

## Institutional Effectiveness Report

### School of Education

2019-2020

Prepared by Callum B. Johnston

### Program Mission Statement

Francis Marion University's School of Education 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's mission is to prepare:

- a. Competent teachers (PLO 1); and
  - b. Caring teachers (PLO 2).
- I. Competent teachers
    - a. Possess knowledge of content in their area of teaching;
    - b. professional knowledge and skills as measured by their ability to
      1. plan instruction
      2. apply skill and knowledge in a clinical setting
      3. cause learning in P-12 students
      4. assess learning and learners
      5. work with children of poverty
      6. use technology
  - II. Caring teachers possess professional dispositions that demonstrate
    - a. professional attributes;
    - b. respect for 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. they uphold **ethical and professional** standards
    - d. **respect** for families, cultures, and communities;
    - e. **respect** for colleagues, P-12 students, faculty and staff

### Executive Summary of Report

For the purposes of this report, it is necessary to distinguish between *completers* and *candidates*. *Completers* are former students who graduated from one of the programs offered by the School of Education (SOE). *Candidates* are students who are currently enrolled in one of the programs in the SOE.

This year has been marked by disruption as the faculty and staff have had to put in the time to address accreditation requirements from the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Programs (CAEP). This process includes being formally recognized by Specialty Professional Associations (SPAs) in each program, or in the event that there is no SPA (as is the case with the Elementary Education program

since the Association for Childhood Education (now known as Childhood Education International, or CEI, dropped its function as an accrediting body and its affiliation with CAEP professionally) to be recognized by the State of South Carolina. Formal recognition by each SPA and South Carolina is the result of a separate and lengthy process for each of the individual programs. And while the process for both SPA recognition and CAEP accreditation involve years of data and record keeping, the writing, data, reports, and evidence required by these agencies has occupied many hours of professional time by each faculty member this past academic year. The responsibility for assuring that the SOE is in good standing with each of these agencies, including CAEP, falls on the shoulders of the faculty whose responsibility it is to also prepare, deliver, and assess high quality instruction for their students.

The pandemic created by the COVID 19 virus has also been a major source of disruption in the Spring, 2020. Faculty and students and administration all worked diligently and tirelessly to ensure that students were able to complete their semester course work, and this involved transitioning to alternative methods for delivery of content, course content rearrangement, and assessment practices. It is clearly understood that the SOE was not the only department affected by this pandemic. It is also understood that students themselves had to adapt significantly to course expectations, content learning, and assignment requirements as they dealt with this pandemic. Information provided in this report has been impacted by these events.

Candidates for teacher licensure must pass the professional licensure exams in addition to the coursework offered by the SOE, and thus our completers will always have done so, with very few exceptions, at which time there are none.

Data for past IE reports have reflected *completer* data on standardized exams measuring content knowledge. This year, the data will reflect the results for candidates and completers who have taken the tests.

Our candidates are demonstrating proficiency in reflecting on the needs of P-12 students through planning and assessment. Candidates are also demonstrating proficiency in working with various professionals both within the university classroom and the P-12 classrooms. Finally, employers have indicated that our completers are doing well in their schools, as indicated by survey responses (see Appendix 1 for survey results, Employer Survey on Graduates, 2018-2019). While there is always room for improvement in the SOEs ability to prepare competent and caring professionals, we remain pleased with our programs' abilities to turn out highly qualified teachers.

### **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: 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 first-year program completers and their employers.

### **Results**

Benchmark: 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*)

Table 1. Mean Scores on Praxis Exams

Program (N = number of test takers for the individual program in the academic year 2019-2020).	Exam	Passing Score (Benchmark)	Mean Score of Completers	% Passing
Early Childhood N= 27	5621 PLT	157	162.07	78%
Early Childhood N=32	5024 Education of Young Children	160	161.94	69%
Elementary N= 23	5622 PLT	160	171.87	87%
Elementary N = 10	5002 Reading/ELA Subtest	157	159.3	60%
Elementary N = 7	5003 Math Subtest	157	158.86	57%
Elementary N=12	5004 Social Studies Subtest	155	154.23	62%
Elementary N=13	5005 Science Subtest	159	154.08	38%
Middle Level N=4	5623 PLT	160	*	*
Middle Level N=4	5089 Middle Level Social Studies	155	*	*
Middle level ELA N=2	5047Middle Level ELA	164	*	*
Middle Level Science N=6	5440 Middle Level Science	150	145.33	67%
Middle Level Math N=0	5169 Middle Level Math (n=1)	165	*	*
Secondary N=8	5624 PLT	157	169.63	100%
Secondary N=19	0135 Art Content and Analysis	161	165.63	74%
Secondary N = 2	5135 Art Content and Analysis	161	*	*
Secondary N=5	5039 ELA Content and Analysis	168	160	20%
N=2	5161 Math Content Knowledge	160	*	*
MAT-Learning Disabilities N=23	5622 PLT	160	171.87	87%
Middle level N=8	5624 PLT	157	169.63	100

N=15	5354 Special Ed: Core Knowledge and Applications	151	173.40	100
N = 14	5383 Special Ed: Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities	151	170.64	100

N=Candidates who took the exam for their respective professional program

\* = Data not available because N <2

Benchmark: 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*)

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

Fall 2019 Capstone n=25	EDUC 796
Planning	2.88
Clinical	2.88

N = candidates in class

Benchmark: 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*)

Table 3. Ability to Assess, all programs

Course	Assessment	Mean Fall 19	Mean Spring 20
EDUC 490 N =28	Teacher Candidate Student Learning Objective Unit Item 2D: The teacher candidate explains how he or she will balance the required grade level standards with the students' needs, abilities and developmental levels.	1.7	2.4
EDUC 770 n=4	Teacher Candidate Student Learning Objective Unit Item 2D: The teacher candidate explains how he or she will balance the required grade level standards with the students' needs, abilities and developmental levels.	3.0	3.0
EDUC 796 N=25	Capstone	2.9	n/a*

\* EDUC 796 Not Offered

Benchmark: 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*)

Table 4. Dispositions Ratings

Course	Measurement	EDUC 490		EDUC770	
		Mean Dispositions Rating Fall 18 N=8	Mean Dispositions Rating Spring 19* N=27	Mean Dispositions Rating Fall 18 N=15	Mean Dispositions Rating Spring 19* N=4
EDUC 490/770	Ethical Standards	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.5
	Professional Attributes	3.7	3.9	3.9	4.0
	Respect for Families, Cultures, Communities	3.8	3.6	3.9	3.8
	Respect for Learning Process	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.3

\*Data from Midterm Ratings

Benchmark for Completer Surveys: The following link will take the reader to the, “Information About Our Graduates,” which is a survey of completers and principals as to how our completers are performing in their first year of work <https://www.fmarion.edu/education/aboutourgraduates/>. All completers will be performing at a level across all SLOs that is satisfactory to them and to their employers, based on the survey information provided to us.

**Action:**

SLO 1: Discussion: The PRAXIS II exam results for those who took the tests in school year 2019-2020 were not as strong as the results indicated in the 2018-2019 school year. Across all tests, mean scores for completers in 2019-2020 were down with the exception of the Middle Level PLT (5624) test. In the Elementary Math Subtest, the mean score for completers was down by 20 points, while in elementary social studies it was down by 10 points and in elementary science it was down by 9. The percentages of test takers has been included in this year’s data and will be helpful for analysis next year, but clearly there is something that drove the scores down across all areas. It would be easy to point to the COVID 19 pandemic and worries over this as an excuse, but in truth, while this may be partially true, we will need to take a closer look at our course objectives, instructional procedures, and assessments. It could also be mentioned here that the School of Education has been under pressure from accreditation agencies, including special program area agencies (SPAs) and the Council for Accreditation of Education Programs (CAEP) to write the reports necessary for those agencies for purposes of being accredited. While all of the programs in the School of Education have been recognized without conditions by the SPAs, CAEP required a separate self-study report that required SOE faculty to meet on various occasions in order to complete this on time and to send it in as a prerequisite for their visit in October, 2020. When faculty are busy tending to the requirements of accreditation agencies, they cannot be as focused on their students and their own instruction as they otherwise might be. In one two-week period alone faculty met for a minimum of 34 hours to address CAEP’s self-study requirements. As a faculty in the

coming 2020-2021 year, we will visit these data and determine a course of action to increase these scores. It should be mentioned that all completers (as opposed to candidates who remain in the SOE) have successfully passed the PRAXIS II exams.

SLO 2: Discussion: The SOE conceptual framework uses reflection on planning and clinical settings. As was mentioned in the report last year, the courses used to measure reflection on planning and clinical settings have now been discontinued, although data were available for EDUC 796 through the Fall, 2019. Measured indicators were at or above the target levels using data from that class. Action: We will continue to emphasize the need for professional reflection on planning and clinical settings. Data will be derived from sources identified by a yet-to-be-formed Institutional Effectiveness Committee, with formation expected in Fall, 2020.

SLO 3: Discussion: All candidates have demonstrated their ability to reflect on the needs of their students at the expected or exceeding expectations level. EDUC 769 and EDUC 796 will no longer be used for these data. In the future both EDUC 769 and EDUC 796 will no longer be taught, thus these data will need to be garnished from other courses yet to be identified. The courses will be identified after consultation with SOE faculty as to where this can best be accomplished. Action: We will continue to emphasize the need for professional reflection to analyze the needs of P-12 students through planning and assessment. Data will be derived from sources identified by a yet-to-be-formed Institutional Effectiveness Committee, with formation expected in Fall, 2020.

SLO 4: Dispositions at this time are not an issue within the School of Education. While there are generally one or two candidates with whom we must speak regarding professional dispositions during the year, the process that the SOE has in place for resolving problems with dispositions is working as it should be.

SLO 5: At this time, based on the responses received, completers are performing well in all areas (candidates will be able to reflect on the needs of P-12 students; candidates will be able to assess P-12 student learning; candidates will be able to successfully and positively collaborate with various educational professionals). There is evidence that we must better prepare our candidates in preparing lessons for students who are gifted and talented, and whose native language is not English. Action: The SOE has hired a faculty member who will join the department in Fall, 2020 and who has expertise in working with students whose native language is not English. We will continue to focus on teaching our candidates how to develop lesson plans that are appropriate for students who are gifted, talented, LD, or otherwise. We must also focus on ensuring that secondary programs in English, Biology, Social Studies and Math, or education programs such as Art Education will work to ensure that students in those programs receive appropriate instruction in developing lessons for diverse populations, as data indicate that this is where some of the weaknesses occur, according to completer information.

Benchmark for Completer Surveys: All completers will be performing at a level across all SLOs that is satisfactory to them and to their employers, based on the survey information provided to us. The following link will take the reader to the, "Information About Our Graduates," which is a survey of

completers and principals as to how our completers are performing in their first year of work  
<https://www.fmarion.edu/education/aboutourgraduates/> .