

## Institutional Effectiveness Report

### School of Education

2016-2017

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 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. One area to note that needs improvement is the Science Subtest on the ELE Praxis 2 Exam. Faculty have been involved in workshops that delineate content found on those exams. There are no other noted concerns related to Praxis 2 data.

The implementation of the new SLO project did not reveal any major areas of concern. Further, comments on Exit Surveys were mostly positive, thus a reflection of implemented changes based on last year's Institutional Effectiveness data.

## Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

1. School of Education candidates will exemplify proficiency in content knowledge at or above the state mean (Praxis II); at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 scale (Capstone Project); or at least 80% on the Content Mastery Exam. (PLO a: *Competent teachers*)
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 scale. (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 scale. (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 scale. (PLO b: *Caring teachers*)

## Assessment Methods

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

***Indirect: Dispositions Rating, Surveys***

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 the state mean on those exams.
  - 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.
2. Teacher Candidate Work Sample, 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, 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. Surveys: All SLOs
  - Surveys are administered to program completers and their employers.

### Assessment Results

1. School of Education candidates will exemplify proficiency in content knowledge at or above the passing cut score (Praxis II); at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 scale (Capstone Project); or at least 80% on the Content Mastery Exam. (PLO a: *Competent teachers*)

All items Praxis assessments were at or above target with the exception of the Science section of Elementary.

Table 1. Mean Scores on Praxis Exams

Program	Exam	Passing Score	Mean Score of FMU Candidates
Early Childhood N=19	5621 PLT	157	164.70
	5024 Education of Young Children	160	162.92
Elementary N=15	5622 PLT	160	173.45
	5019 Instructional Practice and Applications	155	168.89
	5002 Reading/ELA Subtest	157	166.85

	5003 Math Subtest	157	167.86
	5004 Social Studies Subtest	155	159.33
	5005 Science Subtest	159	157.17
Middle Level N=8	5623 PLT	160	172.44
	5089 Middle Level Social Studies	155	n/a
	5047 Middle Level ELA	164	n/a
	5440 Middle Level Science	150	n/a
	5169 Middle Level Math	165	159.83
Secondary N=4	5624 PLT	157	170.30
	5135/0135 Art Content and Analysis	161	n/a
	5039 ELA Content and Analysis	168	167.00
	5161 Math Content Knowledge	160	n/a
MAT-Learning Disabilities N=21	5622 PLT	160	173.45
	5624 PLT	157	170.30
	5354 Special Ed: Core Knowledge and Applications	151	174.53
	5383 Special Ed: Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities	151	165.29

- 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 scale. (*PLO a: Competent teachers*)

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

All 11 indicators were at or above the target level. ([See full results in Appendix 1](#))

Table 2. Reflection on Planning, Clinical, and Poverty (M.Ed.-LD and IA)

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

3. School of Education candidates will be able to assess P-12 student learning with at least a 2.0 on a 3.0 scale. *(PLO a: Competent teachers)*

Table 3. Ability to Assess, all programs

Assessment	Mean Score	
	Fall	Spring
Teacher Candidate Student Learning Objective Unit (EDUC 490 and 770)	2.21	2.42
Capstone (EDUC 796)	3.0	n/a
Case Study (EDUC 769)	3.0	3.0

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 scale. *(PLO b: Caring teachers)*
- a. Dispositions Rating

Course	Measurement	Mean Dispositions Rating	
		Fall 16	Spring 17
EDUC 490/770	Ethical Standards	2.45	2.90
	Professional Attributes	2.67	2.74
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	2.73	2.79
	Respect for Learning Process	2.73	2.78
EDUC 796	Ethical Standards	2.96	Course not offered this term
	Professional Attributes	2.94	Course not offered this term
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	3.0	Course not offered this term
	Respect for Learning Process	2.98	Course not offered this term
EDUC 769	Ethical Standards	2.65	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. Surveys (all SLOs) (see full results in Appendix 2)

Results were positive, and the response to changes made last year are clearly positive changes. On all items, at least 80% Strongly Agreed or Agreed to being prepared (both employers and graduate).

Of our first year teachers who are employed, 76% received Met on formal evaluations, with 1/3 winning awards.

Principals, as well as graduates, report that our graduates are well prepared for the realities of teaching.

**Action Items**

1. Based on the Praxis II data, we will review the Science methods courses as well as the content area science courses to determine we are covering content aligned with Praxis 2. This has already begun by Biology creating a general course specifically for teachers. Further, after attending Praxis workshops, we are advising students to take courses specifically aligned in content to Praxis 2. (SLO 1)
2. The Exit Surveys validated changes we made to the planning/assessment course as well as the 390 series last year. There were no notations of any issues with the Classroom Management course this year. Rating for the instructor were high, and feedback from students about the course was positive. We consider this action item successful from last year. (SLO 3)
3. This year, the main action item is to implement the NIET rubric, the new teacher evaluation tool in SC, successfully. All faculty have been trained in the new tool used to measure teachers. (SLO 1-4)
4. Beginning in January, we will collaborate with Lake City and the Buck Institute to provide a new, dynamic student teaching experience geared towards Project Based Learning. This will be a three-year partnership, and we hope to have data to measure that experience at the close of the next academic year. (SLO 4)
5. Although means on assessments did not indicate any major issues, curriculum mapping of all programs will take place, as that has not been done in a number of years. (SLO 1)

## Appendix

### 1. ADEPT Reflection Data

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

<b>ADEPT Key Indicator</b>	Fall 2016 Mean Score (Range 0-3) N=24	Spring 2017 Mean Score (Range 0-3) N=26
<b>The teacher candidate identifies appropriate student information. (SC ADEPT 1a)</b>	2.50	2.962
<b>The teacher candidate gives a sound explanation of the relevance of the student information to student learning. (SC ADEPT 1a)</b>	2.33	2.35
<b>The teacher candidate shows insight into the use of student information to guide planning. (SC ADEPT 1a)</b>	2.38	2.58
<b>The teacher candidate identifies long-range goals that are accurate and appropriate. (SC ADEPT 1b)</b>	2.38	2.46
<b>The teacher candidate provides a sound explanation to support conclusions regarding the most important goals for all students to achieve. (SC ADEPT 1b)</b>	2.33	2.31
<b>The teacher candidate identifies units that are appropriate to the context. (SC ADEPT 1c)</b>	2.38	2.27

<p>The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation for the unit sequence and timeline. <i>(SC ADEPT 1c)</i></p>	2.13	2.27
<p>The teacher candidate establishes appropriate course assessments, evaluation criteria for the course, and method(s) of reporting overall progress and achievement. <i>(SC ADEPT 1d)</i></p>	2.125	2.35
<p>The teacher candidate describes an appropriate record-keeping system. <i>(SC ADEPT 1d)</i></p>	2.29	2.35
<p>The teacher candidate presents solid evidence for determining the appropriateness of the assessments in terms of measuring student progress and achievement. <i>(SC ADEPT 1d)</i></p>	2.29	2.50
<p>The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation of the methods for communicating the assessment information to students and their parents. <i>(SC ADEPT 1d)</i></p>	2.33	2.27
<p>The teacher candidate presents an appropriate description of the expectations for student behavior during instruction and during noninstructional routines. <i>(SC ADEPT 1e)</i></p>	2.25	2.35
<p>The teacher candidate presents a sound explanation of the most important considerations for maximizing instructional time. <i>(SC ADEPT 1e)</i></p>	2.29	2.54
<p>The teacher candidate identifies appropriate unit objectives. <i>(SC ADEPT 2a)</i></p>	2.38	2.42



<p>The teacher candidate gives a sound explanation of the relevance of these objectives to student learning needs and interests. <i>(SC ADEPT 2a)</i></p>	<p>2.33</p>	<p>2.35</p>
<p>The teacher candidate presents an appropriate, logically sequenced instructional plan for the unit. <i>(SC ADEPT 2b)</i></p>	<p>2.13</p>	<p>2.27</p>
<p>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. <i>(SC ADEPT 2b)</i></p>	<p>2.33</p>	<p>2.31</p>
<p>The teacher candidate develops and/or selects appropriate key unit assessments. <i>(SC ADEPT 3a)</i></p>	<p>2.04</p>	<p>2.27</p>
<p>The teacher candidate presents sound evidence that these assessments are valid and reliable for all students. <i>(SC ADEPT 3a)</i></p>	<p>2.13</p>	<p>2.35</p>
<p>The teacher candidate provides an appropriate and accurate analysis of student performance. <i>(SC ADEPT 3a)</i></p>	<p>2.21</p>	<p>2.42</p>

<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>	2.25	2.27
<p>The teacher candidate makes appropriate determinations regarding the need to make adjustments to the instructional plans. (SC ADEPT 2c)</p>	2.25	2.27
<p>The teacher candidate presents a solid rationale for making these determinations. (SC ADEPT 2c)</p>	2.25	2.27
<p>The teacher candidate uses appropriate methods for determining student grades (or other performance indicators) for the unit). (SC ADEPT 3c)</p>	2.38	2.19
<p>The teacher candidate appropriately and accurately summarizes overall student performance for the unit. (SC ADEPT 3c)</p>	2.33	2.42
<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>	2.33	2.42

--	--	--

## 2. Survey Results

<u>Employer Survey</u>	<u>Responses</u>
Teacher Effectiveness (n=29)	76% received Met on a formal evaluation
Awards and Special Recognition (n=30)	33% received some type of award <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden Apple Award</li> <li>• Teacher of the Month</li> <li>• Outstanding First Year Teacher Award</li> <li>• Montessori Certification</li> <li>• Wonderful Worker of the Week</li> <li>• STEAM Certification</li> </ul>
Ability to Recognize the basic developmental levels of students (n=12)	33% Strongly Agree 67% Agree
Seeks professional development opportunities (n=12)	42% Strongly Agree 58% Agree
Work Collaboratively with colleagues and other professionals (n=12)	42% Strongly Agree 58% Agree
Understand, uphold, and follow professional ethics, policies, and legal codes of conduct (n=12)	50% Strongly Agree 50% Agree
Contribute to positive changes in practice and advance the teaching profession (n=12)	Strongly Agree 25% Agree 75%
Principals' responses to the questions 'what were the strengths of FMU's educator preparation program?'	<p>Willingness to participate in all school activities and academics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Instructional Planning</li> <li>•Classroom Management</li> <li>•Instruction delivery</li> <li>•I find that FMU graduates are consistently well prepared to plan for classroom instruction and navigate the ADEPT system of evaluation.</li> <li>•Planning Classroom Management Assessments</li> <li>•The teachers are knowledgeable of the content.</li> <li>•Knowledge of developmentally appropriate practice</li> <li>•FMU provides its teachers with a strong foundation</li> </ul>

	<p>in the understanding of effective, explicit direct instruction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel FMU prepared this individual for the "realities" of teaching. He was prepared from the very beginning and has adjusted very well</li> </ul>
<b>Completer Survey (n=30)</b>	<b>Responses</b>
Understand individual differences and diverse cultures and the impact on student learning	53% Strongly Agree 47% Agree
Use differing perspectives to engage learners	40% Strongly Agree 60% Agree
Utilize strategies to create learning environments which engage students	47% Strongly Agree 53% Agree
Create opportunities for learners to develop diverse social and cultural perspectives	53% Strongly Agree 47% Agree
Overall preparation received from FMU as effective and relevant to the responsibilities of a teaching job	50% Strongly Agree 50% Agree
Completers' responses to the question, 'what were the strengths of FMU's educator preparation program?'	<p>Planning was the greatest thing that I learned at FMU that I have used this year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The lesson plans template at FMU really helped me to prepare effective lesson plans for my students.</li> <li>• Lesson Planning, ADEPT preparation, TCWS and LRP (SLO) prep.</li> <li>• Completing a TCWS and LRP. Diversity in how students learn.</li> <li>• Being familiar with the ADEPT process and how it works</li> <li>• I was extremely prepared on how to prepare my classroom, be professional, adapt, and change for my students and environment. I felt very confident in incorporating technology into the classroom and how to align my standards and be prepared for instruction each day. One of the biggest lessons I was thankful that FMU taught me, was self-reflection. Obviously, they couldn't prepare me for everything but they did instill in me to reflect and be willing to change what didn't go so well or how to seek out someone to help me modify.</li> <li>• FMU prepared me for the process of teaching, and helped me to learn how to prioritize my tasks.</li> <li>• I was already ahead of the game as far as knowing what to do when it came to lesson</li> </ul>

plans and know how to run a classroom. There are new teachers here from another university that did not learn what I did at Francis Marion!

- Francis Marion taught me how to reach the students. They taught me strategies on how to deliver my content.

- FMU did a great job of preparing me for the classroom. I know how to construct meaningful lessons that are effective.

- 1. Lesson Planning- allowing student teachers to write more abbreviated lesson plans after a few weeks so they can focus more on teaching and their students than on perfecting a lesson plan. 2. Center of Excellence- learning how to help students of poverty be successful.

- FMU's program really prepared me to find common misconceptions and address them from the very beginning.

- The strengths of the FMU's educator preparation program is that they provided numerous opportunities of clinical experience, countless ways of having effective classroom management, and they provided a strong support system for students even after they have graduated.

- Relevance of lesson and standards to students  
Technology Lesson Planning DOK Strategies and Levels Educating students of/living in poverty Heavy clinical experience Being able to experience what the ADEPT process is actually like was VERY HELPFUL The biggest: THE AMAZING STAFF AT FMU :)