



Major Assessment Findings and Curricular Improvements 2009-2013

Department of Education

Undergraduate Programs:

- **Teacher Education (Early Childhood, Elementary, Secondary Education [English, Math, Social Studies]);**
 - **Education Studies**

Assessment Measures

Progression Data

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION: UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY ACADEMIC PLAN AND SUBPLAN																
Fall 2009 through Fall 2013																
Categories	Academic Plan	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
	EDUCA-BA	1		1			0			0			0			0
Education Studies	EDUC-BA	10		10	18	1	19	17		17	16		16	13		13
Teacher Education	EDUCECH-BA	15		15	23		23	22		22	21		21	21		21
	EDUCELE-BA	55	1	56	54		54	62		62	64		64	61	1	62
	ENGSEC-BA	10		10	7		7	7		7	10		10	7		7
	HISTSEC-BA	14		14	18		18	24		24	17		17	20		20
	MATHSEC-BS	9		9	5		5	5		5	4		4	6		6
	CHEMSEC-BA			0			0			0			0			0
	DRSEC-BA	1		1	2		2	1		1			0			0
	FRENSEC-BA	2		2	1		1			0			0	1		1
	GERSEC-BA	1		1			0			0			0			0
	LATSEC-BA			0			0			0			0			0
	SPANSEC-BA	2		2	2		2	2		2			0			0
Total Teacher Education		109	1	110	112	0	112	123	0	123	116	0	116	116	1	117
TOTAL		120	1	121	130	1	131	140	0	140	132	0	132	129	1	130

Early childhood education enrollment increased in 2010 and has been constant above 20 students since the Fall 2010 semester.

Elementary education enrollment data started to increase in the Fall 2011 semester and has remained constant above 60 for the last three years.

Secondary English enrollment has ranged between 7-10 students for the last five years.

Secondary social studies/history enrollment ranges between 14 and 24 with a more recent number of 20.

Secondary math enrollment ranges between 4 and 9 usually with a mean of 5 students in the program.

Education studies enrollment ranges between 11 and 19, which is partially impacted by the number of students who were advised to switch out of teacher education to education studies based on their lower performance.

Course Grades and Evaluation Data

COURSE SUMMARY DATA: DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION														
EDUC 567/568/569 Supervised Internship & Seminar: Early Childhood Education														
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades						Course Evaluation Results					
	Undergraduate		Course Grade		Grade Distribution				Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating	
	Unduplicated	Duplicated	Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F, W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Fall 2008	3	9	3.67	0.50	6	3			0	0.00%				
Fall 2009	6	18	3.93	0.18	17	1			7	38.89%	9.43	0.53	9.14	0.38
Fall 2010	2	6	4.00	0.00	6				1	16.67%	7.00		7.00	
Fall 2011	4	12	3.75	0.45	9	3			11	91.67%	10.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Fall 2012	6	18	4.00	0.00	18				0	0.00%				

Students' performance in this course with mean course grades between 3.67 and 4.00 indicate candidates' robust understanding of knowledge and skills acquired in this course.

Faculty and course evaluation data indicate that students were mostly satisfied with the course and instructor performance, but we need to point out that the lower course evaluation data (mean of 7.00) is based on two students, which makes the data less reliable. Nonetheless, 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.

EDUC 590 Reflective Teaching Tutorial																
Term	Undergraduate		Course Grades						Course Evaluation Results							
	Course Enrollment		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	10		3.84	0.32	9	1					1	10.00%	7.00		8.00	
Fall 2009	13		3.98	0.08	13						5	38.46%	9.80	0.45	8.20	1.92
Fall 2010	15		3.96	0.11	15						3	20.00%	9.33	0.58	8.00	2.00
Fall 2011	10		3.71	0.40	8	2					9	90.00%	9.56	0.73	9.33	0.87
Fall 2012	15		3.69	1.04	13	1		1			8	53.33%	8.38	1.41	8.38	1.60
Term	Undergraduate		Course Grades						Course Evaluation Results							
	Course Enrollment		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	3		3.67	0.58	2	1					2	66.67%	7.50	0.71	8.00	0.00
Spring 2010	3		3.77	0.40	2	1					0	0.00%				
Spring 2011	2		3.65	0.49	1	1					0	0.00%				
Spring 2012	1		4.00		1						1	100.00%	7.00		7.00	
Spring 2013	1		4.00		1						0	0.00%				

EDUC 590 is one of the student teaching numbers offered with EDUC 591, 592, and 593 and is discussed with those numbers under the next table.

EDUC 591/592/593 Student Teaching & Seminar: Elementary Education															
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades						Course Evaluation Results						
	Undergraduate		Course Grade		Grade Distribution				Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating		
	Unduplicated	Duplicated	Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Fall 2008	7	21	3.97	0.09	21					6	28.57%	7.50	2.26	6.50	2.52
Fall 2009	7	21	3.99	0.07	21					9	42.86%	8.44	1.51	8.56	1.81
Fall 2010	13	39	3.91	0.25	36	3				8	20.51%	8.63	0.92	7.75	1.91
Fall 2011	6	18	3.97	0.10	18					11	61.11%	9.55	0.52	8.91	0.94
Fall 2012	9	27	3.52	1.27	24			3		11	40.74%	9.00	1.55	8.82	1.83
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades						Course Evaluation Results						
	Undergraduate		Course Grade		Grade Distribution				Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating		
	Unduplicated	Duplicated	Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Spring 2009	3	9	3.86	0.25	8	1				3	33.33%	7.67	0.58	7.00	1.00
Spring 2010	3	9	3.90	0.15	9					0	0.00%				
Spring 2011	3	6	3.78	0.40	5	1				0	0.00%				
Spring 2012	1	3	4.00	0.00	3					3	100.00%	10.00	0.00	10.00	0.00
Spring 2013	1	3	4.00	0.00	3					0	0.00%				

Students' performance in EDUC 590-593 with mean course grades between 3.67 and 4.00 indicate candidates' robust understanding of knowledge and skills acquired in this course.

Faculty and course evaluation data indicate that students were mostly satisfied with the course and instructor performance, but we need to point out that most of the uncomplimentary faculty and course evaluation data (7.00, 7.50, and 7.67) are from low-enrollment semesters, which make the data less reliable. Nonetheless, 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.

EDUC 597/598/599 Student Teaching & Seminar: Secondary Education															
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades							Course Evaluation Results					
	Undergraduate		Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating	
	Unduplicated	Duplicated	Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Fall 2008	0	0	0.00	0.00											
Fall 2010	0	0	0.00	0.00											
Fall 2011	1	3	3.70	0.00	3					0	0.00%				
Term	Course Enrollment		Course Grades							Course Evaluation Results					
	Undergraduate		Course Grade		Grade Distribution					Course Eval.		Instructor Rating		Course Rating	
	Unduplicated	Duplicated	Avg.	StDev.	A, A-	B+, B, B-	C	F	W, I	#	%	Avg.	StDev.	Avg.	StDev.
Spring 2009	4	12	3.73	0.62	10	1	1			5	41.67%	8.40	1.95	7.40	2.30
Spring 2010	6	18	4.00	0.00	18					5	27.78%	8.40	1.95	8.00	1.79
Spring 2011	5	15	3.87	0.21	14	1				9	60.00%	3.89	1.62	2.22	1.30
Spring 2012	6	18	3.78	0.38	15	3				13	72.22%	7.00	1.11	6.86	1.79
Spring 2013	3	9	3.97	0.10	9					0	0.00%				

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 and course evaluation data indicate that some students were somewhat satisfied with the course and instructor performance, but 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).

NSSE 2013 Data

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA												
Planning, Institutional Research, Student Learning Outcomes Assessment												
2013 National Survey of Student Engagement Mean Comparisons:												
Selected Catholic University General Education Goals												
Department of Education: Seniors												
Department of Education compared with:												
General Education Goals: Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication, including argumentative essays, research papers, presentations, and creative and collaborative work employing a variety of media.	Department of Education	Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2013				
	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c		
<i>During the current school year, about how much writing have you done? 1=none, 1.5=1-2, 4=3-5, 8=6-10, 13=11-15, 18=16-20, 23=more than 20</i>												
Number of papers, reports, or other writing tasks up to 5 pages	8.6	8.4		.03	7.2		.21	7.9		.10		
Number of papers, reports, or other writing tasks between 6 and 10 pages	4.8	4.3		.12	3.1		.43	3.7		.26		
Number of papers, reports, or other writing tasks 11 pages or more	2.8	2.4		.11	1.9		.27	2.0		.21		
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>												
Writing clearly and effectively	2.8	2.9		-.06	3.0		-.18	3.1		-.29		
Speaking clearly and effectively	2.8	2.9		-.07	2.9		-.08	2.9		-.14		
Department of Education compared with:												
General Education Goals: Graduates will show facility in critical thinking and reasoned analysis.	Department of Education	Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2013				
	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c		
<i>During the current school year, how much has your coursework emphasized the following mental activities? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>												
Memorizing course material	3.2	2.7		.52	2.8		.48	2.7		.53		
Applying facts, theories, or methods to practical problems or new situations	3.3	3.1		.28	3.1		.19	3.2		.18		
Analyzing an idea, experience, or line of reasoning in depth by examining its parts	3.2	3.1		.12	3.1		.13	3.1		.10		
Evaluating a point of view, decision, or information source	3.0	3.0		-.02	2.9		.11	3.0		.01		
Forming a new idea or understanding from various from various pieces of information	3.2	2.9		.28	2.9		.31	3.0		.24		
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>												
Thinking critically and analytically	2.8	3.2		-.54	3.3		-.62	3.3		-.66		
Analyzing numerical and statistical information	1.0	2.5	***	-1.36	2.9	***	-1.88	2.8	***	-1.83		
Solving complex real-world problems	2.4	2.7		-.33	2.8		-.43	2.8		-.44		

2013 National Survey of Student Engagement Mean Comparisons: Selected Catholic University General Education Goals Department of Education: Seniors										
<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>										
General Education Goals: Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of scientific and quantitative reasoning.	Department of Education	Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2013		
	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>										
Thinking critically and analytically	2.8	3.2		-.54	3.3		-.62	3.3		-.66
Analyzing numerical and statistical information	1.0	2.5	***	-1.36	2.9	***	-1.88	2.8	***	-1.83
<i>During the current school year, about how often have you done the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often</i>										
Reached conclusions based on your own analysis of numerical information	1.8	2.5		-.63	2.7		-.89	2.6		-.86
Used numerical information to examine a real-world problem or issue	1.6	2.4		-.76	2.4	*	-.83	2.4	*	-.84
Evaluated what others have concluded from numerical information	1.6	2.4		-.79	2.4	*	-.88	2.4		-.85
<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>										
General Education Goals: Graduates will demonstrate an ability to find information effectively using appropriate resources and technologies, critically assess the validity and relevance of that information, and utilize it in ethical and legal ways.	Department of Education	Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2013		
	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c
<i>In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often</i>										
Combined ideas from different courses when completing assignments	2.6	2.9		-.38	3.0		-.51	3.0		-.49
Connected your learning to societal problems or issues	2.0	2.8	***	-.93	2.8	***	-.87	2.9	***	-.96
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	2.8	2.7		.12	2.6		.23	2.7		.11
Connected ideas from your courses to your prior experiences and knowledge	3.8	3.3		.71	3.2		.77	3.3		.73
<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>										
General Education Goals: Graduates will demonstrate knowledge of and respect for different cultures and religions.	Department of Education	Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2013		
	Mean ^a	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c	Mean ^a	Sig ^b	Effect Size ^c
<i>In your experience at your institution during the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often</i>										
Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	2.8	2.7		.12	2.6		.23	2.7		.11
Had discussions with people of a race or ethnicity other than your own	3.0	3.0		.04	3.1		-.13	3.1		-.12
Had discussions with people with religious beliefs other than your own	2.2	2.7		-.55	3.0	*	-.87	3.0	*	-.89
<i>During the current school year, about how often have you done each of the following? 1=never, 2=sometimes, 3=often, 4=very often</i>										
Tried to better understand someone else's views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective	2.2	3.0		-.93	2.9		-.83	3.0		-.91
<i>To what extent does your institution emphasize each of the following? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>										
Encouraging contact among students from different social, racial/ethnic, religious backgrounds	2.2	2.2		-.03	2.5		-.33	2.6		-.38
<i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>										
Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds	2.2	2.7		-.50	2.7		-.54	2.8		-.61

Undergraduate data from the NSSE survey indicate that education majors are mostly satisfied with their learning experiences at the Department of Education. Some areas where the Department has performed better than the CUA average (though not statistically significantly) are assignments, such as research papers and presentations that require students to demonstrate their written and oral proficiency; key assessments that require critical thinking and reasoned analysis; and work in which students need to find information effectively using technology and appropriate resources.

Students evaluated their learning experiences less than favorable (in some situations statistically significantly) in the areas of analyzing numerical and statistical information, connecting their learning to societal problems, and communicating with people of other faiths. The Action Research Paper is designed to support students as they connect educational problems in their student

teaching classroom to societal problems, but faculty will need to make this connection more explicit through the use of our reflective conceptual framework. The Action Research Paper also requires quantitative analyses, which are often challenging to undergraduate education majors, many of whom suffer from math phobia. Faculty members have a plan to address this area for improvement (see section on Curricular Improvements). The Department of Education has a more diverse student body (in terms of race and religion) on the graduate level, so until the undergraduate student body becomes more diverse, it continues to be a challenge to provide opportunities for undergraduates to communicate with people from other faiths. There is an assumption that this topic is covered in courses taken within studies in the School of Theology and Religious Studies.

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.

1. The Chair of the Department of Education will assign to the secondary student teaching seminar offered in the spring semester a faculty member with expertise in secondary education.
2. Education faculty members are considering to restructure the early childhood and elementary teacher education programs to require more math in the programs of studies.
3. Faculty will scaffold education majors in realizing the inherent nature of school problems and how societal issues impact all aspect of teaching.

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

Undergraduate Programs in Teacher Education

Key Assessment Findings 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.

UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

Undergraduate Early Childhood Education

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

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Reading	180.7	168
Writing	179.7	165
Math	178.7	169

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Early Childhood: Content Knowledge (022)	176.3	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)	176	157

CUA's early childhood 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 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 *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 and 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 ten points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and almost 20 points higher on the PRAXIS II pedagogy test.

Key Assessment #2: Tutoring Journals

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Description and Adaptation	11	4	0	2.73
2. Theory into Practice	6	9	0	2.40
3. Active Engagement	11	4	0	2.73
4. Communication to Foster Learning	11	4	0	2.73
5. Assessment	9	6	0	2.60
6. Reflection and Evaluation	3	12	0	2.20
7. Writing Mechanics	7	7	1	2.40

All sophomore early childhood education candidates exceeded expectations in the following domains: description and adaptation, active engagement, communication to foster learning, and assessment. Candidates consistently met expectations regarding theory into practice, reflection and evaluation, and writing mechanics. The cohort's means ranged from 2.20 to 2.73.

Further analysis indicated that candidates performed better and exceeded expectations on later tutoring journals (three journals are submitted in this class). One assignment at the beginning of the semester needed attention in the area of writing mechanics; candidates did not have difficulties in this area in subsequent journals.

Key Assessment #3.1: Lesson Plans (EDUC 570)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Development, learning, and motivation	0	5	2	1.71
2. Adaptation to diverse students, lesson goals, rationale	0	5	2	1.71
3. Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction, standards, essential questions, objectives	0	6	1	1.86
4. Development of critical thinking and problem solving; materials, procedures, differentiation	0	5	2	1.71
5. Active engagement	1	5	1	2.00
6. Communication to foster learning	0	4	3	1.57
7. Assessment	0	2	5	1.29
8. Reflection	2	1	4	1.71

Key Assessment #3.2: Lesson Plans (EDUC 351, EDUC 571, EDUC 574, and EDUC 577)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Development, learning, and motivation	26	13	5	2.48
2. Adaptation to diverse students, lesson goals, rationale	29	8	7	2.50
3. Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction, standards, essential questions, objectives	20	20	4	2.36
4. Development of critical thinking and problem solving; materials, procedures, differentiation	27	11	6	2.48
5. Active engagement	25	18	1	2.55
6. Communication to foster learning	28	7	2	2.70
7. Assessment	17	20	7	2.23
8. Reflection	12	3	6	2.29

Data on the lesson plan assignment (from five courses in two semesters) are varied. EDUC 570, which early childhood education candidates take in the first professional semester (in the fall semester of the junior year), is the first course in which they learn lesson planning. Data in Table *Key Assessment #3.1* indicate that candidates were predominantly acquiring skills, such as communicating to foster learning, assessing, and reflecting. The candidates performed better in the areas of considering theories of development, learning, and motivation in designing lessons; adapting instruction to diverse students; creating essential questions and objectives; planning for the development of higher order thinking skills and problem solving; and planning for students' active engagement. The cohort average scores ranged from 1.29 to 1.86. These results are to be expected. Planning lessons is a complex activity that needs several semesters and years of practice to refine. Faculty members expect to see difficulties as planning lessons is especially challenging for first semester junior candidates.

Comparison of candidate performance in the fall and spring revealed that the same cohort of candidates demonstrated substantial growth and performed significantly better in their second professional semester (spring semester of their junior year, see table *Key Assessment #3.2*). However, some lesson plans were still not meeting expectations in some areas. A more nuanced analysis revealed that those lesson plans that did not meet expectations were designed at the beginning of the semester. Faculty worked individually with candidates who were still acquiring skills in order to provide feedback on how to improve their lesson plans and to scaffold their skills in these content domains. Toward the end of the semester most candidates met the expectations, and the cohort averages were consistently above meeting expectations in each area with means ranging from 2.23 to 2.70 (see Table *Key Assessment #3.2*). The instructors of all the courses (both in the fall and spring semester) revised the lesson plan template and scoring guide, and the EDUC 570 course was restructured to provide additional scaffolding and time for candidates to acquire the skill of lesson planning. See the description of changes for program improvement in the last section of this report.

Key Assessment #4: Student Teaching Evaluation

Items on Final Student Teaching Evaluations	Mean
Assessment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge	2.62
Assessment of Technology Use	2.50
Assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	2.65
Assessment of P-12 Impact during Student Teaching, AY 2012-2013	2.67

On the evaluation that occurs at the end of student teaching, all candidates met or exceeded expectations in terms of pedagogical content knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in applying such knowledge in the classroom context, and use of technology in the classroom. Candidates also met and sometimes exceeded expectations in the area of effectively and positively impacting student learning.

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

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Educational philosophy	4	0	0	3.00
2. Discussion of problematic situation and dilemma	4	0	0	3.00
3. Identifying causes	4	0	0	3.00
4. Pre/post data collection and analysis	4	0	0	3.00
5. Proposed solutions	4	0	0	3.00
6. Describing individual interventions	4	0	0	3.00
7. Development, learning, and motivation: Connections to course theories	3	1	0	2.75
8. Reflecting on impact on P-12 students	4	0	0	3.00
9. Collaboration with colleagues	4	0	0	3.00
10. Use of Literature	4	0	0	3.00
11. Professional Presentation	4	0	0	3.00

The early childhood candidates consistently 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, connect theory to practice, reflect on the overall impact of their intervention on their students, collaborate with colleagues, relate their project to their philosophy of teaching and to extant literature, and present their work professionally. Data on this key assessment indicate exemplary completion of this project: the cohort's means were very high ranging from 2.75 to 3.00.

Key Assessment #6: Electronic Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Professional Presentation	4	0	0	3.00
2. Quality of Reflection	4	0	0	3.00
3. Use of Artifacts	4	0	0	3.00
4. SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	4	0	0	3.00
5. Organization and Writing Mechanics	4	0	0	3.00
6. EP Oral Presentation	4	0	0	3.00

The early childhood education candidates consistently exceeded expectations in all domains of the electronic portfolio assignment completed during the capstone field experience. Data provide strong evidence for candidates' ability to develop and present their work professionally, reflect on their practice, select artifacts to showcase their ability to plan for and implement effective instruction, and use SPA and DCPS P-12 standards. The electronic portfolio data indicate exemplary performance with means of 3.00 in all areas.

Key Assessment #7: Observation Paper

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Description	10	2	0	2.83
2. Interpretation of observed behavior	11	1	0	2.92
3. Reflection and evaluation	4	6	2	2.17
4. Application	12	0	0	3.00
5. Attention to mechanics	3	4	5	1.83

The early childhood education candidates demonstrated high performance in their observational skills as measured by their ability to describe the behavior of children ranging in age from 6 months to 8 years, interpret behavior, and apply developmental theories. Candidates demonstrated a wider range of competence in the areas of reflection and evaluation, and five candidates' writing mechanics did not meet expectations. These candidates were referred to CUA's Writing Center and the course instructor for remediation. The cohort met expectations with means ranging from 2.17 to 3.00 with the exception of the writing mechanics where the mean was 1.83.

The observation assignment was revised in the Fall of 2013 to provide more explicit expectations for candidates regarding how to document all of the developmental domains and to include observations on parent-child and peer interactions with greater attention to family dynamics.

Key Assessment #8: Child Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Use of multiple assessment strategies	4	3	0	2.57
2. Evidence of knowledge of child's current development and level of functioning	5	2	0	2.71
3. Activities, instruction, and accommodations	7	0	0	3.00
4. Connections to environment	4	3	0	2.57

The early childhood education candidates consistently exceeded expectations regarding their knowledge of children's development across key domains and their skills in taking into account developmentally appropriate practice in designing activities for early childhood students. Candidates were also rated highly in their use of multiple assessment strategies and making connections to students' environments. The cohort's means ranged from 2.57 to 3.00.

Undergraduate Elementary Education

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

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Reading	177.5	168
Writing	179.1	165
Math	181.2	169

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (014)	164.8	145

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Elementary Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades K-6 (622)	173	160

CUA's elementary 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 *Elementary Education: Content Knowledge (014)* indicate that our candidates have solid preparation in the areas of reading/language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. 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 10-13 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and PRAXIS II pedagogy tests.

Key Assessment #2: Overall GPA

Elementary Education Candidates	Mean GPA
Overall GPA in Program	3.53

CUA elementary education candidates earned a mean GPA of 3.53 and met expectations in this area.

Key Assessment #3.1: Lesson Plans (EDUC 570)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Development, learning, and motivation	0	7	7	1.50
2. Adaptation to diverse students, lesson goals, rationale	0	4	10	1.29
3. Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction, standards, essential questions, objectives	0	9	5	1.64
4. Development of critical thinking and problem solving; materials, procedures, differentiation	0	8	6	1.57
5. Active engagement	2	8	4	1.86
6. Communication to foster learning	0	6	8	1.43
7. Assessment	0	9	5	1.64
8. Reflection	0	10	4	1.71

Key Assessment #3.2: Lesson Plans (EDUC 351, EDUC 571, EDUC 574, and EDUC 577)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Development, learning, and motivation	52	25	11	2.47
2. Adaptation to diverse students, lesson goals, rationale	52	24	12	2.45
3. Integrating and applying knowledge for instruction, standards, essential questions, objectives	45	32	10	2.40
4. Development of critical thinking and problem solving; materials, procedures, differentiation	46	25	17	2.33
5. Active engagement	54	29	5	2.56
6. Communication to foster learning	55	14	4	2.70
7. Assessment	36	34	18	2.20
8. Reflection	26	7	9	2.40

Data on the lesson plan assignment (from five courses in two semesters) are varied. EDUC 570, which elementary education candidates take in the first professional semester (in the fall semester of the junior year), is the first course in which they learn lesson planning. Data in Table *Key Assessment #3.1* indicate that candidates were predominantly acquiring skills, such as adapting lessons to diverse students and creating lesson goals and rationale, and communicating to foster learning. The candidates performed better in the areas of considering theories of development, learning, and motivation in designing lessons; adapting instruction to diverse students; integrating and applying knowledge for instruction and creating essential questions and objectives; planning for the development of higher order thinking skills and problem solving; planning for students' active engagement; assessing, and reflecting. The cohort average scores ranged from 1.29 to 1.86. These results are to be expected. Planning lessons is a complex activity that needs several semesters and years of practice to refine. Faculty members expect to see difficulties as planning lessons is especially challenging for first semester junior candidates.

Comparison of candidate performance in the fall and spring revealed that the same cohort of candidates demonstrated substantial growth and performed significantly better in their second professional semester (spring semester of their junior year). However, some lesson plans were still not meeting expectations in some areas. A more detailed analysis revealed that those lesson plans that did not meet expectations were designed at the beginning of the semester. Faculty worked individually with candidates who were still acquiring skills in order to provide feedback on how to improve their lesson plans and to scaffold their skills in these content domains. Toward the end of the semester most candidates met the expectations, and the cohort

averages were consistently above meeting expectations in each area with means ranging from 2.20 to 2.70 (see Table *Key Assessment #3.2*).

The instructors of all the courses (both in the fall and spring semester) revised the lesson plan template and scoring guide, and the EDUC 570 course was restructured to provide additional scaffolding and time for candidates to acquire the skill of lesson planning. See the description of changes for program improvement in the last section of this report.

Key Assessment #4: Student Teaching Evaluation

Items on Final Student Teaching Evaluations	Mean
Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge	2.33
Assessment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge	2.71
Assessment of Technology Use	2.78
Assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	2.70
Assessment of P-12 Impact during Student Teaching, AY 2012-2013	2.89

On the evaluation that occurs at the end of student teaching, all elementary candidates met or exceeded expectations in terms of content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in applying such knowledge in the classroom context, and use of technology in the classroom. Candidates also met and sometimes exceeded expectations in the area of effectively and positively impacting student learning. 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

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Educational philosophy	8	1	0	2.89
2. Discussion of problematic situation and dilemma	8	1	0	2.89
3. Identifying causes	8	1	0	2.89
4. Pre/post data collection and analysis	5	4	0	2.56
5. Proposed solutions	9	0	0	3.00
6. Describing individual interventions	8	1	0	2.89
7. Development, learning, and motivation: Connections to course theories	7	2	0	2.78
8. Reflecting on impact on P-12 students	6	3	0	2.67
9. Collaboration with colleagues	9	0	0	3.00
10. Use of Literature	7	2	0	2.78
11. Professional Presentation	8	1	0	2.89

The elementary education candidates consistently 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, connect theory to practice, reflect on the overall impact of their intervention on their students, collaborate with colleagues, relate their project to their philosophy of teaching and to extant literature, and present their work professionally. Data on this key assessment indicate exemplary completion of this project: the cohort's means were very high ranging from 2.56 and 3.00.

Key Assessment #6: Tutoring Journals

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Description and Adaptation	43	7	0	2.86
2. Theory into Practice	39	11	0	2.78
3. Active Engagement	43	7	0	2.86
4. Communication to Foster Learning	43	7	0	2.86
5. Assessment	41	9	0	2.82
6. Reflection and Evaluation	43	7	0	2.86
7. Writing Mechanics	39	10	0	2.80

All sophomore elementary education candidates exceeded expectations in all the domains of this assignment: description and adaptation, theory into practice, active engagement, communication to foster learning, assessment, reflection and evaluation, and writing mechanics. The cohort's means ranged from 2.78 to 2.86.

Key Assessment #7: Electronic Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Professional Presentation	8	1	0	2.89
2. Quality of Reflection	8	1	0	2.89
3. Use of Artifacts	9	0	0	3.00
4. SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	8	1	0	2.89
5. Organization and Writing Mechanics	8	1	0	2.89
6. EP Oral Presentation	8	1	0	2.89

The elementary education candidates consistently met or exceeded expectations in all domains of the electronic portfolio assignment completed during the capstone field experience. Data provide strong evidence for candidates' ability to develop and present their work professionally. More specifically, the electronic portfolio data indicate exemplary performance in the areas of selection of artifacts to showcase the candidates' ability to plan for and implement effective instruction, reflection, use of SPA and DCPS P-12 standards, and the professional oral presentation of the portfolio. The cohort's means ranged from 2.89 to 3.00.

Key Assessment #8: Thematic Unit in 1) EDUC 351 & 574 and 2) EDUC 571 & EDUC 577

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Description of integrated unit	8	12	6	2.08
2. Collaboration with families and connection to family, community, student need	6	6	0	2.50
3. Development, learning, and motivation: Connections to course theories	7	13	6	2.04
4. Integration of unit components	14	9	3	2.42
5. Adaptation to diverse students, lesson goals, rationale	7	14	4	2.12
6. Development of critical thinking and problem solving, differentiation	10	7	9	2.04
7. Active engagement	14	8	4	2.38
8. Communication to foster learning	14	8	3	2.44
9. Curriculum: Science	10	2	0	2.83
10. Curriculum: Health	3	9	0	2.25
11. Curriculum: Physical education	5	7	0	2.42
12. Curriculum: Mathematics	13	8	2	2.47
13. Curriculum: Social Studies	4	4	6	1.86
14. Curriculum: Language Arts	6	5	3	2.21
15. Assessment	6	18	2	2.15
16. Annotated Bibliography	7	12	7	2.00
17. Reflection & Professional Presentation	5	13	8	1.88

CUA elementary education candidates completed two thematic units for the first time in their second semester junior methods classes integrating units in language arts and social studies as well as math and science, health, and physical education. The cohort means indicate that on average the cohort met expectations with means ranging from 2.00 to 2.83; however, the cohort averages were 1.86 and 1.88 in the areas of social studies curriculum and reflection and professional presentation respectively. A more comprehensive analysis indicates that candidates had difficulties in 13 out of 17 areas of the assignment, more specifically, in the areas of describing the integrated unit, making connections between theory and practice, integrating unit components, adapting instruction to diverse students as well as creating a rationale and lesson goals, developing critical thinking and problem solving as well as differentiating instruction, actively engaging students, communicating to foster learning, integrating curricular areas in mathematics, social studies and language arts, assessing student learning, creating an annotated bibliography, and reflecting as well as professionally presenting

the unit. This pattern of performance is to be expected as this semester was the first exposure to thematic units, which are very complex assignments. Candidates will continue practicing the skills of writing thematic units during their student teaching experience.

Undergraduate Secondary English Education

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

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Reading	176	168
Writing	180	165
Math	179	169

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
English Language, Literature, & Composition: Content Knowledge (041)	163	160

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades 7-12 (624)	170	157

The secondary English education candidate successfully passed the Praxis I and Praxis II tests required for licensure. The pass rates on Praxis I indicate that the candidate who has been admitted to the program has the requisite content knowledge in math, reading, and writing to be eligible for teacher licensure. The candidate performed 8-15 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS I test in all three domains, reading, writing, and math.

The score on the Praxis II content test entitled *English Language, Literature, & Composition: Content Knowledge (041)* indicates that the candidate has solid preparation in the areas of literature and understanding text, language and linguistics, and composition and rhetoric. Similarly, the high score on the Praxis II pedagogy test entitled *Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades 7-12 (624)* exam suggest that our candidate 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. The candidate performed three points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and 13 points higher on the PRAXIS II pedagogy test.

Key Assessment #2: Undergraduate Comprehensive Exam

According to the Department of English the secondary English candidate successfully passed the comprehensive exams in English.

Key Assessment #3: Unit Plan

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Lesson Goals/ Rationale/ Audience	0	2	0	2.00
2. Standards/ Essential Questions/ Objectives	0	2	0	2.00
3. Materials/ Procedures/ Differentiation	1	1	0	2.50
4. Assessment	0	2	0	2.00
5. Reflection	0	2	0	2.00

The secondary English candidate demonstrated the ability to plan for a unit of instruction, meeting all the expectations in regard to goals and objective settings, development of essential questions, assessment, and reflection. The candidate exceeded expectations in regard to identifying rich and appropriate instructional materials and planning for effective and differentiated instruction. The candidate's scores ranged from 2.00 to 2.50.

Key Assessment #4: General Student Teaching Evaluation

Items on Final Student Teaching Evaluations	Mean
Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge	3.00
Assessment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge	2.71
Assessment of Technology Use	3.00
Assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	3.00
Assessment of P-12 Impact during Student Teaching, AY 2012-2013	3.00

On the evaluation that occurs at the end of student teaching, the secondary English candidate exceeded expectations in terms of content knowledge as well as professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in applying such knowledge in the classroom context, and use of technology in the classroom. . The candidate also met and often exceeded expectations in terms of pedagogical content knowledge. The candidate also consistently exceeded expectations in the area of effectively and positively impacting student learning.

Key Assessment #5: Action Research Project

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	Mean
1. Educational Philosophy (Part I, Sections 1, 7)	1	0	0	3.00
2. Discussion of Problematic Situation and Dilemma (Part I, Sections 2)	1	0	0	3.00
3. Identifying Causes (Part II, Sections 3A, B)	1	0	0	3.00
4. Pre/Post Data Collection and Analysis (Part II, Sections 3C, 5, 6)	1	0	0	3.00
5. Proposed Solutions (Part II, Section 4)	1	0	0	3.00
6. Describing Individual Interventions (Part II, Section 5)	1	0	0	3.00
7. Reflecting on Impact on P-12 Students (Part III, Section 7)	1	0	0	3.00
8. Use of Literature (Throughout paper, but specifically in Part II, Sections 3 B, C)	1	0	0	3.00
9. Professional Presentation	1	0	0	3.00

The secondary English 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 student teaching experience, identify causes of observed behaviors, collect and analyze pre- and post-implementation data to evaluate the outcomes of interventions, propose and describe solution strategies as individual interventions, connect theory to practice, reflect on the overall impact of intervention on students, relate the project to the candidate's philosophy of teaching and to extant literature, and present 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: Instructional Framework

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Lesson Goals/ Rationale/ Audience	3	0	0	3.00
2. Standards/ Essential Questions/ Objectives	2	0	1	2.33
3. Materials/ Procedures/ Differentiation	2	1	0	2.67
4. Assessment	3	0	0	3.00
5. Reflection	3	0	0	3.00

The secondary English candidates demonstrated their ability to successfully develop lesson plans for a differentiated group of students. They all exceeded expectations in regard to their ability to develop appropriate goals and assessment and reflect on the pedagogical choices they made, and exceeded or met expectations in regard to identifying rich and appropriate instructional materials and planning for effective and differentiated instruction. One candidate did not meet the expectations in regard to developing essential questions and identifying specific objectives and was referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 2.33 to 3.00.

Key Assessment #7: Electronic Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Professional Presentation	1	0	0	3.00
2. Quality of Reflection	1	0	0	3.00
3. Use of Artifacts	1	0	0	3.00
4. SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	1	0	0	3.00
5. Organization and Writing Mechanics	1	0	0	3.00
6. EP Oral Presentation	1	0	0	3.00

The secondary English candidate exceeded expectations in all domains of the electronic portfolio assignment completed during the capstone field experience. Data provide strong evidence for the candidate's ability to develop and present an electronic portfolio professionally. More specifically, the electronic portfolio data indicate exemplary performance in the areas of selection of artifacts to showcase the candidates' ability to plan for and implement effective instruction, reflection, use of SPA and DCPS P-12 standards, and the professional oral presentation of the portfolio. 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 #8: Annotated bibliography

Parts of Assignment	Exceeds Expectation (3 pts)	Meets Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Citations	1	0	0	3.00
2. Range of Literature: Time & Culture	0	1	0	2.00
3. Range of Literature: Genre & Author	0	0	0	N/A
4. Audience	1	0	0	3.00
5. Summary and Analysis	0	1	0	2.00
6. Use in Curriculum	0	0	0	N/A

The secondary English candidate demonstrated knowledge of adolescent literature and met expectations in terms of the range of the literature considered and the ability to summarize and analyze its content. The candidate exceeded expectations in regard to the ability to describe the audience of the texts and to provide appropriate citations of the texts. When the candidate completed this key assessment, the range of literature was holistically evaluated, and the candidate was not required to provide suggestions for use of the literature within the curriculum. This explains the terms N/A on Lines 3 and 6. The candidate's scores ranged from 2.00 to 3.00.

Since the last administration of this key assessment, the template and scoring guides have been revised to obtain data in the areas of Genre & Author and Use in Curriculum.

Undergraduate Secondary Math Education

The undergraduate 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.

Undergraduate Secondary Social Studies Education

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

Name of Test	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Writing	178.5	165

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Social Studies: Content Knowledge (081)	175	155

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

PRAXIS™ II	Cohort Mean	DC Minimum Score
Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades 7-12 (624)	173	157

CUA's secondary social studies 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 13.5 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS I tests in the domain of writing. (These candidates used their qualifying SAT scores in lieu of the PRAXIS I reading and math tests.)

High scores on the Praxis II content test entitled *Social Studies: Content Knowledge (081)* indicate that our candidates have solid preparation in the areas of United States history, world history, government/civics/political science, geography, economics, and behavioral sciences. Similarly, the high scores on the Praxis II pedagogy test entitled *Principles of Learning & Teaching: Grades 7-12 (624)* 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 20 points higher than the minimum score for Washington, D.C. on the PRAXIS II content test and 16 points higher on the PRAXIS II pedagogy test.

Key Assessment #2: Undergraduate GPA

Overall GPA Before Student Teaching (Mean)	GPA in Content Area Before Student Teaching (Mean)
3.19	3.05

CUA's secondary social studies candidates entered student teaching with a 3.05 GPA in the content area and an overall GPA of 3.19.

Key Assessment #3: Lesson Plans (EDUC 585 & 582)

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Lesson Goals/ Rationale/ Audience	5	1	0	2.83
2. Standards/ Essential Questions/ Objectives	2	3	1	2.17
3. Materials/ Procedures/ Differentiation	3	3	0	2.50
4. Assessment	5	1	0	2.83
5. Reflection	5	1	0	2.83

During their junior and senior years, secondary social studies candidates were assessed six times on their ability to develop effective and diversified lessons plans. Data on the lesson plan assignment indicate that they mostly exceeded expectations in regard to goal settings, development of assessment, and reflection. They met or exceeded expectations in regard to their ability to develop essential questions, identify specific objectives and rich and appropriate instructional materials, and plan for effective and differentiated instruction.

The candidate who did not meet the expectations in regard to developing essential questions and objectives was referred to the course instructor for remediation. Toward the end of the semester the candidate met the expectations. The cohort averages were consistently above meeting expectations in each area with means ranging from 2.17 to 2.83.

Key Assessment #4: Student Teaching Evaluation

Items on Final Student Teaching Evaluations	Mean
Assessment of Candidate Content Knowledge	2.50
Assessment of Pedagogical Content Knowledge	2.29
Assessment of Technology Use	2.50
Assessment of Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	2.67
Assessment of P-12 Impact during Student Teaching, AY 2012-2013	2.39

On the evaluation that occurs at the end of student teaching, all secondary social studies candidates met or exceeded expectations in terms of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills in applying such knowledge in the classroom context, as well as the use of technology in the classroom. Candidates also met and sometimes exceeded expectations in the area of effectively and positively impacting student learning. 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

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Educational Philosophy (Part I, Sections 1, 7)	1	1	0	2.50
2. Discussion of Problematic Situation and Dilemma (Part I, Sections 2)	2	0	0	3.00
3. Identifying Causes (Part II, Sections 3A, B)	2	0	0	3.00
4. Pre/Post Data Collection and Analysis (Part II, Sections 3C, 5, 6)	0	2	0	2.00
5. Proposed Solutions (Part II, Section 4)	1	1	0	2.50
6. Describing Individual Interventions (Part II, Section 5)	0	2	0	2.00
7. Reflecting on Impact on P-12 Students (Part III, Section 7)	0	2	0	2.00
8. Use of Literature (Throughout paper, but specifically in Part II, Sections 3 B, C)	1	1	0	2.50
9. Professional Presentation	0	2	0	2.00

CUA's secondary social studies candidates exceeded expectations in regard to the discussion of a problematic situation encountered in the context of their student teaching experience and the identification of causes of observed behaviors. They met, and in some cases exceeded, expectations in proposing and describing solutions, collecting pre- and post-data to evaluate the outcomes of the intervention, relating their project to their philosophy of teaching and to extant literature, reflecting on the overall impact of the intervention on students, and presenting their work professionally. The cohort's means ranged from 2.00 to 3.00.

Key Assessment #6: Electronic Portfolio

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Professional Presentation	0	2	0	2.00
2. Quality of Reflection	0	2	0	2.00
3. Use of Artifacts	0	1	1	1.50
4. SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	0	2	0	2.00
5. Organization and Writing Mechanics	0	2	0	2.00
6. EP Oral Presentation	0	1	1	1.50

The secondary social studies candidates met most of the expectations in the electronic portfolio assignment completed during the capstone field experience. Data indicate that the candidates were able to develop and present their work professionally, reflect on their practice, and use SPA and DCPS P-12 standards. One candidate did not meet the expectations in regard to the oral presentation of the portfolio and the selection of artifacts able to showcase the candidate's ability to plan for and implement effective instruction. The candidate was referred to the course instructor for remediation. The cohort's means ranged from 1.50 to 2.00.

Key Assessment #7: Unit Plan

Parts of Assignment	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pt)	Mean
1. Lesson Goals/ Rationale/ Audience	4	1	0	2.80
2. Standards/ Essential Questions/ Objectives	2	3	0	2.40
3. Materials/ Procedures/ Differentiation	2	3	0	2.40
4. Assessment	5	0	0	3.00
5. Reflection	5	0	0	3.00

The secondary social studies candidates exceeded expectations in regard to their ability to develop appropriate assessments for their unit of instruction and reflect upon their pedagogical choices. Candidates also met or exceeded expectations in regard to their ability to develop

goals and essential questions for their unit, and identify specific objectives, materials, and differentiated instructional approaches for reaching the stated objectives. The cohort's means ranged from 2.40 to 3.00.

Key Assessment #8: This program administers seven key assessments only.

Department of Education: Education Studies AY 2012-2013 Key Assessment Findings

The Education Studies comprehensive exam is used to assess students' mastery of the core education content. Students request six questions based on content from the core classes that they have taken in the Department of Education. Due to the highly individualized nature of education studies, not all students have taken the same courses. Students have five weeks to respond to five of six questions written by the instructor of record. Questions are written to gauge students' understanding of the standards from each course. After the instructor has evaluated the student responses based on accuracy, adequacy and cogency, the scores are submitted to the faculty for a final vote. If a student fails a question, a second reader scores the question. The average of the two scores is used to determine the final score.

As an alternative to taking the comprehensive exam, students can register for an internship where they spend a semester engaging their area of specialization. Students are required to implement a project and report on their experiences in the form of a senior thesis. Their senior thesis includes a literature review, project action plan, implementation, analysis and reflection/conclusion. Students defend their thesis before a public audience and faculty members. In AY 2012-2013, all students took the comprehensive exam.

Summary of Scores from the Comprehensive Exam

To pass the Comprehensive Exam, all students must earn at least a total of 15 points on the five questions. In order to receive a high pass, students must accumulate 20 points with no single question receiving less than a 3.67. Four students took the comprehensive exam. One student received a high pass with a mean score of 4.2. Two students passed with mean scores of 2.9 and 3. One student initially failed the exam with a mean score of 2.5. Upon retake, the student passed with a mean score of 3.4.

Explanation of Scores: Some of the students in the Education Studies program transfer into the program from Teacher Education because they discover that they are no longer interested in being a teacher or because they were unsuccessful in the major. Others transfer into the program in their junior or senior year from other majors. This was the case for the Education Studies majors taking the comps. The students who struggled with their comprehensive exam came into the program in their senior year.

Curricular Improvements for Teacher Education in AY 2012-13

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE

Activities and Progress:

1. The teacher education faculty members have increased the education and cumulative GPA requirements for undergraduate admission and continuation from 2.75 to 3.0.
2. The Teacher Education Committee members approved the College Basic Academic Subjects Examination (CBASE) test for the early childhood and elementary education programs in Fall 2012. The test will be administered for the incoming Class of 2017 (first administration for this cohort will occur in Spring 2015). CBASE, developed by the Assessment Resource Center at the University of Missouri-Columbia, is a test of general education knowledge that assesses four subject areas: language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies, and it also has a writing component. The exam also measures three cross-disciplinary competencies including interpretive reasoning, strategic reasoning, and adaptive reasoning.
3. The early childhood program coordinator revised EDUC 584: *Curriculum and Strategies in Early Childhood Education* to include more detail on developmentally appropriate practices, strategies for supporting diversity and promoting anti-bias practices in the classroom, and greater attention to specific content areas including aesthetics, language arts, math, science as well as the cognitive and socio-emotional domains. For example, new topics now include the goals of anti-bias education and candidates practice using a scoring guide for evaluating the diversity in early childhood classroom environments in terms of visuals and environmental print, toys and materials, and interactions. Candidates practice writing developmental objectives and choosing strategies for implementing activities in different classroom domains. Candidates discuss strategies for learning about culture and supporting positive relationships with families.
4. Elementary faculty revised the student teaching evaluation form to focus more on content knowledge. The revised form is being implemented in Fall 2013.
5. The secondary social studies program coordinator modified the tracking sheet for secondary social studies education undergraduate candidates to ensure their preparation in the ten NCSS Thematic standards.

Plans and Timeline:

1. Program faculty are currently re-evaluating undergraduate 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. The Director of Teacher Education continues to meet with candidates who are on provisional and probationary semesters on a regular basis. The meetings will be held twice a month instead of once a month (beginning in Fall 2014). Advising faculty also meet with candidates who are on provisional or probationary semesters.

PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHER CANDIDATES

Activities and Progress:

1. The Action Research Project now ensures that all undergraduate candidates are able to “select and develop instructional strategies based on research and experience, that help all students learn.”
2. The early childhood program coordinator revised the observation assignment in the Fall of 2013 to provide more explicit expectations for candidates regarding how to document all of the developmental domains and to include observations on parent-child and peer interactions with greater attention to family dynamics.
3. Elementary education faculty restructured EDUC 570 based on candidate performance data from the Fall 2012 semester to focus more on adaptation and differentiation, authentic tasks, and authentic assessments.
4. The elementary program coordinator revised the tutoring journal assignment to focus more on active engagement, communication skills to foster learning, and assessment.
5. The program coordinator for the undergraduate 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.
6. The secondary English program coordinator revised the scoring guide for the electronic portfolio to include assessment of undergraduate secondary English teacher candidates' performance specified in NCTE standards.
7. Secondary English faculty revised the annotated bibliography assignment administered in EDUC 582 for undergraduates 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.
8. Secondary English and social studies faculty revised the Unit Plan assignment administered in EDUC 580 and EDUC 585 for undergraduates in order to include clear reference to the specific disciplinary knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

Plans and Timeline:

1. Early childhood and elementary faculty revised the lesson plan template and scoring guide based on candidate performance in the Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 semesters to include a section on an annotated bibliography and P-12 student misconceptions. The newly revised version is piloted in the AY 2013-14. The lesson plan template and scoring guide will be finalized (in Fall 2014).
2. Early childhood and elementary faculty will revise the early childhood/elementary thematic unit template and scoring guide (beginning in November 2013) based on candidate performance in the Spring 2013 semester to include more focus on content.
3. In addition to the elementary student teaching evaluation, undergraduate program coordinators will revise all other 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 undergraduate candidates to learn how to implement technology in order to deliver cutting edge teaching practices in the classroom.
2. Elementary education faculty revised the microteaching component in EDUC 570 and added a detailed reflection protocol. During the semester, candidates teach multiple short lessons, which are video recorded. Candidates use the conceptual framework to guide their reflection.
3. The elementary program coordinator revised the elementary Action Research Project to include more connections to course theories and collaboration with colleagues.

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.

Curricular Improvements for Education Studies

In AY 2012-2013, the Department of Education approved the course entitled, EDUC 545 *Contemporary Issues in American Education*. Considered a capstone course, this course serves upper-level undergraduates and focuses on seminar-style discussions of current issues in American education including the political, social, economic, and religious goals of education.

Education Studies alongside the Psychology Department redeveloped the Psychology major/Education Studies minor option.

The Education Studies faculty members are reexamining the comprehensive exam and are considering a paper format that would be attached to the capstone course EDUC 545: *Contemporary Issues in American Education*.