1 = does not meet
> 'Not observed' is not counted against the candidate.

Findings*:

Program Name	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet	Not observed

MAT (ALL)	24.00%	74.86%	0.86%	0.29%
(n=14)				
MAT English	46.00%	52.00%	0.00%	2.00%
MAT History	25.00%	75.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAT Math	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAT Biology	12.00%	84.00%	4.00%	0.00%
MAT Chemistry	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAT Earth/Space	8.00%	92.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAT Physics	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
MAT Spanish	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%

*Findings reported as overall mean of *evaluations completed* that exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations.
Some candidates had multiple evaluations because of several placements.
NOTE: Subarea scores for each program are available on the SOE shared drive for program faculty review

In all content areas, candidates met or exceeded expectations. The new student teaching
evaluation was implemented. Regarding the process, there seemed to be less confusion on how to
complete the online evaluation than in previous years. The navigation radio buttons which sorted
the data into content areas were modified so data was streamed to the correct programs.
What did we learn about candidates? Candidates displayed the necessary knowledge, skills,
and dispositions during student teaching.
Actions to Take Based on Data: The student teaching evaluation was revised to better reflect
clinical standards set by specialized professional associations and the Illinois Professional
Teaching Standards. The student teaching evaluation process will be reviewed to ensure clarity.
The new student teaching evaluation consists of 25 questions along with additional program-
customized questions based on SPA standards. The MAT did not add additional questions. Since
the previous student teaching evaluation did not have the option, "not observed," the new
instrument revealed interesting data from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. The
following questions were identified as ones that programs need to review:
- *Q7 Differentiates strategies, materials, pace, levels of complexity, and language to introduce concepts and
  principles so that they are meaningful to students at varying levels of development and to students with
  diverse learning needs.*
- *Q12 Applies and adapts an array of content area and literacy strategies to increase reading (fluency,
  comprehension, vocabulary, text analysis), writing (organization, focus, elaboration, word choice, and
  conventions) and oral communication skills.*
- *Q14 Analyzes the classroom environment, makes decisions and initiates action to resolve conflicts and to
  enhance cultural and linguistic responsiveness, mutual respect, collaboration, positive social relationships,
  student motivation, and classroom engagement.*
- *Q21 Engages in self-assessment and adjusts practice to enhance personal growth and development;
  participates in professional development, professional organizations, and learning communities.*

Faculty did review these questions and only 0.3% of the indicators were "not observed."
Question 22 was the only indicator that indicated that 7% of candidates were "not observed."
- Q22: Works with students, families, colleagues, and communities in ways that reflect the professional
  dispositions expected of professional educators as delineated in professional, state, and institutional
  standards.

Faculty followed these suggestions to improve scoring: (a) Faculty modified the experiences
required in student teaching, (b) they changed assignments/lesson plans to cover the items "not

observed" and/or (c) required university supervisors to verify that these experiences are being included through writing or oral communications.

<u>Assessment: Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT)</u>
All candidates must pass the State-administered Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) prior to certification. The APT is designed to assess candidates' pedagogical knowledge. The six subareas addressed include: foundations, characteristics, and assessment; planning and delivering instruction; managing the learning environment; collaboration, communication, and professionalism; language arts; and educational technology.
<u>Criteria for passing:</u>
 Overall scores of 240 or above are considered passing. Because subarea (100-300) scores are on the same scale, subarea scores below 240 could suggest areas of relative weakness.
<u>Findings:</u>

APT Sub-Area Scores* (Average Scaled Score)

Number of Candidates & Overall Mean for Test	Subarea 1	Subarea 2	Subarea 3	Subarea 4	Subarea 5	Subarea 6	Subarea 7
267 (n=15)	275	269	266	277	270	269	244

Note: Scaled Score of 240 or above indicates satisfactory performance
Subarea 1=Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessment; Subarea 2=Planning and Delivering Instruction; Subarea 3=Managing the Learning Environment; Subarea 4=Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism; Subarea 5=Language Arts; Subarea 6=Educational Technology; Subarea 7=Constructed Response
*Sub-Area Scores by program are available on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Nontraditional Data Summary)

<u>What did we learn about our candidates?</u>
All but one candidate passed the APT on their first try. One candidate passed on her second attempt. The lowest average score is in subtest 7 which is the constructed response section. This section asks candidates to respond to prompts about teaching, specifically about classroom management, building a positive environment, etc.
<u>Actions to take based on data:</u>
Faculty members should review the subtest "constructed response" and determine if the curriculum adequately prepares candidates.

<u>Assessment: Effect on Student Learning – edTPA TASK #3Assessment</u>
As part of the edTPA candidates must complete a formal analysis of student learning, including: analyzing patterns of learning for the whole class and choose documents from 3 individual focus students who represent the patterns of learning; document your feedback given to the three students and how they use it, provide commentary, analyze student's Language use and learning, and use assessment to inform instruction.
<u>Criteria for passing:</u>

Scoring Guide			
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Range	1 – 1.4	1.5 – 3.0	3.1 – 5.0

<u>Findings:</u>

Number of Candidates	# Does Not Meet Expectations	# Meets Expectations	# Exceeds Expectations
13	1	9	3

Note: Findings by program are detailed on the SOE Shared drive, SOE Data

What did we learn about our candidates?
All candidates with the exception of one were able to positively affect student learning.
Actions to take based on data:
Faculty will continue to adjust their teaching, courses, and assignments to prepare candidates for the edTPA which will be required in September, 2015.

Final Project: edTPA tasks (1, 2, and 3) as completed in Spring 2014
Candidates complete a comprehensive edTPA, which includes two components: Task #1 Planning and Task #3 Assessment. Teacher candidates' first attempts at these tasks were evaluated in Fall semester. The attempts shown in this section encompass the entire process, but only two of the three tasks are evaluated.
Criteria for passing:

Scoring Guide			
	Does Not Meet Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations
Range	1 – 1.4	1.5 – 3.0	3.1 – 5.0

Findings:

Number of Candidates	# Does Not Meet Expectations	# Meets Expectations	# Exceeds Expectations
13	1	9	3

What did we learn about our candidates?
Almost all candidates met or exceeded expectation, meaning that they displayed the requisite pedagogical skills and knowledge to positively affect student learning.
Actions to take based on data:
Monitor candidate progress from Fall semester through Spring semester. It is expected that Spring scores would be higher given that candidates have practiced the same tasks in the Fall, but this is not the case. Please see the data on the shared drive (planning, effect on student learning and final project).

TRANSITION POINT: FOLLOW-UP

Assessment: Exit Survey (Initial Candidates)-2013-2014
Initial candidates in teacher education programs assess the quality of their programs via a 26-item inventory. The exit survey is completed just prior to graduation. On statements 1-16, candidates provided opinions on a Likert scale, where A=Strongly Disagree (1), B=Disagree (2), C=Agree (3), and D=Strongly Agree (4). On statements 17-26, candidates were asked to reflect

on their level of preparation in a variety of areas using a Likert scale, where A=No Preparation (1), B=Minimal Preparation (2), C=Adequate Preparation (3), and D=Extensive Preparation (4).

Criteria for passing:

Means for each item, overall, should be at least 3.0 (i.e., agree or adequate preparation) AND at least 75% of candidates should have means of at least 3.0.

Findings:

Candidates in the MAT program rated the following areas below 3.0:

- Q1: Admission requirements to teacher education were clearly stated.
- Q5: It appeared that the teacher education program was comprised of students from diverse backgrounds.
- Q6: OCECA advisors provided me with appropriate academic and professional assistance.
- Q17: Integrate theory and practice.
- Q21: Build Learning Communities

Only four candidates completed this survey, so the data needs to be analyzed with previous data when the faculty redesign this program (please see SOE shared drive, SOE Data, for data, including candidate comments).

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates cited a lack of coordination and communication specifically regarding admission requirements and advising. They also cited a lack of diversity in teacher candidates, community and integration of theory into their practice.

Actions to take based on data:

The MAT did not admit candidates in 2014 since it is undergoing redesign. MAT faculty should review candidate comments and areas of low scores when they design the new program.

Contributors to this report:

Barbara O'Donnell, Associate Dean; Gretchen Fricke, Director, OCECA; Angie White: Graduate Program Coordinator; Binod Pokhrel, Director of Technology

December, 2014