

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Baccalaureate Study in Education
Assessment Findings and Curricular Improvements

Early Childhood Education

Licensure Tests

PRAXIS I: Reading, Writing, and Math

Data on PRAXIS I are used to determine eligibility for program admittance. In AY 2007-08, six students applied to the early childhood teacher education program. Five students met PRAXIS I requirements and were accepted into the program. One student did not submit passing scores on PRAXIS I and was provisionally accepted to the program with the stipulation that PRAXIS I requirements be met by the end of the fall 2008 semester.

PRAXIS II: Education of Young Children

Scores on the PRAXIS II test are criteria required for eligibility for state licensure. Altogether two candidates took and passed the PRAXIS II test and applied for licensure. The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) closely monitors PRAXIS II pass rates to determine the effectiveness of the early childhood program to prepare candidates for the teaching profession. In the past TEC members made programmatic changes by reorganizing courses to place stronger focus on certain subject areas tested on the licensure exams.

Lesson Plans

Two candidates submitted 3 lesson plans each in their methods courses. Faculty assessed the assignments using the lesson plan scoring guide. All lesson plans met or exceeded expectations for performance on the assessment. Data on this assessment are presented in the following table.

Based on the lesson plan data from previous years, the lesson plan assignment was modified for the spring 2008 semester to better enable candidates to demonstrate ability to align learning outcomes with appropriate and engaging teaching methods and assessments. Opportunities for modeling and guided practice throughout the lesson development process and the presentation of authentic options for lesson planning seemed to have impact on candidate performance. Data from lesson plans submitted in the AY 2007-08 demonstrate improvement in the statement of learning outcomes, the integration of relevant models of instruction, and the development of valid assessments of learning.

Report Title: Lesson Plans

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their lesson plans in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Audience/ Rationale	<u>5</u> (83%)	<u>1</u> (16%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Standards/ Objectives	<u>5</u> (83%)	<u>1</u> (16%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Materials/Procedures	<u>5</u> (83%)	<u>1</u> (16%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Evaluation/Assessment	<u>3</u> (50%)	<u>3</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Reflection	<u>4</u> (80%)	<u>1</u> (16%)	<u>0</u>	2.80	3	0.40

Total Documents Assessed: 6

Student Teaching

Two early childhood teacher education candidates completed student teaching in the fall 2007 semester. The student teaching evaluation includes assessment in all major areas of teaching. All candidates met or exceeded expectations for performance during the student teaching semester, based on the averages of performance aligned with professional standards. The program coordinator reviews data from each program assessment and, with input from the Teacher Education Committee, determines any directions for improving candidate performance. In the following table averaged scores are presented in each category.

<u>Student Teaching Evaluation</u> n=2	Overall Score* (Average)
Early Childhood	
Candidate's Personal and Professional Qualities	3
Planning, Organization, and Assessment Skills	3
Curriculum and Teacher Directed Activities	3
Child-Directed Activities	3
Interactions with Children	3
Social Context	3
Decision Making and Reflective Qualities	2

*Scoring: 3=exceeding expectation, 2=meeting expectation, 1=acquiring skill

Action Research Project

Two candidates completed the Action Research Project (ARP) during the student teaching experience. Each candidate met or exceeded expectations for performance on the project. Feedback from candidates and student teaching supervisors suggests that although all candidates

met expectations for the use of pretest and posttest data, this requirement seemed to pose the greatest challenge for the majority of candidates.

The Department of Education's Assessment Committee is currently revising the template for the ARP. It is the feeling of the committee that the project, in its current form, is too broad in scope. It is our expectation that a revised format, to be piloted in the spring 2009 semester, will improve candidate performance in the use of pretest and posttest data to inform the selection of interventions and to enable reflection on P-12 impact.

Report Title: Action Research Project

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their action research project in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Expectations (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Educational Philosophy	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00
Systematic Observations	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00
Exploring Causes	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Plan for Pre/Post Measures	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Exploring Interventions	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Describing Individual Interventions	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Reflecting on Impact on P-12 Students	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Reflecting on Professional Development	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.50
Use of Literature	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Professional Presentation	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00

Total Documents Assessed: 2

Electronic Portfolio

Two candidates completed the electronic portfolio as a requirement for licensure. As indicated in the table below, candidates met or exceeded expectations in all categories aligned with professional standards.

Data from the previous year suggested a need for more explicit guidance on the presentation of artifacts that demonstrate achievement of professional standards. Data from this current year suggest that a student teaching seminar session on the use of standards, more guidance from faculty supervisors, and revised scoring guides in some academic areas had positive impact on candidate performance.

Report Title: Electronic Portfolio

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their electronic portfolio in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Professional Presentation	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00
Quality of Reflection	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Use of Artifacts	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00
SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	2.00	2	0.00
Organization and Writing Mechanics	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
EP Oral Presentation	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00

Total Documents Assessed: 2

Observation

In EDUC 261: *Human Growth and Development* candidates conduct observations of children of various ages. Using the CUA conceptual framework, candidates complete a series of reflections on what is observed. All candidates who completed this assessment met or exceeded expectations for performance.

Data from this assessment indicate that candidates are proficient in the use of CUA's conceptual framework to guide their reflections on what is observed. We feel that increased attention to the framework at the sophomore level has positively impacted performance in the junior year. Although performance based on use of the framework for reflection has improved overall, data suggest that candidates are less proficient in interpreting observations from multiple perspectives.

Report Title: Observation Paper

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their Observation Paper in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeds Expectation (3 pts)	Meets Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Description	<u>1</u> (25%)	<u>3</u> (75%)	<u>0</u>	2.25	2	0.43
Interpretation of observed behavior	<u>1</u> (25%)	<u>3</u> (75%)	<u>0</u>	2.25	2	0.43
Reflection and evaluation	<u>1</u> (25%)	<u>3</u> (75%)	<u>0</u>	2.25	2	0.43
Application	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	2.00	2	0.00
Attention to mechanics	<u>0</u>	<u>4</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	2.00	2	0.00

Total Documents Assessed: 4

Child Portfolio

This assignment is designed to evaluate candidates' assessment strategies that expand the sources of information they consult in order to understand young children in the context of their families and communities as well as their classrooms. This assignment is unique to the early childhood program because of its emphasis on the family and community context. In addition to the written report, candidates share their portfolios with their peers using PowerPoint presentations.

Data in the table below indicate that both candidates met or exceeded expectations in all areas but one. One of the candidates had difficulty with providing evidence of knowledge of child's current development and level of functioning in the following domains: self-concept, self-esteem, language, literacy, gross and fine motor, math, science, and cognitive development, including problem solving, and planning skills.

The strength of this assessment is to 1) allow candidates to document, along with other artifacts, their ability to demonstrate their understanding of child development as they create a respectful and challenging environment, 2) show programmatic evidence of multiple opportunities for our candidates to document how they involve, support, and empower families and communities in their child's development, and 3) indicate how our candidates use responsible assessment, including seeking partnerships with families, to assist them in developing instruction plans for their children.

Report Title: Child Portfolio

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their child portfolio in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Use of Multiple Assessment Strategies to include: Observations Work Samples Teacher Input Parent Input	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	2.00	2	0.00
Evidence of knowledge of child's current development and level of functioning in the following domains: Self-concept, Self Esteem, Language, Literacy, Gross and Fine Motor, Math, Science, and Cognitive development, including problem solving, and planning skills.	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u> (50%)	2.00	1	1.00
Activities and instruction takes into consideration the developmental needs of the children and supports the development and learning of all children. Activities and instruction reflects individual students, families, language and culture. Specific activities, accommodations for individual needs discussed.	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>1</u> (50%)	<u>0</u>	2.50	2	0.50
Environment connections looks at environment from the perspective of individual child: How does the student respond to the environment? What adaptations did you make? What recommendations would you recommend?	<u>2</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00

Total Documents Assessed: 2

Elementary Education Program

This section presents data on candidates' performance on key assessments using outcome measures listed in the first section of this report. Following the presentation of data for each key assessment is a discussion of how data are used to improve candidate learning.

Licensure Tests

PRAXIS I: Reading, Writing, and Math

Data on PRAXIS I are used to determine eligibility for program admittance. In AY 2007-08, ten students applied to the elementary teacher education program. All but one met PRAXIS I test requirements and were fully accepted into the program. One student did not submit passing scores on PRAXIS I and was provisionally accepted to the program with the stipulation that PRAXIS I requirements be met by the end of the fall 2008 semester.

PRAXIS II: Elementary Education: Content Knowledge

This PRAXIS II test is a licensure requirement but is also used to determine candidates' content knowledge prior to student teaching in the senior semester. In the AY 2007-08 ten candidates passed the test, and one failed. During the capstone experience the student teaching supervisor monitored that student teacher who had difficulty on the test. In order to receive the standard DC license the candidate will have to retake and pass the test. The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) closely monitors PRAXIS II pass rates to determine the effectiveness of the elementary program to prepare candidates for the teaching profession. In the past TEC members made programmatic changes by reorganizing courses to place stronger focus on certain subject areas tested on the licensure exams.

Tutoring Assignment

A minimum of five tutoring assignments were completed by ten sophomore elementary candidates in EDUC 361: *Psychology of Learning*, and some candidates submitted an additional assignment for extra credit.

Data in the table below indicate that candidates find this assignment challenging especially at the beginning of the semester. By providing sample tutoring journals and very thorough feedback on each journal, faculty scaffold candidates ability to describe their tutees' successes and difficulties on tasks during the tutoring session, link theory to practice, and use the CUA conceptual framework to guide their reflection. Further analysis indicates that most candidates met or exceeded expectations in all areas in Journal #5 by the end of the semester.

Report Title: Tutoring Journal

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their tutoring journal in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Std.ev</i>
Description	<u>28</u> (48%)	<u>23</u> (39%)	<u>7</u> (12%)	2.36	3	0.69
Theory into Practice	<u>16</u> (27%)	<u>28</u> (48%)	<u>14</u> 24(%)	2.03	2	0.72
Reflection and Evaluation	<u>22</u> (37%)	<u>16</u> (27%)	<u>20</u> 34(%)	2.03	3	0.85
Writing Mechanics	<u>17</u> (29%)	<u>31</u> (53%)	<u>10</u> 17(%)	2.12	2	0.67

Total Documents Assessed: 57

Lesson Plan

Ten candidates submitted at least 4 lesson plans each in their methods courses. Some submitted additional lesson plans for extra credit. Faculty assessed the assignments using the lesson plan scoring guide. As the data analysis below indicates, most lesson plans met and exceeded the expectations on this assessment. Further analysis of the lesson plans that did not meet expectations (at the performance level of 'acquiring skill') were submitted by 5 candidates.

Based on lesson plan data from previous years, the lesson plan assignment was modified for the spring 2008 semester to better enable candidates to demonstrate ability to align learning outcomes with appropriate and engaging teaching methods and assessments. Opportunities for modeling and guided practice throughout the lesson development process and the presentation of authentic options for lesson planning seemed to have impact on candidate performance. Data from lesson plans submitted in the AY 2007-08 demonstrate improvement in the statement of learning outcomes, the integration of relevant models of instruction, and the development of valid assessments of learning.

Report Title: Lesson Plans

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their lesson plans in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Audience/ Rationale	<u>32</u> (71%)	<u>10</u> (22%)	<u>3</u> (6%)	2.64	3	0.60
Standards/ Objectives	<u>22</u> (48%)	<u>19</u> (42%)	<u>4</u> (8%)	2.40	3	0.65
Materials/Procedures	<u>28</u> (62%)	<u>13</u> (28%)	<u>4</u> (8%)	2.53	3	0.65
Evaluation/Assessment	<u>28</u> (62%)	<u>14</u> (31%)	<u>3</u> (6%)	2.56	3	0.62
Reflection	<u>26</u> (78%)	<u>6</u> (18%)	<u>1</u> (3%)	2.76	3	0.49

Total Documents Assessed: 43

Thematic Unit

The Thematic Unit is designed to document candidates' ability to plan instruction integrating various subject matters in the elementary classroom. This assignment is planned for the 2nd professional semester during the junior year once candidates learn and practice writing lesson plans. This assignment is planned to be an important activity in all methods courses to promote the integration of language arts, math, social studies, science, health, physical education, and arts.

Data below indicate that candidates found this assignment challenging, especially in the area of connection to family, community, and student needs (50%). The areas where candidates struggled were describing their integrated unit, connecting theory to practice, and presenting unit components. Based on the results, faculty have revised this assignment to provide more specific guidance for candidates in these areas. This new format will be piloted in the spring 2009 semester (as this assignment is completed only in the second professional semester).

Report Title: Thematic Unit

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their thematic unit.

	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Skills (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Description of integrated unit	<u>6</u> (33%)	<u>8</u> (44%)	<u>4</u> (22%)	2.11	2	0.74
Connection to family / community / student needs	<u>4</u> (22%)	<u>5</u> (27%)	<u>9</u> (50%)	1.72	1	0.80
Connections to Course Theories	<u>4</u> (22%)	<u>11</u> (61%)	<u>3</u> (16%)	2.06	2	0.62
Unit components	<u>5</u> (27%)	<u>8</u> (44%)	<u>5</u> (27%)	2.00	2	0.75
Annotated Bibliography	<u>11</u> (61%)	<u>6</u> (33%)	<u>1</u> (5%)	2.56	3	0.60
Professional Presentation	<u>13</u> (72%)	<u>5</u> (27%)	<u>0</u>	2.72	3	0.45

Total Documents Assessed: 18

Student Teaching Evaluation

Eleven elementary teacher education candidates completed student teaching in AY 2007-08. The student teaching evaluation includes assessment in all major areas of teaching. All candidates met or exceeded expectations for performance during the student teaching semester, based on the averages of performance aligned with professional standards. The program coordinator reviews data from each program assessment and, with input from the Teacher Education Committee, determines any directions for improving candidate performance. In the following table averaged scores are presented in each subcategory.

<u>Student Teaching Evaluation</u> n=11	Overall Score* (Average)
Elementary Education	
Demonstrates enthusiasm about the profession	3
Is goal oriented and organized	3
Has an understanding of self and impact on classroom	3
Cooperates with peers and supervisors	3
Works for professional growth (e.g., seeks advice to improve)	3
Possesses self-confidence and poise	2.6
Adjusts to unexpected events and emergency situations	2.7
Is punctual and dependable	2.9
Speaks clearly and fluently with projection	2.8

<u>Student Teaching Evaluation</u> n=11	Overall Score* (Average)
Conveys a professional demeanor	3
Is interested in and works within the total school program	3
Effectively works with school staff and resource personnel	2.8
Communicates well with parents regularly about child and about program	2.67
Listens to children with attention and respect	2.8
Conveys a sense of warmth, security and enjoyment	2.8
Demonstrates respect and empathy toward students	2.8
Values differences of culture, race, sex, (dis) ability	2.7
Uses positive verbal and non verbal cues	2.8
Calls students by name and attends carefully to what they say	3
Paces activities to meet the needs of students	2.6
Sets high expectations yet maintains a high success rate	2.6
Involves all students, not just a sub group (e.g., students who raise their hands)	3
Waits long enough for answers to encourage thinking and volunteering	3
Is sensitive to students' perspectives	2.8
Fosters group and cooperative learning	2.8
Checks for student's understanding	2.6
Assesses student progress and makes appropriate adjustments	2.9
Keeps adequate records of student progress and uses them in planning	2.7
Makes methods of assessment clear and purposeful	2.8
Is discrete about confidential matters	2.8
Has command of subject matter including central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of content (in various subjects: Language Arts, Science, Math, Social Studies, Art, Health, and PE)	2.89
Uses theoretical approaches to teaching various subject matter	2.63
Communicates directions and expectations clearly and logically	2.89
Uses a variety of teaching methods and materials which are age appropriate and inclusive of diverse cultures and minority groups, including women	2.89
Informs students of objectives and expectations	2.78
Links subject matter to students' prior knowledge, interests, and (mis)understandings	2.89
Uses appropriate questioning techniques (e.g. probing, recall, open ended, higher order)	2.89
Engages students in lessons that utilize technology, when appropriate	2.89
Develops interesting and challenging lessons	2.8
Conceptualizes and teaches integrated lessons	2.8
Has all materials and resources ready for use ahead of time	2.8
Keeps observations and records of children's work and events	2.6

<u>Student Teaching Evaluation</u> n=11	Overall Score* (Average)
Incorporates differentiation into lessons in order to meet the academic needs and interests of students	2.8
Accommodates for individual differences (ACEI 3b)	2.8
Encourages student responsibility, self evaluation, and input on classroom decisions	2.6
Keeps students on task	2.89
Gives immediate and constructive feedback	2.8
Maintains a safe and aesthetically pleasant classroom	2.8
Has established a set of rules and procedures for administrative matters, participation, movement, assignments, etc.	3
Constantly and fairly reinforces rules and procedures	2.8
Is willing to try a variety of behavior management systems	2.7
Uses effective transitions between classes and activities (ACEI 3d)	3
Generates several options and selects effective and efficient ways to improve teaching	3
Analyzes a situation from several perspectives before deciding on a course of action	2.8
Asks ethically oriented questions about student relations, classroom instruction, and school practices/policies	2.67
Conducts action research for the completion of a capstone project	2.56

*Scoring: 3=exceeding expectation, 2=meeting expectation, 1=acquiring skill

Action Research Project

Eleven candidates completed the Action Research Project (ARP) during the student teaching experience. Each candidate met or exceeded expectations for performance on the project. Feedback from candidates and student teaching supervisors suggest that although all candidates met expectations for the use of pretest and posttest data, this requirement seemed to pose the greatest challenge for the majority of candidates.

The Department of Education Assessment Committee is currently revising the template for the ARP. It is the feeling of the committee that the project, in its current form, is too broad in scope. It is our expectation that a revised format, to be piloted in the spring 2009 semester, will improve candidate performance in the use of pretest and posttest data to inform the selection of interventions and to enable reflection on P-12 impact.

Report Title: Action Research Project

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their action research project in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Expectations (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Educational Philosophy	<u>9</u> (81%)	<u>2</u> (19%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Systematic Observations	8 (72%)	<u>3</u> (28%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Exploring Causes	7 (63%)	<u>4</u> (37%)	<u>0</u>	2.67	3	0.47
Plan for Pre/Post Measures	9 (81%)	<u>2</u> (19%)	<u>0</u>	2.89	3	0.31
Exploring Interventions	10 (90%)	<u>1</u> (10%)	<u>0</u>	2.94	3	0.23
Describing Individual Interventions	<u>10</u> (90%)	<u>1</u> (10%)	<u>0</u>	2.94	3	0.23
Reflecting on Impact on P-12 Students	<u>10</u> (90%)	<u>1</u> (10%)	<u>0</u>	2.89	3	0.31
Reflecting on Professional Development	7 (63%)	<u>4</u> (37%)	<u>0</u>	2.67	3	0.47
Use of Literature	8 (72%)	<u>3</u> (28%)	<u>0</u>	2.83	3	0.37
Professional Presentation	8 (72%)	<u>3</u> (28%)	<u>0</u>	2.78	3	0.42

Total Documents Assessed: 11

Electronic Portfolio

Eleven candidates completed the electronic portfolio as a requirement for licensure. As indicated in the table below, candidates met or exceeded expectations in all categories aligned with professional standards.

Data from the previous year suggested a need for more explicit guidance on the presentation of artifacts that demonstrate achievement of professional standards. Data from this current year suggest that a student teaching seminar session on the use of standards, more guidance from faculty supervisors, and revised scoring guides in some academic areas had positive impact on candidate performance.

Report Title: Electronic Portfolio

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their electronic portfolio in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Mode</i>	<i>Stdev</i>
Professional Presentation	<u>10</u> (90%)	<u>1</u> (9%)	<u>0</u>	2.91	3	0.29
Quality of Reflection	<u>9</u> (81%)	<u>2</u> (18%)	<u>0</u>	2.82	3	0.39
Use of Artifacts	<u>11</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	3.00	3	0.00
SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	<u>9</u> (81%)	<u>2</u> (18%)	<u>0</u>	2.82	3	0.39
Organization and Writing Mechanics	<u>10</u> (90%)	<u>1</u> (9%)	<u>0</u>	2.91	3	0.29
EP Oral Presentation	<u>10</u> (90%)	<u>1</u> (9%)	<u>0</u>	2.91	3	0.29

Total Documents Assessed: 11

Course Grades

Data on GPA are used to determine eligibility for program admittance and program continuance. In AY 2007-08, ten students applied to the elementary teacher education program at the end of the sophomore year. All applicants met expectations for overall GPA and for GPA in education courses. According to the unit assessment system, GPA is monitored every semester. If a candidate's GPA drops below minimum expectations, the candidate is placed on academic probation in the teacher education program and has one semester to rectify the problem.

Secondary Education Programs

This section presents data from student assessment outcome measures. Following the presentation of data for each key assessment is a discussion of how data are used to improve student learning.

GPA

Data on GPA are used to determine eligibility for program admittance and program continuance. In academic year 2007-2008, eight students applied to the teacher education programs in secondary education at the end of the sophomore year. Six applicants met expectations for overall GPA and for GPA in the content area. Two students who did not meet GPA requirements were provisionally accepted into the program with the stipulation that GPA requirements be met by the end of the fall 2008 semester. A calculation of GPA also occurs in the senior year as part of the application to student teaching. In 2008, all secondary education candidates who applied to student teaching met GPA requirements.

Licensure Tests

Data on Praxis I is used to determine eligibility for program admittance. In academic year 2007-2008, seven students applied to teacher education programs in secondary education. Four students met Praxis I requirements and were accepted into the program. Three students did not submit passing scores on Praxis I and were provisionally accepted to the program with the stipulation that Praxis I requirements be met by the end of the fall 2008 semester.

Scores on Praxis II tests in content and pedagogy are criteria required for eligibility for state licensure. Praxis II scores are shared with members of the Secondary Education Committee who use the data to improve student learning through changes at the course and program levels in respective academic departments. The Department of Modern Languages, for example, implemented the use of an oral interview (SOPI) in the junior year that would serve as a diagnostic assessment to better prepare candidates for the successful completion of Praxis II, Language Production, taken in the senior year.

Lesson Plans

Six candidates completed the lesson plan assignment for EDUC 586, Curriculum and Methods in Adolescent Education. Five candidates met or exceeded expectations for performance on the assessment. One candidate did not meet the minimum expectation for including clearly stated learning outcomes and professional standards in the lesson plan. This candidate also failed to submit a reflection on the planned lesson and, as a result, did not meet the minimum expectation for performance. Data on this assessment is presented in the following table.

Based on lesson plan data from previous years, the lesson plan assignment was modified for the spring 2008 semester to better enable candidates to demonstrate ability to align learning outcomes with appropriate and engaging teaching methods and assessments. Opportunities for modeling and guided practice throughout the lesson development process and the presentation of authentic options for lesson planning seemed to have impact on candidate performance. Data from lesson plans submitted in the 2007-2008 academic year demonstrate improvement in the statement of learning outcomes, the integration of relevant models of instruction, and the development of valid assessments of learning.

Report Title: Lesson Plan Assessment

Description: This report includes assessment data on lesson plans in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)
Audience/ Rationale	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	0
Standards/ Objectives	5 (83%)	0	1 (17%)
Materials/Procedures	4 (67%)	2 (33%)	
Evaluation/Assessment	3 (50%)	3 (50%)	
Reflection	2 (33%)	3 (50%)	1 (17%)

Total Documents Assessed: 6

Action Research Project

Five candidates completed the Action Research Project during the student teaching experience. Each candidate met or exceeded expectations for performance on the project. Data suggest that although all candidates met expectations for the use of pretest and posttest data, this requirement seemed to pose the greatest challenge for the majority of candidates.

The Department of Education Assessment Committee is currently revising the template for the ARP. It is the feeling of the committee that the project, in its current form, is too broad in scope. It is our expectation that a revised format, to be piloted in the spring 2009 semester, will improve candidate performance in the use of pretest and posttest data to inform the selection of interventions and to enable reflection on P-12 impact.

Report Title: Action Research Project

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their action research project in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectations (3 pts)	Meeting Expectations (2 pts)	Acquiring Expectations (1 pts)
Educational Philosophy	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	0
Systematic Observations	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Exploring Interventions	<u>3</u> (60%)	<u>2</u> (40%)	<u>0</u>
Plan for Pre/Post Measures	<u>2</u> (40%)	<u>3</u> (60%)	<u>0</u>
Exploring Interventions	5 (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Describing Interventions	5 (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Reflecting on P-12 Impact	3 (60%)	<u>2</u> (40%)	<u>0</u>
Reflecting on Professional Development	4 (80%)	<u>1</u> (20%)	<u>0</u>

Use of Literature	4 (80%)	<u>1</u> (20%)	<u>0</u>
Professional Presentation	4 (80%)	<u>1</u> (20%)	<u>0</u>
Total Documents Assessed: 5			

Electronic Portfolio

Five candidates completed the Electronic Portfolio as a requirement for licensure. As indicated in the table below, candidates exceeded expectations in categories related to professional presentation and use of artifacts as evidence of meeting professional and P-12 learning standards. Candidates met or exceeded expectations for the quality of reflection on selected artifacts and for the quality of the written presentation.

Data from the previous year suggested a need for more explicit guidance on the presentation of artifacts that demonstrate achievement of professional standards. Data from this current year suggest that a student teaching seminar session on the use of standards, more guidance from faculty supervisors, and revised scoring guides in some academic areas had positive impact on candidate performance.

Report Title: Electronic Portfolio

Description: This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on their electronic portfolio in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)
Professional Presentation	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Quality of Reflection	<u>4</u> (80%)	<u>1</u> (20%)	<u>0</u>
Use of Artifacts	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
SPA and DCPS P-12 Standards Discussion	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Organization and Writing Mechanics	<u>4</u> (80%)	<u>1</u> (20%)	<u>0</u>
EP Oral Presentation	<u>5</u> (100%)	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Documents Assessed: 5			

Student Teaching Evaluation

Five candidates from secondary education programs completed student teaching in the spring 2008 semester. The student teaching evaluation includes an overall assessment of performance for all candidates and an assessment of standards-based performance for candidates in each individual program. All candidates met or exceeded expectations for performance during the student teaching semester, based on the averages of overall performance and on candidate performance on standards-based criteria. The program coordinator reviews data from each program assessment and, with input from the Secondary Education Committee, determines any

directions for improving candidate performance. In the following table, each performance category is scored as Exceeding Expectations (3 points), Meeting Expectations (2 points), and Acquiring Skill (1 point). Averaged scores are presented in the tables below.

Secondary Education N=5	Overall Score (Avg)
Student Teacher's Personal and Professional Qualities	2.6
Teacher-Student Interactions	2.8
Subject Matter Knowledge and Pedagogical Skills	2.8
Classroom Management	2.8
Decision-Making and Reflective Qualities	3

Program	# Candidates	Overall Score (Avg)
Drama	1	2
English	1	2
Modern Languages	2	2.5
Social Studies	1	3

Observation Assignment

In EDUC 586, Curriculum and Methods in Adolescent Education, candidates complete 30 hours of observation in secondary classrooms. Using the CUA conceptual framework, candidates complete a series of reflections on what is observed. A final paper is the focus of this assessment. This paper serves as preparation for the action research paper that is completed in student teaching. All candidates who completed this assessment met or exceeded expectations for performance.

Data from this assessment indicate that candidates are proficient in the use of our conceptual framework to guide their reflections on what is observed. We feel that increased attention to the framework at the sophomore level has positively impacted performance in the junior year. Although performance based on use of the framework for reflection has improved overall, data suggest that candidates are less proficient in interpreting observations from multiple perspectives.

Report Title: Observation Project

This data analysis is based on candidates' performance on observation projects in AY 2007-08.

	Exceeding Expectation (3 pts)	Meeting Expectation (2 pts)	Acquiring Skill (1 pts)
Description	5 (100%)		
Interpretation of Observed Behavior	2 (40%)	3 (60%)	
Reflection and Evaluation	3 (60%)	2 (40%)	
Application	5 (100%)		
Mechanics	5 (100%)		

Total Documents Assessed: 5

Education Studies

During the past five years the Education Studies program has had 42 students. Of these 30 have completed the program, seven students continue to actively pursue their studies, three students withdrew from the program and two were dismissed, one for failing to maintain a satisfactory GPA and another for personal reasons. The average GPA for all students enrolled in this program during the past five years was 2.931/4.0; their education GPA (from all education courses taken) was 3.221. Of the 30 completers, six graduated cum laud or above, with an average GPA of 3.7765/4.0.

Of the 30 completers, 27 passed comprehensive examinations. During the past two years, 13 students passed comprehensive examinations with an average score of 17.43 out of a possible average score of 25. Students passing comps averaged 3.486/5 possible points per question. Two students failed comprehensive examinations with an average score of 10.29 out of a possible average score of 25 (averaging 2.058 points per question). One of these students subsequently passed comprehensives, the second failed even the second attempt. Three students opted to produce an Action Research Project in lieu of comprehensive examinations, all were successful.

NSSE Data on Student Course Evaluation

The Department of Education regularly gathered and analyzed student evaluation data on general education courses as well as the curriculum using the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This dataset from 2007 compares Catholic University student responses against those from Carnegie Peers as well as the entire NSSE group. What is reported here includes data on all undergraduate education majors because due to low numbers the data could not be meaningfully disaggregated by major. (See Table 1)

Data analyses revealed that on more than half of the items education majors rated their experiences in the Department of Education as on par with those from other Catholic University

departments and Carnegie institutions. For instance, students were satisfied with how courses included diverse perspectives in discussions and course assignments.

In other instances, however, there were some statistically significant differences. Students considered some of their experiences less satisfactory than their CUA peers as well as students at Carnegie institutions. Students indicated that they were less content with coursework that seemed to fail to encourage them to analyze, synthesize and make judgment about the material presented; they also felt that their experiences failed to help them put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments; and they judged their coursework as somewhat poorer than other CUA departments and Carnegie Peer institutions in prompting them to make judgments about the value of information, or examining how others gathered and interpreted data, or assessed the soundness of their conclusions.

TABLE 1: Standard 12: General Education: The institution's curricula are designed so that students acquire and demonstrate college-level proficiency in general education and essential skills, including at least oral and written communication, scientific and quantitative reasoning, critical analysis and reasoning, and technological competency.				2007 National Survey of Student Engagement Mean Comparisons: Selected Catholic University General Education Goals										
				Department of Education: Seniors										
				<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>										
Graduates will demonstrate proficiency in oral and written communication, including the argumentative essays, research papers, presentations, and creative and collaborative work employing a variety of media.				Department of Education		Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2007		
				<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	
<i>During the current school year, about how much reading and writing have you done? 1=none, 2=1-4, 3=5-10, 4=11-20, 5=more than 20</i>														
Number of assigned textbooks, books, or book-length packs of course readings				2.80	3.35	*	-.53	3.08	.00	-.29	3.13	.00	-.33	
Number of books read on your own (not assigned) for personal enjoyment or academic enrichment				1.62	2.24	*	-.67	2.17	*	-.57	2.17	*	-.57	
Number of written papers or reports of 20 pages or more				1.80	1.73	.00	.10	1.59	.00	.28	1.62	.00	.23	
Number of written papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages				3.49	2.99	.00	.48	2.49	*	1.07	2.55	*	1.00	
Number of written papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages				3.27	3.20	.00	.06	2.93	.00	.29	2.96	.00	.26	
<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				3.00	3.04	.00	-.05	3.03	.00	-.04	3.06	.00	-.07	
Speaking clearly and effectively				3.00	2.94	.00	.07	2.92	.00	.09	2.95	.00	.06	
				<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>										
Graduates will show facility in critical thinking and reasoned analysis.				Department of Education		Catholic University			Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2007		
				<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	
<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 facts, ideas, or methods from your courses and readings so you can repeat them in pretty much the same form	2.88	2.66	.00	.24			2.78	.00	.12			2.75	.00	.15
	Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components	2.99	3.36	*	-.52			3.22	.00	-.32			3.23	.00	-.32
	Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships	2.58	3.20	***	-.73			3.01	**	-.51			3.03	**	-.54
	Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions	2.63	3.11	**	-.56			2.94	*	-.35			2.96	*	-.38
	Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations	2.94	3.33	.00	-.49			3.18	.00	-.29			3.18	.00	-.29
<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>															
	Put together ideas or concepts from different courses when completing assignments or during class discussions	2.58	2.97	*	-.45			2.91	*	-.41			2.90	*	-.40
<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	2.92	3.33	.00	-.55			3.32	*	-.52			3.33	*	-.54
	Analyzing quantitative problems	2.43	2.70	.00	-.28			3.05	**	-.71			3.04	**	-.69
	Learning effectively on your own	2.71	2.97	.00	-.30			2.99	.00	-.31			3.00	.00	-.33
	Solving complex real-world problems	2.31	2.53	.00	-.23			2.75	*	-.46			2.74	*	-.45
<i>Department of Education compared with:</i>															
Graduates will demonstrate an understanding of scientific and quantitative reasoning.		Department of Education		Catholic University				Carnegie Peers			NSSE 2007				
		<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>	<i>Mean^a</i>	<i>Sig^b</i>	<i>Effect Size^c</i>				
<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	2.92	3.33	.00	-.55			3.32	*	-.52			3.33	*	-.54
	Analyzing quantitative problems	2.43	2.70	.00	-.28			3.05	**	-.71			3.04	**	-.69

	Included diverse perspectives (different races, religions, genders, political beliefs, etc.) in class discussions or writing assignments	2.64	2.70	.00	-.07		2.74	.00	-.11		2.80	.00	-.17
	Had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity than your own	2.31	2.70	.00	-.38		2.68	.00	-.37		2.66	.00	-.35
	Had serious conversations with students who are very different from you in terms of their religious beliefs, political opinions, or personal values	2.44	2.88	.00	-.46		2.71	.00	-.28		2.71	.00	-.28
<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	2.73	2.85	.00	-.13		2.81	.00	-.09		2.82	.00	-.10
<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 economic, social, and racial or ethnic backgrounds	2.05	1.97	.00	.09		2.41	.00	-.37		2.44	.00	-.40
<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	2.15	2.20	.00	-.05		2.54	.00	-.40		2.59	.00	-.45

Curricular Improvements

Unit Level Initiatives and Changes

Student Teaching Evaluation

In the Department of Education a review of program assessments led to the revision of all student teaching evaluation forms including those used by education faculty supervisors, A&S faculty supervisors, and cooperating teachers for midpoint and final evaluations of student teachers. Student teaching evaluation forms have also been modified to align performance outcomes with the revised conceptual framework and specialized professional association standards. In order to increase the reliability of the evaluation instruments, the Director of Field Experiences provided cooperating teachers and supervisors with guidelines for using the student teaching evaluation forms.

Action Research Project

The action research project (ARP) provides an opportunity for student teachers to create responsive learning environments that impact P-12 learning. Review of student teachers' performance on action research projects indicated that some student teachers experienced difficulty in using various data sources to identify difficulties in the learning situation and/or to make instructional decisions. Guidelines for the ARP assignment were revised to help student teachers better use data to identify learning issues and to evaluate the effectiveness of solution strategies. Data are now collected on P-12 students' performance also -- in the form of pre- and post-test performance. Performance-based data indicate that student teachers are now proficient in documenting P-12 learning. The format of the action research project assignments was modified to reemphasize the importance of pre/post data analysis. Now the action research project is more like a series of snapshots of the project that represents the best understanding of the student teacher at each stage of the process, culminating in a rigorous reflection on the effectiveness of the project in terms of concrete P-12 evidence and on the student teaching experience as a whole.

Electronic Portfolio

The electronic portfolio is a requirement for all teacher education candidates as one of the key assessments. The electronic portfolio requires candidates to engage in self-assessment by reflecting upon progress made and standards met throughout the program. Building on the goals and guidelines already in place, departmental changes in the process of portfolio development include 1) transition from a paper portfolio to an electronic format, 2) development of guidelines and scoring guides appropriate for all teacher preparation programs, and 3) more systematic consideration of how the portfolio serves as a key assessment within the unit assessment system. Each modification was the result of deliberation by program coordinators, the Assessment Committee and the Teacher Education Committee. Student teachers present their portfolios to unit faculty who score the electronic portfolio jointly using a scoring guide.

Program Level Initiatives and Changes

Content Knowledge

A number of modifications in science programs have been made in recognition of the need to better prepare candidates for teaching science. EDUC 571, a junior level methods course that had addressed both science and social studies methods was split into two separate courses. To illustrate the connections between science and health, the science methods component is now combined with a health and physical education requirement in EDUC 351. A new course entitled Physics 240: *Sun-Earth Connection* was also created by the Chairman of Physics, a staff member from NASA, and a Department of Education faculty member. Through two years of development, this team developed a curriculum that aims to address key concepts in Physics (including gravity, electromagnetism, optics and vision as well as solar system astronomy) through the use of a rich and exciting variety of data from current solar space missions combined with regular, hands-on activities. Frequent interaction with education faculty ensure that candidates are regularly prompted to consider how the content and instructional strategies used in their course could be translated to the PreK-6 classroom.

A new Biology course (BIO 102: *Teaching Science at the Elementary Level*) has been added to the available science courses recommended to early childhood and elementary candidates. The course is designed to present the necessary background information to meet the science education needs of PreK – 6th grade students. Candidates study the relevant science content in a traditional college class setting but then translate their new knowledge to the educational setting by acting as subject area experts to public school teachers in professional development settings.

Assessment

A second area where faculty felt the program needed strengthening was in the area of assessment. Four courses were modified to include discussion and application of assessment. A revised syllabus in EDUC 361: *Psychology of Learning* course allows for more discussion of how to interpret standardized tests. The junior year EDUC 555: *Classroom Management for Regular and Special Needs Children* course now includes extensive discussion of different types of assessment and their use. The EDUC 584: *Curriculum and Strategies in Early Childhood Education* course began requiring candidates to read an early childhood assessment text in conjunction with the child portfolio assignment. The methods courses taught during the second semester of the junior year now focus more on assessment as it relates to lesson planning and instruction. In addition, the action research project assignment has been modified to stress review of pre-post testing data as evidence that addressed problems were solved.

Early Childhood (NAEYC) and Elementary (ACEI) Professional Education Standards

Another area addressed by early childhood and elementary program coordinators was teacher education students' ability to articulate their understanding of the NAEYC and ACEI standards. While the courses and assignments were designed to emphasize these and other professional standards, a review of the program made it clear that CUA students' ability to discuss their own work in light of these standards had not been documented systematically. For this reason, the

department created an electronic portfolio assignment to evaluate candidates' ability to discuss each standard as it relates to their own work.

Program Review

The Department of Education annually reviews programs to determine program viability. Criteria used for review include 1) trends in enrollment, 2) availability of faculty and other resources required to support programs, 3) relation of the program to CUA's mission, and 4) the ability of the program to meet professional standards.

Three Department of Education committees review and use performance-based data on candidate learning. Two of these committees have an impact on improvements in the education program. The *Teacher Education Committee* meets at the end of each semester to discuss majors' performance. As necessary, it develops remediation plans to enhance individual student's learning. Decisions are made based on data identified in the unit assessment system, such as dispositions, grades, PRAXIS scores, field experience evaluations, and assignment assessments. The *Assessment Committee* monitors data collection and makes recommendations to the Teacher Education Committee regarding key assessments and performance criteria, which can lead to course and curriculum revision. Teacher education faculty regularly survey current teacher education candidates, alumni, and their employers to obtain feedback on program quality using surveys published in *LiveText*. These surveys focus on candidate learning outcomes in terms of knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Program improvements were discussed in terms of curricular changes in education classes and field experiences. For instance, faculty made changes in course content and focus in 2 junior level methods classes (EDUC 351 and 571). These two courses were reorganized to provide more time for teaching science in EDUC 351 and integrate it with related subjects, i.e., health and physical education. EDUC 571 now focuses solely on teaching social studies.

Education faculty also considered modifying course delivery and assignments to encourage students to analyze, synthesize, critique, and apply theories, concepts, and principles in and outside of the classroom. Assignments now explicitly require that students think critically and analytically, analyze quantitative problems, make judgments about the value of information, and communicate with peers with diverse backgrounds.

The faculty members in Education Studies have been carefully examining the program during the past two years. We have been working on the procedures we have established for comprehensive examinations in order to see how we can use them to help students integrate the studies they have taken in different courses. We have been examining course requirements to see if the readings and assignments required of the Education Studies students are less than are reasonably expected of students at other institutions. We are especially concerned that our students are not called upon to analyze and synthesize ideas in the courses they take. This concern has led to the development of a Proseminar in Education Studies (a course yet to be offered). We are now requiring Education Studies students to enroll in a research methods course and are considering whether or not this is adequate for helping our students think critically and analytically, or to analyze quantitative problems.

The Education Studies program has a particular problem in that half of its students transfer into this program because they discovered that they were no longer interested in being a teacher or were failing in this endeavor. These students often have taken the majority of their coursework in programs other than Education Studies. While these students graduate with a major in Education Studies, they have little time in this program to develop the knowledge, skills or dispositions we think they need. Their focus often has been on problems associated with the classroom, and they are less knowledgeable about how to solve complex real-world problems. Some of these students leave themselves little time to engage in an appropriate practicum or internship and therefore miss the opportunity to apply theories or concepts to practical problems in situations outside the classroom.

We are also examining how to make better use of their site-based research paper, using it as a way to get students to integrate ideas and information from various sources, examine situations in depth, make judgments about the value of their information, interpret data, and arrive at sound conclusions.

In order to facilitate program improvement, we have been meeting as a group every two weeks to examine the data available to us and arrive at appropriate fixes for the problems we identify. We are concerned about not only the content of the courses we teach, but also the structure of the total program (which depends heavily on courses taken from a variety of other departments), and the effectiveness of the advising of Education Studies students who, unlike most other majors, have a very diverse set of personal objectives they want to achieve.