

Institutional Effectiveness Report

School of Education

2015-16

Prepared by Tracy Meetze-Holcombe

Program Mission Statement

Francis Marion University's School of Education, where teaching and learning are the highest priorities, prepares professional educators in the Pee Dee region and beyond, for a rapidly changing, complex, and diverse society through the acquisition of knowledge, and the processes of reflection, assessment, collaboration, and critical thinking.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)

The School of Education prepares a) competent and b) caring teachers. (See full Conceptual Framework below)

The School of Education prepares competent and caring teachers.

- I. Competent teachers possess
 - a. Knowledge of content in their area of teaching
 - b. Professional knowledge and skills
 1. Ability to plan instruction
 2. Ability to apply skills and knowledge in a clinical setting
 3. Ability to cause learning in P -12 students
 4. Ability to assess learning and learners
 5. Ability to work with children of poverty
 6. Ability to use technology
- II. Caring teachers possess Professional Dispositions
 - a. Exhibits professional attributes
 - b. Respects the Learning Process in demonstrating instructional/assessment flexibility and accommodations to individual differences that reflect the belief that all students can learn regardless of their backgrounds.
 - c. Upholds Ethical and Professional Standards
 - d. Shows respect for families, cultures and communities and demonstrates a sense of fairness and respect to all participants within each group.
 - e. Shows respect for colleagues, P -12 students, faculty and staff

Executive Summary of Report

Overall, the School of Education is pleased with progress from changes that have been implemented. Most means were at or above an acceptable level, demonstrating strength in most areas within the School of Education. However, a few areas to note as needing improvement include Middle Level ELA Praxis II and the classroom management course.

All Praxis II areas had mean scores at or above the passing cut score. However, the Middle Level ELA exam had a mean of 150, 14 points below the passing cut score. While this could be a statistical anomaly, this will be monitored closely to determine if adjustments need to be made to that program.

While no direct measures showed deficiencies with classroom management, the indirect measure of the exit interview revealed a need for improvement in that course. Suggestions were reviewed and the administration agreed that a change to that class was necessary. There will be a new instructor and materials for that course in the Fall 2016.

Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

1. School of Education candidates will exemplify proficiency in content knowledge (PLO a: *Competent teachers*):
 - a. *Initial Licensure Programs*: at or above the passing score on each Praxis II exam (passing scores vary by exam—see Table 1) ;
 - b. *M.Ed. Instructional Accommodation*: at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale (Capstone Project);
 - c. *M.Ed. Learning Disabilities*: at least 80% on the Content Mastery Exam.
2. School of Education candidates will be able to reflect on the needs of P-12 students with at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale (67% mastery). (PLO a: *Competent teachers*)
3. School of Education candidates will be able to assess P-12 student learning with at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale (67% mastery). (PLO a: *Competent teachers*)
4. School of Education candidates will be able to successfully and positively collaborate with various educational professionals with at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale (67% mastery). (PLO b: *Caring teachers*)

Assessment Methods

Direct: Praxis II Exam, Content Mastery Exam, Capstone Project, Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Long Range Plan, Case Study

Indirect: Dispositions Rating, Exit Interview

1. Praxis II exam, Content Mastery Exam, and Capstone Project: SLO 1: School of Education candidates will be able to exemplify proficiency in content knowledge of education courses.
 - Praxis II is a nationally normed exam in which our students are compared to others taking the exam. For that reason, it is the goal that our students achieve at least a passing score on those exams. Passing scores vary from test to test and year to year.
 - Content Mastery Exam is unique to the M.A.T. and M.Ed. Learning Disabilities programs. It is the goal that students achieve at least 80% mastery on that exam.

- The Capstone Project is unique to the M.Ed. Instructional Accommodation program. The rubric is designed based on a 3.0 scale; therefore, it is the goal that students achieve at least a 2.0 on all parts of the rubric for mastery. This is a goal of 67% mastery. This is in keeping with NCATE accreditation.
2. Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Long Range Plan, Capstone, and Case Study: SLO 2: School of Education candidates will be able to reflect on the needs of P-12 students.
 - The Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Capstone, and Case Study are all designed based on a 3.0 scale; therefore, it is the goal that students achieve at least a 2.0 on all parts of the rubric for mastery.
 3. Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Long Range Plan, Capstone, and Case Study: SLO 3: School of Education candidates will be able to assess P-12 student learning.
 - The Teacher Candidate Work Sample, Capstone, and Case Study are all designed based on a 3.0 scale; therefore, it is the goal that students achieve at least a 2.0 on all parts of the rubric for mastery.
 4. Dispositions Rating: SLO 4: School of Education candidates will be able to successfully and positively collaborate with various educational professionals.
 - The Dispositions rating is designed based on a 3.0 scale; it is the goal that students achieve at least a 2.0 on all parts of the rubric for mastery.
 5. Exit Interview (focus group): All SLOs
 - An exit interview with a focus group of students was conducted to determine strengths and weaknesses of the program. Responses were coded for themes and patterns and results were then compared to quantitative data.

Assessment Results

1. School of Education candidates exemplified proficiency in content knowledge (PLO a: *Competent teachers*):
 - a. *Initial Licensure Programs:* at or above the passing score (Praxis II);
 - b. *M.Ed. Instructional Accommodation:* at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale (Capstone Project);
 - c. *M.Ed. Learning Disabilities:* at least 80% on the Content Mastery Exam.

Table 1. Mean Scores on Praxis Exams

Program	Exam	Passing Score	Mean Score of FMU Candidates
Early Childhood N=19	5621 PLT	157	167.1
	5024 Education of Young Children	160	164.8

Elementary N=15	5622 PLT	160	175.9
	5019 Instructional Practice and Applications	155	166
	5002 Reading/ELA Subtest	157	161.5
	5003 Math Subtest	157	162.2
	5004 Social Studies Subtest	155	166.4
	5005 Science Subtest	159	166.4
Middle Level N=8	5623 PLT	160	167.4
	5089 Middle Level Social Studies	155	165.5
	5047 Middle Level ELA	164	150
	5440 Middle Level Science	150	177
	5169 Middle Level Math	165	163
Secondary N=4	5624 PLT	157	181
	5135/0135 Art Content and Analysis	n/a	n/a
	5039 ELA Content and Analysis	168	174.5
	5044/0044 ELA, Literature Composition, Content Analysis	n/a	n/a
	5161 Math Content Knowledge	n/a	n/a
MAT-Learning Disabilities N=21	5622 PLT	160	170.4
	5624 PLT	157	163
	5354 Special Ed: Core Knowledge and Applications	151	171.1
	5383 Special Ed: Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities	151	161

- School of Education candidates were able to reflect on the needs of P-12 students with at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 point scale. Mean scores are displayed in Table 2. No areas fell below a mean of 2.0. The target was achieved for SLO #2. (*PLO a: Competent teachers*)

[Because Table 2 is so large, it can be found in the Appendix.]

The SOE conceptual framework uses reflection on planning, clinical settings, and poverty to measure reflection.

Table 3 shows the results from the Case Study and Capstone projects from the M.Ed. programs. Each of these projects is aligned with the conceptual framework which measures *reflection* through planning, clinical experiences, and working with children of poverty.

The mean of all scores on these portions the projects was a 3.0, thus 100% mastery.

Table 3. Reflection on Planning, Clinical, and Poverty (M.Ed.-LD and IA)

	EDUC 769 Case Study	EDUC 796 Capstone
Planning (Ib1)	3.0	3.0
Clinical (Ib2)	3.0	3.0
Poverty (Ib5)	3.0	3.0

- School of Education candidates were able to assess P-12 student learning with an overall average score of 2.717 in the fall and 2.65 in the spring on a 3.0 point scale. The target was achieved for SLO #3.

Table 4. Ability to Assess, all programs

Assessment	Mean Score	
	Fall	Spring
Teacher Candidate Work Sample Section III (EDUC 490 and 770)	2.42	2.65
Teacher Candidate Work Sample Section IV (EDUC 490 and 770)	2.47	2.65
Capstone (EDUC 796)	3.0	n/a
Case Study (EDUC 769)	3.0	n/a

- School of Education candidates were able to successfully and positively collaborate with various educational professionals with an overall average score of 2.89 in the fall and 2.95 in the spring a 3.0 point scale. The target was achieved for SLO #4.

Table 5. Dispositions Rating

Course	Measurement	Mean Dispositions Rating	
		Fall	Spring
EDUC 490/770	Ethical Standards	2.7	2.9
	Professional Attributes	2.6	2.9
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	2.8	2.9
	Respect for Learning Process	2.7	2.9
EDUC 796	Ethical Standards	3.0	3.0
	Professional Attributes	2.9	2.9
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	3.0	3.0
	Respect for Learning Process	3.0	3.0
EDUC 769	Ethical Standards	3.0	3.0
	Professional Attributes	3.0	3.0
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	3.0	3.0
	Respect for Learning Process	3.0	3.0

5. Exit Interview (focus group)

6 students from EDUC 490 (student teaching) 1 Elementary; 1 Early Childhood; 2 Middle Level; 2 Secondary English	April 13, 2016 SOE Conference Room
<u>Question</u>	<u>Responses</u>
How prepared were you in terms of technology?	Unanimous 'very well prepared' Tech being used in public schools: Macs Chromebooks Google Chrome Powerschool Powerpoint iPods
How prepared were you in terms of planning/assessment?	Unanimous 'over prepared' Comments: "Least of our worries" Hate LiveText; attaching Lesson Plans made easier Collaboration/team planning SLOs: 4 heard of, 1 had access to data; 1 never mentioned 390 courses prepared for planning paperwork Indicated the planning/assessment course to be critical
Noted Strengths	Planning/assessment Reading in content area Methods courses (ELA/SS) Caring and competent---looking for that---weed out those that are not Collaboration between departments (English and Education)

	ECE professors are wonderful
Noted Weaknesses	Classroom management not geared for secondary Still using Harry Wong Need classroom management course earlier; not on top of student teaching Tell students to take 305 then PLT right after...don't wait Put times on schedules for student teachers Suggested a 'get to know the CT night'

Action Items

1. Based on the Praxis II data, we will keep an eye on the Middle Level ELA program. A mean below the passing score could just be a statistical anomaly. However, this will be monitored to determine if programmatic change is needed.
2. The Exit Interviews validated changes we made to the planning/assessment course as well as the 390 series last year. The instructor for these courses changed as well as portions of the curriculum. The curriculum for the planning/assessment course was revised to include more planning, and the 390 series was revised to more closely duplicate student teaching projects.
3. However, there appear to be issues (not relevant to all levels—early childhood-secondary, projects during student teaching) with the classroom management course that are being addressed this fall (2016). How that course is taught will be revisited, as well as a change has been made in instructors. The suggestion of moving the classroom management course into the block before student teaching has been investigated, but changes are not feasible with schedules in all programs.
3. Our push to learn and implement SLO evaluation has slowed, as based on the interviews, it does not seem schools are 'there yet.' From professional development we have engaged in at the school and state level, it seems districts are still developing what the SLO model will look like. As the public schools move more towards an SLO model, we will adjust accordingly. Since there is a great deal of variability in models from district to district, we will adopt what Florence 1 chooses, as they employ the largest percentage of our graduates.
4. Additionally, based on data from professional development we engaged in with SC Educational Television and in response to student teachers seeing the use of Chromebooks in the public schools, we have ordered a set for use in the Education Technology course, EDUC 310. The instructor for ETV works with schools in integrating technology all over the state, and Chromebooks seems to be the trend towards which districts are moving.
5. We are aware that a 2 out of 3 on a 3.0 scale is 67%. While this seems like a low benchmark, it is in keeping with NCATE accreditation. With the transition towards CAEP, we will be adjusting and revising rubrics to a 4 point scale, thus changing future benchmarks to a 3 out of 4 on a 4.0 scale for a 75% mastery.

Appendix

Table 2. ADEPT Reflection Data (ECE, ELE, MLE, Sec, MAT)

ADEPT Key Indicator	Mean Score						
	ECE (n= 21)	ELE (n= 16)	MLE (n=6)	Eng (n=2)	Math (n=0)	Art (n=2)	MAT- LD (n=20)
The teacher candidate identifies appropriate student information. (SC ADEPT 1a)	2.65	2.56	2.13	2.00	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate gives a sound explanation of the relevance of the student information to student learning. (SC ADEPT 1a)	2.70	2.66	2.89	2.50	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate shows insight into the use of student information to guide planning. (SC ADEPT 1a)	2.56	2.34	2.25	2.50	n/a	2.50	---
The teacher candidate identifies long-range goals that are accurate and appropriate. (SC ADEPT 1b)	2.65	2.72	2.38	2.00	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate provides a sound explanation to support conclusions regarding the most important goals for all students to achieve. (SC ADEPT 1b)	2.64	2.52	2.75	3.00	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate identifies units that are appropriate to the context. (SC ADEPT 1c)	2.41	2.25	2.88	2.50	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation for the unit sequence and timeline. (SC ADEPT 1c)	2.56	2.31	2.38	3.00	n/a	2.00	---

<p>The teacher candidate establishes appropriate course assessments, evaluation criteria for the course, and method(s) of reporting overall progress and achievement. (SC ADEPT 1d)</p>	2.56	2.39	2.25	3.00	n/a	1.00	---
<p>The teacher candidate describes an appropriate record-keeping system. (SC ADEPT 1d)</p>	2.52	2.45	2.62	3.00	n/a	1.00	---
<p>The teacher candidate presents solid evidence for determining the appropriateness of the assessments in terms of measuring student progress and achievement. (SC ADEPT 1d)</p>	2.52	2.34	2.62	3.00	n/a	1.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation of the methods for communicating the assessment information to students and their parents. (SC ADEPT 1d)</p>	2.59	2.33	2.50	3.00	n/a	1.00	---
<p>The teacher candidate presents an appropriate description of the expectations for student behavior during instruction and during noninstructional routines. (SC ADEPT 1e)</p>	2.60	2.53	2.25	2.50	n/a	1.00	---
<p>The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation of the most important considerations for maximizing instructional time. (SC ADEPT 1e)</p>	2.53	2.25	2.75	3.00	n/a	2.00	---

The teacher candidate identifies appropriate unit objectives. (SC ADEPT 2a)	2.62	2.60	2.88	3.00	n/a	3.00	2.8
The teacher candidate gives a sound explanation of the relevance of these objectives to student learning needs and interests. (SC ADEPT 2a)	2.61	2.45	3.00	3.00	n/a	2.00	2.8
The teacher candidate presents an appropriate, logically sequenced instructional plan for the unit. (SC ADEPT 2b)	2.64	2.62	3.00	2.50	n/a	3.00	---
The teacher candidate provides a sound explanation of factors that must be taken into consideration in balancing grade-level standards/ expectations and individual students' needs, abilities, and developmental levels. (SC ADEPT 2b)	2.63	2.75	3.00	2.50	n/a	2.00	---
The teacher candidate develops and/or selects appropriate key unit assessments. (SC ADEPT 3a)	2.54	2.36	2.50	2.50	n/a	3.00	2.6
The teacher candidate presents sound evidence that these assessments are valid and reliable for all students. (SC ADEPT 3a)	2.60	2.47	2.50	2.50	n/a	2.00	2.6
The teacher candidate provides an appropriate and accurate analysis of student performance. (SC ADEPT 3a)	2.42	2.42	2.75	2.00	n/a	2.00	2.6

<p>The teacher candidate displays sound reasoning in describing the way(s) in which this information was helpful in determining individual students' strengths and weaknesses as well as aspects of instruction that need to be modified. (SC ADEPT 3b)</p>	2.50	2.42	2.88	2.50	n/a	2.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate makes appropriate determinations regarding the need to make adjustments to the instructional plans. (SC ADEPT 2c)</p>	2.59	2.56	2.75	2.50	n/a	2.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate presents a solid rationale for making these determinations. (SC ADEPT 2c)</p>	2.59	2.62	2.63	2.50	n/a	2.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate uses appropriate methods for determining student grades (or other performance indicators) for the unit. (SC ADEPT 3c)</p>	2.66	2.50	2.88	2.50	n/a	3.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate appropriately and accurately summarizes overall student performance for the unit. (SC ADEPT 3c)</p>	2.23	2.64	2.75	2.50	n/a	2.00	2.6
<p>The teacher candidate provides a well-thought-out summary of the how the students met his/her expectations for the unit. (SC ADEPT 3c)</p>	2.63	2.50	2.75	2.50	n/a	3.00	2.6

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--