



**Major Assessment Findings and Curricular Improvements  
Department of Education**

**Graduate Programs**

**Certificate Programs in:**

- **Secondary Education (English, Mathematics, Social Studies);**
  - **Special Education;**
  - **Early Childhood Special Education**

**Master's Program in:**

- **Secondary Education (English, Mathematics, Social Studies);**
  - **Special Education;**
  - **Early Childhood Special Education**

**Doctoral Program in:**

- **Catholic Educational Leadership and Policy Studies;**
  - **Educational Psychology**

## Major Assessment Findings

### Progression Data

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY ACADEMIC PLAN AND SUBPLAN																
Fall 2009 through Fall 2013																
Academic Plan	Academic SubPlan	Fall 2009			Fall 2010			Fall 2011			Fall 2012			Fall 2013		
		FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total	FT	PT	Total
EDUC-CERT		2	5	7		2	2	1	1	2		4	4		5	5
EDUC-CERT	ERL_SPEC											4	4		6	6
EDUC-CERT	SPECIALED														2	2
SPEED-CERT			1	1												
EDUC-MA						1	1	1	1	2						
EDUC-MA	ADMIN		2	2												
EDUC-MA	ENG	1	1	2	3	1	4	1		1						
EDUC-MA	ERLY_SPEC									9	9					
EDUC-MA	LEARNING		2	2												
EDUC-MA	MATH		1	1												
EDUC-MA	SOCSTUDIES		3	3	3	1	4	1	1	2						
EDUC-MA	SPECED	1	10	11		8	8			5	5					
EDUSCED-MA											1	1	2	5	1	6
EDUEARL-MA												13	13		12	12
EDUSPEC-MA											1	3	4	4	1	5
EDUC-ND			2	2		3	3		2	2		1	1		2	2
EDUC-PHD			3	3		2	2					2	2		1	1
EDUC-PHD	ADMINPOLIC		5	5		4	4		3	3		1	1			
EDUC-PHD	EDUCPSYCH	2	13	15		13	13		11	11		7	7		6	6
EDUC-PHD	LEADERSHIP		10	10		12	12		13	13		8	8		10	10
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>55</b>

**Early Childhood Special Education** (Certificate & MA) enrollment has remained constant with the first cohort of 10 in Fall 2011 and additional cohorts resulting in 17 and 18 enrolled students in subsequent semesters.

**Special Education** (Certificate & MA) dropped from 12 to a range of 4 to 8 in most recent years. With a new faculty program coordinator, we anticipate an upward trend in enrollment.

**Secondary Education** (Certificate & MA) enrollment is more challenging to discuss due to the lack of sub-plan codes. Based on the number of identified secondary candidates, enrollment (ranging from 2 to 11) has seen a sudden increase in the Fall 2013 semester.

The number of students in the categories of **EDUC-CERT**, **EDUC-MA**, and **EDUC-ND** ranges between 5 to 9, and based on the number of graduate license students in the secondary social studies program, who have not been identified with a sub-plan code, we assume that these students belong to the secondary program.

**Catholic Educational Leadership and Policy Studies** (Leadership) enrollment has remained steady over the past five years. Due to the non-traditional delivery of this doctoral program, students do not register for courses during the academic year (fall/spring) and therefore are not included in these enrollment numbers. There are an additional 11 students in the program at this time making a total of 21 CELPS students.

**Administration and Policy** data describe a program that has been suspended.

**Educational Psychology** numbers show students in Dissertation Guidance as admission has also been suspended to this doctoral program.

## Course Grades and Evaluation Data

COURSE SUMMARY DATA: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION															
EDUC 534 FldExpr:Collab,Consltn&Sys Chg															
Term	Graduate Course Enrollment	Course Grades								Course Evaluation Results					
		Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating		
		Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W	I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Summer 2009	6	3.78	0.40	5	1					6	100.00%	8.50	1.29	8.00	1.83
Fall 2009	5	3.93	0.15	4					1	2	40.00%	9.00	1.41	7.50	3.54
Fall 2010	4	3.90	0.17	3					1	4	100.00%	7.25	1.26	6.25	1.26
Summer 2011	2	3.65	0.49	1	1					0	0.00%				
Summer 2012	1	4.00		1						0	0.00%				

Students' performance in this course with mean course grades between 3.65 and 4.00 indicate candidates' robust understanding of knowledge and skills acquired in this course.

Faculty course evaluation data indicate that students were mostly satisfied with instructor performance, but we need to point out that course evaluation data from few students are not very reliable.

EDUC 575 Supervised Internship															
Term	Graduate Course Enrollment	Course Grades								Course Evaluation Results					
		Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating		
		Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W	I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Summer 2012	10	3.88	0.15	10						10	100.00%	7.00	2.26	8.10	1.97
Summer 2013	10	3.94	0.13	10						10	100.00%	6.40	0.97	5.50	1.96

\*Note: Summer 2013 uses a new evaluation instrument where ratings are based on a 7-point scale.

Students' performance in this course with mean course grades between 3.88 and 3.94 indicate candidates' robust understanding of knowledge and skills acquired in this course.

Faculty course evaluation data indicate that students were mostly satisfied with instructor performance. The Chair of the Department meets with every faculty member to discuss teaching effectiveness, so concerns are systematically and regularly addressed in a supportive environment. When considering the mean of 5.50 in the Summer 2013 course evaluations, please note that as of the Summer 2013 semester CUA has used a new evaluation instrument where ratings are based on a 7-point scale.

EDUC 597/598/599 Student Teaching & Seminar: Secondary Education															
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades								Course Evaluation Results				
	Graduate Unduplicated	Duplicated	Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating	
			Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Fall 2008	1	3	3.70	0.00	3					0	0.00%			7.00	0.00
Fall 2010	1	3	4.00	0.00	3					1	33.33%	5.00	0.00	7.00	0.00
Fall 2011	1	3	4.00	0.00	3					3	100.00%	9.33	0.58	8.00	0.00
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades								Course Evaluation Results				
	Graduate Unduplicated	Duplicated	Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating	
			Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Spring 2009	1	1	4.00	0.00	1					1	100.00%	4.00	0.00	3.00	0.00
Spring 2010	0	0													
Spring 2011	4	12	3.93	0.14	12					7	58.33%	1.67	0.50	3.67	2.00
Spring 2012	3	9	4.00	0.00	9					6	66.67%	9.00	1.10	9.00	1.10
Spring 2013	0	0													

Students' performance in this course with mean course grades between 3.70 and 4.00 indicate candidates' robust understanding of knowledge and skills acquired in this course.

Faculty course evaluation data are varied with means ranging between 1.67 and 9.33 indicating that some cohorts were satisfied with instructor performance, and others were not. This pattern is to be expected as the seminar instructor has expertise in early childhood and elementary education but not in secondary education. The Chair of the Department has met with the faculty member to discuss teaching effectiveness and has created a plan to address this concern (see section entitled Curricular Improvement).

## Curricular Improvements

*Briefly describe improvements to the curriculum or student supports that will be introduced subsequent to the findings, if any. Comment on the effects of recent curricular improvements in light of data if known. For example, the improvements may include changing the structure of particular courses, requiring prerequisite courses or skills, providing special advisement, introducing earlier experiences with parts of what become key projects or papers.*

In the spirit of continuous improvement the Department of Education faculty members regularly examine data to identify areas for improvement. Faculty members have made the following data-based decisions:

1. The Chair of the Department of Education will continue to discuss each faculty member's teaching effectiveness and provide strategies for improvement.
2. The secondary student teaching seminar (EDUC 597, 597, 598) will be taught by a faculty member with expertise in secondary education. \*Please note that the course numbers have been changed.
3. The new Program Coordinator of the special education program will use Transition to Teaching funds to recruit additional students to the program.
4. The new Program Coordinator of the special education program will also restructure the program, key assessments and scoring guides and align all these components with the newly published CEC professional standards.

Please note that a more nuanced discussion of changes for program improvement is included in the department's *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report* for graduate programs that follows this section.

## **Annual Key Assessment Findings by Program AY 2012-2013**

The Teacher Education Program has identified learning goals for each candidate. These goals are aligned with CUA's conceptual framework standards as well as professional standards published by Specialized Professional Associations in each discipline, such as early childhood, elementary, secondary English, secondary math, secondary social studies, special education, and early childhood special education. The following report includes data, disaggregated for each program, on each key assessment (major assignment) and the means for each cohort during the AY 2012-2013.

Each assessment instrument used for key assessments (with the exception of licensure tests, comprehensive exams, and grades) uses a 3-point scale (3=exceeding expectations, 2=meeting expectations, and 1=acquiring skill). The discussion below each table includes areas where candidates exceeded, met or did not meet expectations. The document concludes with a description of changes implemented for program improvement.

### **Secondary English Education**

The graduate secondary English education program did not have any candidates in the AY 2012-13. The 2013-14 Annual Key Assessment Findings Report will include performance data on candidates who will take courses in which key assessments are administered.

### **Secondary Math Education**

The graduate secondary math education program did not have any candidates in the AY 2012-13. The 2013-14 Annual Key Assessment Findings Report will include performance data on candidates who will take courses in which key assessments are administered.

### **Secondary Social Studies Education**

The graduate secondary social studies education program did not have any candidates in the AY 2012-13. The 2013-14 Annual Key Assessment Findings Report will include performance data on candidates who will take courses in which key assessments are administered.

## Special Education

### Key Assessment #1.1: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ I Tests

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Reading	180.7	168
Writing	175	165
Math	180	169

### Key Assessment #1.2: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ II Content Tests

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Special Education: Core Knowledge & Applications (354)	186.3	151

### Key Assessment #1.3: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ II Pedagogy Tests

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades K-6 (622)	187	160

CUA's special education candidates successfully passed the Praxis I and Praxis II tests required for licensure. Pass rates on Praxis I indicate that the candidates who have been admitted to the program have the requisite content knowledge in math, reading, and writing to be eligible for teacher licensure. On average, candidates performed more than ten points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS I tests in all three domains, reading, writing, and math.

High scores on the Praxis II content test entitled *Special Education: Core Knowledge & Applications (354)* indicate that our candidates have solid preparation in the areas of the development and characteristics of learners, planning and the learning environment, instruction, assessment, and foundations and professional responsibilities. Similarly, the high scores on the Praxis II pedagogy test entitled *Elementary Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades K-6 (622)* exam suggest that our candidates can analyze instructional scenarios and address questions in the areas of students as learners; instructional process; assessment; and professional development, leadership, and community in an exemplary manner. On average, candidates performed more than 35 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and 17 points more on the PRAXIS II pedagogy tests.

### Key Assessment #2: Child Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Use of multiple assessment strategies	3	1	0	2.75
2. Knowledge of child's developmental functioning in four domains	3	1	0	2.75
3. Use of culturally and individually specialized instruction	2	2	0	2.50
4. Environment and adaptations	2	2	0	2.50
5. Instructional planning	1	2	1	2.00
6. Journal Reflections on Instructional planning	2	2	0	2.50

The special education candidates exceeded expectations regarding their mastery of a variety of assessment techniques and their knowledge about the developmental functioning of children. Candidates were also rated highly in their use of culturally and individually specialized instruction, their skills to plan and adapt instruction to diverse students, and their reflections. The candidate who had difficulty in the area of instructional planning was referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 2.57 to 3.00.

### Key Assessment #3: Case Study

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Student Background	7	10	1	2.33
2. Assessment	12	6	0	2.67
3. Analysis	8	9	1	2.39
4. Instructional Needs	5	9	4	2.06
5. Instructional Recommendations	7	8	2	2.29
6. Parent Caregiver Summary	7	10	0	2.41

The special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in most domains of their case study of a child experiencing reading difficulty. Data indicate that candidates demonstrated strength in the area of collecting and analyzing assessment data and creating a parent caregiver summary. Some candidates experienced difficulty in describing students' backgrounds, analyzing student reading difficulties, identifying instructional needs based on the assessment data they had collected and providing instructional recommendations. These candidates were referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 2.06 to 2.67.

### Key Assessment # 4: Video Collaboration

No data were collected on this assessment in the 2012-13 AY.

**Key Assessment #5: Action Research Project**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Problem Specification	1	0	0	3.00
2. Taking Action to Improve Practice	1	0	0	3.00
3. Gathering Evidence	1	0	0	3.00
4. Drawing Conclusions	1	0	0	3.00
5. Professional Writing	1	0	0	3.00

The special education candidate consistently exceeded expectations in all domains of the action research paper completed during the capstone field experience. Data provide strong evidence for the candidate's ability to discuss problematic situations and dilemmas encountered in the context of the learning environment, taking action to improve practice, gathering evidence, drawing conclusions, and presenting the Action Research Project professionally. Data on this key assessment indicate exemplary completion of this project as the candidate received a 3.00 in all areas of this assignment.

**Key Assessment #6: Functional Behavioral Assessment**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Clarity	4	0	0	3.00
2. Completeness	3	1	0	2.75
3. Behavioral Approach and Framework	1	3	0	2.25
4. Test Recommendations	2	2	0	2.50

All special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in all domains of their functional behavioral assessment. The candidates showed particular strengths in clearly defining the behavior of interest and the completeness with which they collected data on the behavior. Candidates also met and exceeded expectations in the areas of behavioral approach and framework as well as test recommendations. The cohort's means ranged from 2.25 to 3.00.



**Key Assessment #7: Case Law**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Recognition of the educational and instructional needs of a child with disabilities and how the lack of appropriate services or other requirement may lead to a legal dispute	3	2	0	2.60
2. Ability to work collaboratively in a group with a positive outcome	5	0	0	3.00
3. Ability to describe the steps of a legal process that parents may take if their child is not receiving services appropriately	5	0	0	3.00
4. Knowledge about the meaning of legal decisions about children with disabilities and education that shows an understanding of the law and how special education should be practiced	5	0	0	3.00

The special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in all domains of their case law assignment. The candidates showed particular strengths in their knowledge about the meaning of legal decisions about children with disabilities and education that shows an understanding of the law and how special education should be practiced, and their abilities to work collaboratively in a group with a positive outcome and to describe the steps of a legal process that parents may take if their child is not receiving services appropriately. Candidates also met and exceeded expectations in the area of recognizing the educational and instructional needs of a child with disabilities and how the lack of appropriate services or other requirement may lead to a legal dispute. The high scores demonstrate that the candidates have a solid understanding of how the legal process works for students with disabilities. The cohort's means ranged from 2.60 to 3.00.

**Key Assessment #8: Woodcock Johnson**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Clarity	1	0	0	3.00
2. Organization	1	0	0	3.00
3. Accuracy	1	0	0	3.00
4. Test Recommendations	1	0	0	3.00
5. Ethical issues/informed consent	1	0	0	3.00

The special education candidate consistently exceeded expectations in all domains of the Woodcock Johnson assignment, a norm-referenced assessment that each candidate is required to administer and interpret in the special education program. This assessment is commonly used in schools as one measure of identifying students with learning disabilities. The candidate demonstrated a superior ability to accurately administer this measure, make recommendations based on the results, consider the ethical issues inherent in the administration of this assessment, and make a clear and organized narrative to present the case. Data on this key assessment indicate exemplary completion of this project as the candidate received a 3.00 in all areas of this assignment.

### Early Childhood Special Education

#### Key Assessment #1.1: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ I Tests

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Reading	178	168
Writing	176.1	165
Math	175.1	169

#### Key Assessment #1.2: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ II Content Tests

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Early Childhood: Content Knowledge (022)	178.72	165

#### Key Assessment #1.3: Pass Rates on PRAXIS™ II Pedagogy Tests

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Principles of Learning & Teaching: Early Childhood (621)	173.8	157

CUA's early childhood special education candidates successfully passed the Praxis I and Praxis II tests required for licensure. Pass rates on Praxis I indicate that the candidates who have been admitted to the program have the requisite content knowledge in math, reading, and writing to be eligible for teacher licensure. On average, candidates performed at least 6-11 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS I tests in all three domains, reading, writing, and math.

High scores on the Praxis II content test entitled *Early Childhood: Content Knowledge (022)* indicate that our candidates have solid preparation in the areas of language, literacy, mathematics, social studies, science, health and physical education, as well as creative and performing arts. Similarly, the high scores on the Praxis II pedagogy test entitled *Principles of Learning & Teaching: Early Childhood (621)* exam suggest that our candidates can analyze instructional scenarios and address questions in the areas of students as learners; instructional process; assessment; and professional development, leadership, and community in an exemplary manner. On average, candidates performed more than 13 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and more than 16 points higher on the PRAXIS II pedagogy test.

A more exhaustive analysis reveals that the average score for Cohort 2 on the Early Childhood Content Knowledge is nearly identical (178.75 and 178.72 respectively) to the prior year. The average score for the Principles of Learning & Teaching exam (0621/5621) for Cohort 2 of 173.18 is substantially higher than the previous year (160). These results would suggest that the quality of the Early Childhood Special Education program's content instruction remained constant between the first and second years of the program. Cohort 2's higher average score for the pedagogy PRAXIS exam is a strong indicator of positive program development, especially in the subcategories of *IV. Professional Development, Leadership & Community* to Cohort 2's average of 11.45 out of a possible 12 raw points available) *V. Analysis of Instructional Scenarios* (to Cohort 2's average of 12.54 out of a possible 16 raw points available) rose from the previous year.

### Key Assessment #2.1: Child Portfolio (Part I in EDUC 639)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Part Ia. Early childhood adult/child joint attention and conversation	11	1	0	2.92
2. Part Ib. Observation and description of the structures of language and communication	11	1	0	2.92
3. Part Ic. Description of developmental milestones	11	1	0	2.92
4. Part Id. Attention to mechanics	11	1	0	2.92

### Key Assessment #2.2: Child Portfolio (Part II in EDUC 525)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
5. Part Ie. & Iia. Description	9	3	0	2.75
6. Part I. & Iib. Interpretation of observed behavior	6	6	0	2.50
7. Part I. & Iic. Reflection and evaluation	2	10	0	2.17
8. Part I. & Iid. Application	6	6	0	2.50
Part II. Attention to mechanics	10	1	1	2.75

In the first part of the assignment early childhood special education candidates mostly exceeded expectations regarding their description of the child-adult joint attention and conversation, structures of language and communication, and developmental milestones. The cohort's means were 2.92 in each area.

In the second part of the assignment candidates mostly exceeded expectations regarding their writing mechanics and their ability to describe the child and his or her successes and difficulties when completing academic tasks. Candidates met or exceeded expectations in the areas of

interpreting observed behaviors, reflection and evaluating the learning environment, and applying theory to practice. One candidate had difficulty in the area of writing mechanics and was referred to CUA's Writing Center. The cohort's means ranged from 2.17 to 2.75.

A more thorough analysis revealed that Cohort 3's data from 2012-13 AY are stronger in both parts of the assignment than in the previous year.

Faculty believe that candidates' higher performance in 2012-13 AY is a result of strengthening the performance assessment scoring guide for both parts of the assignment and refining some lectures to focus more on early childhood special education.

### **Key Assessment #3.1: Environmental Observation and Analysis**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Representation of classroom environment	11	0	0	3.00
2. Description of environment	10	1	0	2.91
3. Rate the Environment from a child's perspective	8	2	1	2.64
4. Rate the Environment as the classroom teacher	10	1	0	2.91

### **Key Assessment #3.2: Planning for All Learners**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
5. Description of integrated unit	10	0	0	3.00
6. Unit details	10	0	0	3.00
7. Individualized Activities & Instruction Reflective of Development, Culture & Language	9	0	1	2.80
8. Individual learning plan	9	0	1	2.80

Early childhood special education candidates met and in most areas exceeded expectations on these assignments. Data on the environmental observation and inclusive lesson plan assignments indicate that the majority of candidates met and exceeded expectations in most areas, such as representing, describing, rating the classroom environment from the teacher's perspective,, describing the integrated unit and its details. One candidate needed further practice in the area of rating the environment from the child's perspective (in the Environmental Observation and Analysis) and another candidate needed more work in the areas of individualizing activities and instruction and individual learning plans (in the Planning for All Learners assignment). The candidate was referred to the course instructor for remediation.

A more in-depth analysis shows strong evidence of the overall improvement in candidate performance and attainment of skills and knowledge aligned with standards in the second year of the program (2012-2013) compared to the first year (2011-2012), with a higher percentage of candidates exceeding expectations in Cohort 2 than Cohort 1. Cohort 2's means ranged from 2.64 to 3.00.

Faculty members believe that improvement in practicum sites, addition of new sites, and a better supervisor-to-candidate ratio supported the candidates' enhanced performance.

#### **Key Assessment #4: Student Teaching Evaluation**

<b>Items on Final Student Teaching Evaluations</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Assessment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge	2.53
Assessment of Technology Use	1.91
Assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills During Student Teaching	2.50

On the evaluation that occurs at the end of student teaching, all candidates met or exceeded expectations in terms of pedagogical content knowledge and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in applying such knowledge in the classroom context. While there was marked improvement from the midterm observation to the final observation on the student teaching evaluation, the final mean score still falls short of meeting standard expectations in the use of technology.

One recommendation will be to work more closely with the practicum sites whose assistive technology resources are limited. A second recommendation will be to incorporate, into the first student teaching course, a guided visit to the Washington, DC Assistive Technology Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities. The teacher preparation program's new smart classroom will provide additional opportunities for candidates to learn how to implement technology in order to deliver cutting edge teaching practices in the classroom.

**Key Assessment #5: Action Research Project**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Educational Philosophy	7	2	0	2.78
2. Discussion of Problematic Situation and Dilemma	7	2	0	2.78
3. Identifying Causes	7	2	0	2.78
4. Pre/Post Data Collection and Analysis	7	2	0	2.78
5. Proposed Solutions	7	2	0	2.78
6. Describing Individual Interventions	6	3	0	2.67
7. Reflecting on Impact on Birth-8 Children	8	1	0	2.89
8. Use of Literature	5	4	0	2.56
9. Professional Presentation in Writing and in Public	4	5	0	2.45
10. Identifies Functional Child Outcome and the ECO Accountability Measure	2	7	0	2.22

The early childhood special education candidates consistently met and exceeded expectations in all domains of their action research papers completed during the capstone field experience. Data provide strong evidence for candidates' ability to discuss problematic situations and dilemmas encountered in the context of their student teaching experience, identify causes of observed behaviors, collect and analyze pre- and post-implementation data to evaluate the outcomes of their interventions, propose and describe solution strategies as individual interventions, reflect on the overall impact of their intervention on their students, relate their project to their philosophy of teaching and to extant literature, identify functional child outcomes and the ECO accountability measure, and present their work professionally. Data on this key assessment indicate exemplary completion of this project as the cohort's means ranged from 2.22 to 2.89. A more meticulous analysis of the Action Research Project data reveals strong evidence of the overall improvement in candidate performance and attainment of skills and knowledge aligned with standards in the second year of the program (2012-2013) compared to the first year (2011-2012), with a higher percentage of candidates exceeding expectations in Cohort 2 compared to Cohort 1.

Advising candidates in the spring semester to prepare a research question and begin the ARP as soon as possible has helped candidates master this assignment more fully than in prior years. Additionally, faculty added an assessment section related to self-reflection about performance in the field.

**Key Assessment #6.1: Family Systems Performance - Home-School Communication Interview**

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Cultural Competence	5	5	0	2.55
2. Connecting Families to Resources	7	3	0	2.64
3. Learning as a Professional	5	4	1	2.36
4. Strengths-Based Communication	6	4	0	2.55
5. Improving Communication Systems	4	6	0	2.36

**Key Assessment #6.2: Family Systems Performance - Family Interview**

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
6. Diversity & Community Influences	4	6	0	2.36
7. Engaging Relationships	6	4	0	2.55
8. Research & Reflection	4	6	0	2.36

**Key Assessment #6.3: Family Systems Performance - Collaborative Skills**

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
9. Family Systems Theory & Normal Development	7	3	0	2.70
10. Systematic Assessment & Planned Intervention	5	5	0	2.50

The early childhood special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in all domains of the assignments with the exception of a single artifact that needed improvement in the area of learning as a professional.

Candidates demonstrated an exceptional ability to connect families to resources and understanding family systems theory and normal development. Candidates met and exceeded expectations in the areas of cultural competence, learning as a professional, strength-based communication, improvement of communication systems, diversity and community influences, engaging relationships, research and reflection and systematic assessment and planned intervention. The cohort's means ranged from 2.36 to 2.70.



**Key Assessment #7: Functional Behavioral Assessment (EDUC 635)**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Collaboration with families and other professionals	8	2	0	2.80
2. Clarity and Completeness	7	3	0	2.70
3. Behavioral Approach and Framework	5	5	0	2.50
4. FBA Recommendations Plan	8	2	0	2.80

The early childhood special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in all domains of their functional behavioral assessment. The data show strong evidence for candidates' skills and knowledge in the areas of collaborating with families and other professionals, clearly and completely describing the behavior of interest, and designing an FBA recommendation plan. Candidates also met and exceeded expectations in the area of behavioral approach and framework. The cohort's means ranged from 2.50 to 2.80.

Faculty believe that a higher performance in the AY 2012-13 (as compared to the previous cohort) is a result of placing the assignment and assessment earlier in the course to support candidate achievement.

**Key Assessment #8: Formal Assessment**

<b>Parts of Assignment</b>	<b>Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)</b>	<b>Meeting Expectations (2 pts)</b>	<b>Acquiring Skill (1 pt)</b>	<b>Mean</b>
1. Clarity	5	5	0	2.50
2. Organization	8	2	0	2.80
3. Accuracy	8	1	1	2.70
4. Test Recommendations	8	1	1	2.70
5. Identifying the Individual	8	1	1	2.70
6. Using the Assessment	5	5	0	2.50
7. Relating to the Individual	7	2	1	2.60

Early childhood special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in three domains of this assignment, such as clarity, organization, and using the assessment. One candidate needed more practice in the areas of accuracy, test recommendations, identifying the individual, and relating to the individual. The candidate was referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 2.50 to 2.80.

### Key Assessment #9: Language & Literacy Development Case Study

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Student Background	5	7	1	2.31
2. Assessment	10	3	0	2.77
3. Analysis	6	7	0	2.46
4. Instructional Needs	5	7	1	2.31
5. Instructional Recommendations	6	5	1	2.42
6. Parent Caregiver Summary	5	7	0	2.42

This assessment was added to the early childhood special education portfolio for the AY 2012-13 because the case study performance assessment is in place and allows for a more comprehensive description of the knowledge and skills of early childhood special education candidates, particularly their ability to further early reading skills and utilize Response to Intervention (RTI) school system-wide interventions to address reading difficulties.

The special education candidates met and exceeded expectations in most domains of the case study. Data indicate that candidates demonstrated strength in the area of collecting and analyzing assessment data. Candidates also met and exceeded expectations in the areas of analyzing student reading difficulties and creating a parent caregiver summary. One candidate experienced difficulties in describing students' backgrounds and instructional needs, and providing instructional recommendations. The candidate was referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 2.31 to 2.77.

## Key Assessments for Doctoral Programs

### Doctoral Program in Catholic Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Students Comprehensive Examinations

#### Progress Results

#### CELPS Cohort 2010

	Fail	Pass	TOTAL
	#	#	
Summer 2013	0	4	4

Scale	Excellent (10)	Above Average (7-9)	Satisfactory (3-6)	Unsatisfactory (0-2)	Average Scale Score
<b>Research Skills</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.25</b>
<b>Writing Skills</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.25</b>
<b>Synthesis of Knowledge Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.25</b>
<b>Potential as Independent Scholar</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.25</b>

The CELPS 2010 Cohort demonstrated its strength on comprehensive examinations. Three of the four members of this cohort of students are anticipated to be above average in their success to complete a dissertation.

## Students Enrolled in Courses

### Cohorts 2009 & 2012 & 2013

During AY 2012-2013, eight of 11 doctoral students in the Catholic Educational Leadership and Policy Studies Program still in coursework were rated as demonstrating above average academic progress and above average in terms of readiness or potential readiness for dissertations. All CELPS students demonstrated an above average commitment to Catholic Education.

Scale	Above Average (8-10)	Satisfactory (4-7)	Improvement Needed (1-3)	Average Scale Score
<b>Academic Progress</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8.18</b>
<b>Potential Readiness for Dissertation</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.82</b>
<b>Commitment to Catholic Education</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>9.00</b>

**Annual Key Assessment AY2012-2013  
Students Enrolled in Dissertation Guidance**

**CELPS Cohorts 2003-2009**

<b>Scale</b>	<b>Excellent (10)</b>	<b>Above Average (7-9)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (3-6)</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory (0-2)</b>	<b>Average Scale Score</b>
<b>Research Skills</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7.45</b>
<b>Writing Skills</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7.82</b>
<b>Synthesis of Knowledge Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7.36</b>
<b>Potential as Independent Scholar</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>7.00</b>

During AY 2012-2013, two CELPS doctoral students successfully defended their dissertations.

During AY 2012-2013, one CELPS doctoral student successfully defended her proposal.

**Ph.D. in Educational Psychology**

Too few doctoral students took the comprehensive exams during this year to report and maintain anonymity. All doctoral students who remain in the doctoral program have successfully completed coursework and comprehensive examinations.

**Progress Results**

**Ph.D. in Educational Psychology**

	<b>Above Average (8-10)</b>	<b>Satisfactory (4-7)</b>	<b>Improvement Needed (1-3)</b>	<b>Average Scale Score</b>
<b>Academic Progress 2012-2013 (n=8)</b>	5	3	0	8.0
<b>Potential Readiness for Dissertation 2012-2013 (n=8)</b>	5	1	2	7.0

During AY 2012-2013, five of eight doctoral students were rated as demonstrating above average academic progress and five of eight were also rated as above average in terms of readiness or potential readiness for dissertations. Three were rated as satisfactory in academic progress. One was rated satisfactory in readiness for a dissertation while two were rated as needing improvement in this category.

In AY 2012-2013, one student completed a proposal defense.

## **Curricular Improvements for Graduate Programs in Teacher Education in AY 2012-13**

### *CONTENT KNOWLEDGE*

#### Activities and Progress:

1. The GPA requirements have also been increased in some areas for graduate candidates. According to the new policy all GTCP and MA applicants must have a cumulative GPA of 2.75 in their undergraduate studies. In addition, secondary English, social studies, and math applicants must have a 3.0 GPA in their last 60 credits of their undergraduate studies. All applicants for graduate studies must have a 3.0 in their previous graduate work if applicable. Once admitted, all graduate students are required to maintain a 2.75 GPA in their education and content (if applicable) courses to continue in the program.
2. The secondary social studies program coordinator modified the transcript analysis for secondary social studies Education Master's and GTCP candidates to assess their standards-based content knowledge preparation. Specifically, prior coursework in history and in the social sciences will be reviewed to assess candidates' preparation in the ten NCSS Thematic Standards.
3. The secondary English program coordinator modified the transcript analysis for secondary English education Master's and GTCP candidates to directly relate program requirements to specific NCTE standards.

#### Plans and Timeline:

1. Program faculty are currently re-evaluating graduate programs, key assessments and syllabi to align with newly published SPA, CUA conceptual framework and InTASC standards, the content of PRAXIS™ II exams, the Title II assurances, and feedback from NCTQ (beginning in the Fall 2013 semester).
2. Early childhood special education faculty are planning to increase early childhood special education candidates' selectivity at admission (beginning in Fall 2014). The mean GPA has risen for each successive cohort since the program was launched in 2011. This outcome is due to more comprehensive recruitment efforts and a rigorous competition for scholarship and admission.

## PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES

### Activities and Progress:

1. The program coordinator for the graduate secondary English and social studies programs revised the Action Research Project to direct secondary teacher candidates to focus their intervention on a problem relevant for learning in the context of their specific subject-matter and to include their views about learning and teaching their specific subject-matter in their educational philosophy statement. The scoring guide of this assessment was modified to reflect these changes and track candidates' performance on specific SPA standards.
2. The secondary English program coordinator revised the scoring guide for the electronic portfolio to include assessment of graduate secondary English teacher candidates' performance specified in NCTE standards.
3. Secondary English faculty revised the annotated bibliography assignment administered in EDUC 582 for graduate students in order to obtain data on its use in the curriculum as well as the range of literature in the area of genre and author.
4. Secondary English and social studies faculty revised the Unit Plan assignment administered in EDUC 580 and EDUC 585 for graduate students in order to include clear reference to the specific disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.
5. Early childhood special education faculty enhanced the Action Research Project to include the ECO framework to determine child functional outcomes.
6. Early childhood special education faculty revised all key assessments to meet all elements of the NAEYC and CEC standards. They also added an additional Key Assessment #9: *Language & Literacy Development Case Study*. This assessment used in EDUC 531: *Literacy Instruction and Engagement for Diverse Learners* was added to the early childhood special education portfolio for the AY 2012-13 because the case study performance assessment is in place and allows for a more comprehensive description of early childhood special education candidates' knowledge and skills to further early reading skills and utilize Response to Intervention (RTI) school system-wide interventions to address reading difficulties.
7. Early childhood special education faculty strengthened the child portfolio performance assessment scoring guide for both parts of the assignment and refined some lectures in EDUC 525: *Psychology of Learning for Diverse Populations* and EDUC 639: *Human Growth and Development* to focus more on early childhood special education.
8. The early childhood special education program coordinator revised the final paper (Child Portfolio) in EDUC 525 to require a more explicit link between theory and practice in real-world contexts.
9. Early childhood special education faculty made substantial changes in the scoring guide for Key Assessment #6: *Family Systems Performance - Home-School Communication Interview, Family Interview, and Collaborative Skills*. The Home/School Communication Interview, which used to be a single component of the scoring guide, has been expanded to include Rows 1-5. The Family Interview project,



- which used to be a single component of the scoring guide, has also been expanded and enhanced to include Rows 6-8. The Collaborative Skills portion of the Family Systems Performance assessment was added to address the need for the greater application of collaboration in candidate learning. Faculty also utilized data from observations on site as an additional source of data when available.
10. Early childhood special education faculty placed the Functional Behavior Assessment assignment earlier in the course to provide additional time for candidates' successful completion of the assignment.
  11. The special education program coordinator revised the special education student teaching evaluation to be used as one of the key assessments in the program. Supervising faculty will evaluate candidates' performance using the same form at both the midterm and final points.
  12. The program coordinators of the special education and early childhood special education programs revised the Language and Literacy Case Study assignment for both programs to include a more explicit focus on selecting appropriate assistive technology devices for communication and instruction.

#### Plans and Timeline:

All graduate program coordinators will revise student teaching or capstone evaluation forms to include more items on content knowledge in each specific subject area and specific items on assessing diversity (beginning in Spring 2014).

### *PROFESSIONAL AND PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES*

#### Activities and Progress:

1. The teacher preparation program's new smart classroom is providing multiple opportunities for graduate candidates to learn how to implement technology in order to deliver cutting edge teaching practices in the classroom.
2. Early childhood special education faculty improved all practicum sites and added new ones as well and decreased the program's supervisor-to-candidate ratio to increase candidates' learning as assessed by the assignments of Environmental Observation and Analysis and Planning for All Learners.
3. Early childhood special education candidates will work more closely with the practicum sites whose assistive technology resources are limited.
4. Early childhood special education faculty will also incorporate, into the first student teaching course, a guided visit to the Washington, DC Assistive Technology Resource Center for Persons with Disabilities.
5. Early childhood special education faculty changed the timeline of the Action Research Project (ARP) and advised candidates to prepare their research questions and begin their ARP as soon as possible. This change in the timeline provided additional time for candidates to successfully complete this comprehensive assignment.
6. Early childhood special education faculty added an assessment section to the Action Research Project related to self-reflection about performance in the field.

7. Early childhood special education faculty redesigned Key Assessment #8: *Formal Assessment*. This assessment, previously named “Woodcock-Johnson” was renamed “Formal Assessment” to include both the candidates’ performance on the Woodcock-Johnson Tests of Achievement as the focus of the assessment as well as other formal, standardized assessments. This key assessment has an enhanced scope directed at improving instructional strategies and recommendations that are based upon results with formal assessment tools, including the Battelle Developmental Inventory (BDI), a tool that spans the early childhood age range, for example. The changes to the assessment include more attention to IEP recommendations and instructional planning and better coordination and communication with family members about the testing and its results.

#### Plans and Timeline:

The secondary math program coordinator has designed a new course entitled EDUC 479/579: *Methods of Teaching Middle School and High School Mathematics*. The course is slated to be offered for undergraduate and graduate candidates in Fall 2014.

### **Annual Key Assessment AY2012-2013 Curricular Improvements Education Doctoral Programs**

#### **CELPS**

CELPS doctoral students are located throughout the nation and do not return to campus regularly following coursework. These doctoral students typically hold full time, high level challenging administrative position. This situation continues to challenge their ability to complete a dissertation in a timely fashion. Because a significant number of CELPS doctoral students require the entire five years allotted for dissertation completion, and sometimes even an extension, the CELPS director and core faculty have decided to request a long term commitment from university officials to acquire appropriate faculty to continue the program into the future. Two of the core faculty members with essential expertise are over retirement age and another is approaching retirement age. In consideration that recruitment of a new cohort of students allows for 4 summers to complete coursework and comprehensive examinations and another five years to complete the dissertation, a total of potentially nine years in a cohort cycle, (projecting a summer 2014 cohort would complete their timeline in 2022); it seems unwise to recruit more students without a plan to recruit faculty with leadership and administrative expertise.

The discussion of faculty is crucial to the curriculum because at this time the Department of Education has a body of faculty focused on Teacher Education. There are no faculty members outside of the CELPS core faculty with the administrative knowledge or practical expertise to deliver the CELPS program’s coursework if these faculty members are no longer available. This is the most immediate curricular challenge that must be met in order to continue the program.

A second discussion focused on the arrival of Cohort 2013. Three of the five new doctoral students were teachers with minimal administrative experience. Due to the lack of high level administrative experience CELPS faculty modified courses and delivered more substantive administrative knowledge and basic skills in coursework due to the teacher's lack of prior knowledge. Should this pattern continue courses will have to be further modified to meet student needs.

Alternatively, if the university commits to appropriate faculty for CELPS, recruitment of experienced Catholic school administrators should be strengthened.

### **Educational Psychology Program**

Admission to the PhD program in Educational Psychology was suspended in Spring, 2010 due to faculty losses. In keeping with the 2011-2012 Departmental Strategic Plan two faculty members were hired in the Literacy area; one started in Fall, 2013 and another will start in Fall, 2014. These new faculty members have skills in qualitative and quantitative research respectively. In addition, a new faculty member in Early Childhood Education started in Fall, 2013, who has strengths in quantitative research and assessment that are promising for supporting doctoral students. Since these new hires strengthen our faculty resources overall as well as for support of doctoral students, the faculty will consider whether to prioritize reopening admissions to the PhD program in Educational Psychology or focus on recruitment and strengthening other programs. The department has yet to propose a specific hire in Educational Psychology. The 2013-2017 Departmental Strategic Plan calls for exploring the feasibility of a viable financial model to permit reactivation of this doctoral program.