

**Unit Assessment Report: #5 Impact on Student Learning**

**YEAR: 2011-2012**

**Description of the Assessment:** Although no two programs outside of a department program use the exact same instruments to assess candidate’s impact on student learning, all assessments with the exception of Educational Leadership are built on a 3 point rubric scale with 3 indicating target performance and 1 indicating unacceptable performance. The Initial licensure programs and the Reading & Literacy measures include the Analysis of Student Learning task from the Teacher Work Sample. The Educational Leadership measure is gleaned from items from the Completer’s survey that is a SPA required assessment. The survey examines candidate satisfaction with their program related to creating a positive learning environment, attending to the needs of diverse learners and their ability to assess and analyze student learning and make adjustments to monitor achievement. In addition, all educational leadership candidates are expected to analyze student learning in a building or a district and to determine professional development needs in order to improve student achievement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Initial Programs** | **Mean Score** |
| Elementary Education - Undergraduate | 2.61 |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Field Based | - |
| Elementary Education – Graduate Evening Masters | 2.88 |
| Special Education Undergraduate | 2.85 |
| Special Education Graduate | 2.91 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics undergraduate | 3.0 |
| Secondary Education – Mathematics graduate | 2.87 |
| Secondary Education – Science undergraduate | 3.0 |
| Secondary Education – Science graduate | 3.0 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History undergraduate | 3.0 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science History Graduate | 2.85 |
| Secondary Education – Social Science Psychology undergraduate | - |
| Secondary Education - Social Science Psychology graduate | - |
| Secondary Education – English Language Arts undergraduate | 2.95 |
| Secondary Education - English Language Arts Graduate | 3.0 |
| Secondary Education Average of all candidates | 2.95 |
| Average | 2.91 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advanced programs** | **Mean Score** |
| Educational leadership: 92% satisfaction on completer’s on Student Learning items | |
| English as a Second Language | 3.0 |
| Instructional Technology | 2.90 |
| Reading and Literacy | 2.26 |
| School Counseling | 1.81 |
| Average | 2.49 |

**Interpretation and Findings:** A review of data from 2011-2012 assessments again shows strong performance by Unit program on Key Assessment #5, Impact on Student Learning. A review of Initial Licensure programs indicates no available data for the Field Based Elementary Master’s degree. Due to an inadequate enrollment, this program was shelved.

Candidates in the Elementary program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels performed well on these measures and slight increases are noted from the previous year. These improvements may be impacted by the addition of a course in differentiation and a course in assessment that are now required of all Elementary candidates. Special Education candidates also performed well with slight increases noted for both undergraduate and graduate candidates. A review of the secondary programs again shows perfect and near perfect scores across all disciplines.

A decrease in performance is noted in the mean score for Reading and Literacy with a 2.26 compared to 2.95 in 2010-2011. The Reading and Literacy report for Assessment 5 notes changes in the curricular emphasis to include a more targeted focus on the recognition of student needs and implications for student learning particularly in the area of diversity. The faculty engaged in professional development for working with English Language Learners in order to better incorporate that emphasis on diverse learners. The department anticipates that with these improvements candidates will better demonstrate their ability to impact student learning.

English as a Second Language and Instructional Technology once again show strong ability of candidate’s in the area of impact with mean scores of 3.0 and 2.9 respectively. Nine-two percent of Educational Leadership candidates express satisfaction with their ability to assess and analyze student learning and to make adaptations for learners. In addition, Education Leadership candidates are expected to analyze student learning at the building and district levels and to determine professional development needs for their buildings as administrators.

Both Reading and Literacy and School Counselor candidates showed lower average performance than in previous years. For Reading and Literacy this may be impacted by SPA standard changes that resulted in new assessments for impact on student learning. Again school counselor candidates exhibit some difficulty with the assessment and evaluation of their ability to measure the impact of their instruction on their students. Counseling faculty will continue to emphasize and reinforce the importance of sound assessment strategies and reflective practice to insure that the counselors are meeting their instructional goals utilizing best practice.

Overall, the unit demonstrates acceptable to target performance on tasks related to measuring and monitoring the impact of instruction on student learning with particular focus on meeting the needs of diverse learners.
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