



DATA SUMMARIES OF SIUE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS

2014-2015

Contents:

This document is a compilation of the 2014-2015 assessment data summaries for Initial and Advanced Teacher Education Programs offered at Southern Illinois University Edwardsville

Data Summary
School of Education, Health and Human Behavior Unit Assessment System
Initial Teacher Education Programs
2014-2015

TRANSITION POINT I: ADMISSION TO TEACHER EDUCATION

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Self-Assessment)

The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year.

Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale:

Response Set 1=Not at all characteristic 2 3=somewhat characteristic 4 5=extremely characteristic	Criteria – out of a score of 50 Needs support= 34 and below Developing= 35-39 Meets=40-45 Exceeds=46-50
--	--

Findings:

TC1 (on-campus). Nearly, all candidates met or exceeded expectations. Seven candidates (four Secondary, two Elementary, and one Special Education) identified weak areas which contributed to their scoring in the developing category. One secondary candidate self-identified as needing support. There was no clear trend in the areas these candidates identified as low. However, class participation and preparation stood out as receiving lower scores of 3 than other areas when looking at the data overall.

TC2 (field). With the exception of two candidates, one in Elementary Education and the other in Special Education (identified themselves as developing), candidates reported as meeting the criteria. Although there were no clear indicators with consistent scores of 3, candidates did indicate lower scores in professional development and respect for policies.

What did we learn about our candidates? Candidates perceived themselves as displaying these dispositions. Candidates are also beginning to self-identify their majors early so findings are program-specific.

Actions to Take Based on Data: Candidate scores are still inflated as they were with the previous survey. The purpose of these surveys is two-fold: 1) to alert candidates of the dispositions which they will be held accountable, and 2) to provide candidates with the opportunity to alert faculty of areas in which they needs support. This evaluation would be more useful if faculty alerted candidates to these purposes and ensured candidates that these evaluations are not tied to grades in currently enrolled coursework. This data was reported to program chairs 4 weeks prior to the end of the semester, so faculty can plan support for candidates who acknowledge that they need it. The TC2 evaluation had a limited completion rate. The associate dean will remind program directors who will in turn have faculty ask candidates to complete this evaluation. These forms are being added to the Taskstream accounts of three of the programs. Trigger events will be constructed to remind the candidates to do this self-assessment.

Assessments: Admission Grade Point Average (GPA), Test of Academic Proficiency Test Score or ACT of 22 with writing, and entry-level education courses (CIED100/SPE100)

Criterion for passing: Each program determined the required grade point average for admission to a program. For most programs, the required GPA is 2.5. All candidates must pass the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP) (previously known as the Illinois Basic Skills Test) or a

score of 22 or higher on the ACT with writing, prior to admission to teacher education. Programs specify the required grade for the entry-level course, CIED100 or SPE100. Most programs require a grade of “C” in one of these courses. Two programs, physical education and special education, require a grade of “B”.

Findings:

Early Childhood

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program.

Admission GPA¹:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean	
Fall 2010	30	2.57 – 3.86	3.23	
Fall 2011	19	2.60 – 4.00	3.20	
Fall 2012	20	2.53 – 3.84	3.10	
Fall 2013	17	2.5 – 4.00	3.32	
Fall 2014	14	2.67 – 4.00	3.25	+10 non-licensure students
Fall 2015	18	2.56 – 4.00	3.31	+ 13 non-licensure students

Admission GPA² - Off Campus Cohort (EChOs)

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean	ADDL Admit as non TE
Fall 2010*	9*	2.36 – 3.58	2.73	16
Fall 2011	3**	2.92 – 3.14	3.06	12
Fall 2012	1***	2.95	2.95	9
Fall 2013	3****	2.62-3.11	2.85	12
Fall 2014	1*****	3.30	3.30	9
Fall 2015	No fall cohort			

*16 additional student were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2010

**12 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2011

***9 additional student were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2012

****12 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2013

*****9 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students in Fall 2014

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students using ACT
Fall 2010	241 – 285	263.36	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2011	244 - 278	258.58	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	244 – 268	254.05	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2013	245-268	256.75	240	100%	13
Fall 2014	248	248	240	100%	13
Fall 2015	0	0	240	n/a	18

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score – Off Campus Cohort (EChOS)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students Using ACT instead of TAP
Fall 2010	241 – 272	254.66	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	251 - 253	258	240	100%	1
Fall 2013	245	245	240	100%	2
Fall 2014	0	0	0	0	1

¹ Entering GPA for Early Childhood Education students includes any transfer work and is calculated at the time the student is admitted to the teacher education program.

² Students in this cohort are not required to take CI200 if they are entering as a graduate degree seeking student.

Fall 2015	No fall cohort	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
-----------	----------------	-----	-----	-----	-----

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
Fall 2010	18	3	0	8
Fall 2011	12	2	0	5
Fall 2012	14	1	0	5
Fall 2013	16	0	1	0
Fall 2014	6	2	6	0
Fall 2015	14	2	2	0

CI 200 Grade – Off Campus Cohort (EChOS)*

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer	Degree ³
Fall 2010	1	0	0	4	4
Fall 2011	0	0	0	1	2
Fall 2012	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2013	0	1	2	0	0
Fall 2014	1	0	0	0	0
Fall 2015	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

*16 additional students were accepted into the program as non-certification students.

Elementary Education

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program.

Entering GPA⁴:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
Fall 2010	115	2.51 – 4.00	3.27
Fall 2011	78	2.51 – 4.00	3.18
Fall 2012	74	2.57 – 4.00	3.30
Fall 2013	82	2.58 - 4.00	3.30
Fall 2014	78	2.50 – 4.00	3.32
Fall 2015	50	2.49 – 3.95	3.27

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students Using ACT Instead of TAP
Fall 2010	240 – 292	263.71	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2011 ⁵	240 – 288	259.62	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2012	241 – 287	256.63	240	100%	n/a
Fall 2013	240 - 284	258	240	100%	54
Fall 2014	240 – 252	248	240	100%	74
Fall 2015	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	50

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
Fall 2010	83	3	0	29
Fall 2011	51	3	0	24
Fall 2012	51	6	0	17

³ Students in this cohort are not required to take CI200 if they are entering as a graduate degree seeking student.

⁴ Entering GPA for Elementary Education students includes any transfer work and is calculated at the time the student is admitted to the teacher education program.

⁵ Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

Fall 2013	45	2	0	35
Fall 2014	41	4	1	32
Fall 2015	32	2	1	16

Special Education

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the various program. Up until the Fall 2007 cohort, students progressed at their own pace with students reaching the student teaching semester at different times. Beginning in Fall 2007, students' progress through the program at the same pace.

Entering GPA⁶:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2010-2011	29	2.50 – 3.90	3.12
2011-2012	31	2.50 – 4.00	3.06
2012-2013	15	2.50 – 3.50	3.10
2013-2014	35	2.50 – 4.00	3.09
2014-2015	18	2.47 – 3.77	3.15
2015-2016	30	2.51 – 4.00	3.22

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of students Using ACT instead of TAP
2010-2011	242 – 290	260.86	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	242 - 278	257.94	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	246 - 274	254	240	100%	15
2013-2014	242 - 263	251	240	100%	24
2014-2015	248 - 251	249.5	240	100%	16
2015-2016	244 - 249	246.5	240	100%	28

SPE 400/SPE 200 Grade⁷:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2010-2011	19	7	0	1
2011-2012	9	11	0	11
2012-2013	10	5	0	0
2013-2014	8	21	0	6
2014-2015	7	4	0	7
2015-2016	16	6	0	8

Secondary Education

NOTE: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the student was *admitted* to the student teaching semester of the various Secondary education programs.

Entering GPA⁸:

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2010-2011	117	2.50 – 4.00	3.27
2011-2012	112	2.50 – 4.00	3.32
2012-2013	85	2.60 – 4.00	3.35

⁷ Entering GPA for Special Education students includes any transfer work.

⁸ Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

⁹ Beginning in Fall 2006, the Special Education Program began offering a SPE 200 course as an introduction to Special Education. The program had previously used the grade in SPE 400, Exceptional Child, as the course required for admission to the program.

⁸ Entering GPA for Secondary Education students excludes any transfer work.

2013-2014	57	2.63 – 4.00	3.41
2014-2015	67	2.53 – 4.00	3.34

Test of Academic Proficiency/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# of Students Taking the ACT instead of TAP
2010-2011 ⁹	242–291	271.25	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	240-296	269.58	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	244-286	264.44	240	100%	n/a
2013-2014	240-283	260.68	240	100%	9
2014-2015	242-282	257.05	240	100%	41

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2010-2011	94	2	1	20
2011-2012	76	14	1	21
2012-2013	72	9	2	1
2013-2014	46	7	2	2
2014-2015	51	12	0	4

Unit aggregate

Entering GPA

Cohort	Students	Range	Mean
2010-2011	337	2.36 - 4.0	3.11
2011-2012	273	2.5 – 4.0	3.12
2012-2013	224	2.5 – 4.0	3.11
2013-2014	185	2.5 – 4.0	3.30
2014-2015	178	2.47* – 4.0	3.30

*Conditional admission

Test of Academic Proficiency/ACT/Basic Skills Score:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Cut Score	Pass Rate	# taking ACT
2010-2011	240 - 291	261.22	240	100%	n/a
2011-2012	240 - 296	261.36	240	100%	n/a
2012-2013	241 - 287	256.64	240	100%	4
2013-2014	240 - 283	251.92	240	100%	121
2014-2015	240 - 282	255.26	240	100%	145

CI 200 Grade:

Cohort	A	B	C	Transfer
2010-2011	242	25	1	62
2011-2012	162	36	6	62
2012-2013	156	23	6	18
2013-2014	102	34	9	40
2014-2015	106	22	7	43

⁹ Students in this cohort may have taken either the older test (096) or the newer test (300).

What did we learn about our candidates?

Since 2010, the number of candidates entering teacher education has drastically declined. This is due to the Illinois State Board of Education's institution of higher standards for entry into teacher education programs. Candidates now have to pass either the Test of Academic Proficiency with a score of 240 or an ACT composite score of 22 or higher with a writing component score of 19 or higher. The majority of candidates are using the ACT option.

Candidates continued to display high grades in the required early entry course, CI 200 or SPE 200. The mean GPA of entering candidates remains over 3.0. Although the number of Secondary education candidates is at an all-time low, their GPA increased this year. This data suggests that our candidates display strong general education knowledge and skills that form the foundation for educator preparation.

Actions to take based on data:

The SOE Student Services Office is counseling candidates to take the ACT with writing over the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP). More candidates are eligible to enter programs since the TAP equates to an ACT of 26. For those candidates who have not been able to meet these testing requirements, the EChOS program offers a non-certification option. Candidates in the EChOS program have the option to move to the certification track once they pass all the testing requirements.

At this time, our cohort group numbers remain lower in all programs. It should also be noted that the school health education program has been discontinued due to lack of interest in School Health Education and increasing interest in community health education and exercise science programs. Candidates who are interested in teaching health education in a school setting are adding this endorsement to a certificate in another teaching area. The Physical Education Teacher Education program has also been approved to close its undergraduate program, citing the dismal prospects for school district hiring in this area. The School Health Education program has graduated its last candidates and the PETE program has a few candidates remaining.

TRANSITION POINT II: ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING

Assessment: Content Area Test (2014-2015)

The data provided in the tables below reflect the scores of students who passed the IL Content Test and were then eligible to enter student teaching.

Assessment	Criterion for passing	Findings	What did we learn about our candidates?	Actions to Take Based on Data
IL Content Test - standardized criterion-references tests (by content area) that are tied to State standards	Must pass – overall score must be 240 or above	100% pass rate; See chart below for overall means by content area; Subscores for each content area are listed in the shared drive (SOE Data) – listed by program.- see also appeals by students to continue to student teaching if not passed content test (1 out of 7 students	Candidates possess appropriate content knowledge	None at the unit level; program level faculty should review objectives associated with subtest scores below 240; clarify and consistently apply rule about not student teaching

		allowed to have extended field experience until test passed)		without passing the content test; remind students earlier in the program about test dates
--	--	--	--	---

Contest Test Data

(includes all test results reported between July 1, 2014 and June 30, 2015)

Content Area and Number of Candidates (Programs not listed did not have test scores)	Findings – Overall mean (areas listed have scores <240)*
Biology (n=5)	259 (area 4 ‘Earth Systems and the Universe’)
Chemistry (n=1)	258 (area 2 ‘life science’; area 6 ‘Stoichiometry and Chemical Reactions’)
Early Childhood (n=28)	258 (all subscores above 240)
Earth and Space Science (n=1)	236 (area 2 ‘Life Science’; area 3 ‘Physical Science’; area 5 ‘The Earth and the Atmosphere’)
Elementary (n=64)	261 (all subscores above 240)
English/Language Arts (n=15)	267 (all subscores above 240)
Foreign Language-Spanish (n=3)	268 (all subscores above 240)
Foreign Language-French (n=0)	No data
Foreign Language-German (n=0)	No data
Geography (n=0)	No data
History (n=6)	245 (area 3 ‘Historical Concepts and World History’; area 4 ‘U.S. and Illinois History’)
Mathematics (n=4)	273 (all subscores above 240)
Music (n=4)	265 (all subscores above 240)
**Physical education (n=2)	254 (area 2 ‘Movement and Skill Acquisition’)
**Physics (n=0)	No data
Political Science (n=0)	No data
Special Education (LBSI n=29) (Gen n=27)	271 (all subscores above 240 on LBS1) 260 (area ‘Social Sciences’ on Gen Curriculum)
Theater (n=1)	273 (all subscores above 240)
Visual arts (n=5)	271 (all subscores above 240)
Unit aggregate (n =195 tests taken)	262.37

*Note: Means below 240 may indicate area of relative weakness and are considered “red flag”

**Note: This program was discontinued because of low enrollment or lack of employment in the field

Additional Review of Subareas within the Content Test: All candidates must pass the Illinois Content Test within their areas of certification, as stated above. Each content test is divided into subareas. Subarea scores below 240 might indicate areas of relative weakness.

With the exception of Earth Space Science, programs had overall mean subscores of 240 or above. Earth Space Science had one candidate, who did not pass the content test. 5 of 19 programs recorded 1 area of weak subscores. It is recommended that the program faculty of these programs review the objectives associated with mean subarea scores below 240 to determine possible reasons for these scores. Appropriate action, if needed, can then be considered by program faculty.

The subarea mean scores are listed by program on the SOE shared drive (SOE Data for all programs and secondary education content areas). This documentation also includes failed attempts and frequency of failed attempts by candidates.

Assessment: Candidate ability to plan instruction in the field

Each program administers an assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction that is aligned to the program’s standards. Data was reported as the number of candidates who exceeded, met, or

did not meet the program expectations. This year the data varies from program to program, depending on whether they submitting SPA reports to NCATE/CAEP. For those programs who did submit response to conditions reports, the data will reflect what they provided to their SPA. Program descriptions of these assessments and their data tables are located on the SOE Shared Drive (under SOE Data).

Criterion for passing:

It is expected that at least 80% of each program’s candidates meet or exceed expectations.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Location of Program	Findings by candidate or standard*
*Early childhood (n=24)	SIUE and EChOS	93% of NAEYC Standards were exceeded or met
*Elementary education (n=78)	SIUE	97% of ACEI Standards were exceeded or met expectations
*Special education (n=30)	SIUE-On Campus	92% of CEC Standards were exceeded or met expectations
Unit aggregate (n=112)	Combined	95.1% of all candidates exceeded or met the standards of their SPA.

*% are based on data taken from NCATE SPA reports and is an average of the standard element scores.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Across all programs, candidates were able to plan instruction for students in school settings. Early Childhood candidates compiled a lesson plan portfolio prior to student teaching, which is composed of lesson plans from each content methods area. Student scores were well distributed with most scoring meets. The Elementary Education program used edTPA task #1 and candidates overall mean was a 3.07 out of 5.00. Faculty performed local scoring of all elementary education candidates’ edTPA portfolios. Special Education candidates completed an Instructional Planning Project based on the 2012 CEC Standards. Candidates demonstrated expertise in determining baseline data, student strengths and weaknesses, and an intervention plan targeting areas of concern.

Actions to take based on data:

All programs should continue to refine assessments to increase validity and reliability and alignment with specialized professional association and State standards. Revise and refine curriculum to include activities and assignments that will prepare teacher candidates for the high-stakes assessment of edTPA.

Assessment: Disposition Checklist (Faculty) (2014-2015)

The new 4-tiered assessment was implemented for the first time this year. Faculty rated candidates’ dispositions on-campus and in their field placements.

Criterion for Passing: Candidates assessment themselves on a 5 point scale:

Response Set 1=Not at all characteristic 2 3=somewhat characteristic 4 5=extremely characteristic	Criteria – out of a score of 50 Needs support= 34 and below Developing= 35-39 Meets=40-45 Exceeds=46-50
---	--

University Faculty On-Campus (UF1) Findings:

Note: Column 1 names the program and the number of evaluations performed. Numbers in column 2 represent the range of evaluation scores, not number of candidates.

Numbers in columns 3 and 3 represent the number of candidates scoring in lower ranges.

Program*	Range of scores	# of candidates Needing Support	# of candidates in Developing Stage
Early Childhood (All Locations) n=57	40-50	0	0
Elementary n=35	30-50	1	1
Special Education n=44	33-51**	1	5
CAS K-12 and Secondary programs			
Art n=18	39-50	0	1
Biology n=14	39-50	0	1
Chemistry n=2	40-43	0	0
Earth/Space Science n=0	----	---	---
English n=52	39-50	0	1
French n=2	48-50	0	0
German n=1	42	0	0
Spanish n=9	40-50	0	0
Geography n=1	50	0	0
History n=39	25-50*	2	1
Mathematics n=6	35-50	0	1
Music n=15	24-50	2	1
Political Science n=3	46-48*	0	0
Theater n=1	50	0	0
Unit aggregated n = 299 evaluations	24-51**	6	12

University Faculty Supervising Field Placements (UF2) Findings:

Program*	Range of scores	# of candidates Needing Support	# of candidates in Developing Stage
Early Childhood (All Locations) n=55	31-51**	2	1
Elementary n=219	30-55**	4	8
Physical Education n=1	31	1	0
Special Education (All Locations) n=33	38-51**	2	1
CAS K-12 and Secondary programs			
Art n=17	39-50	0	1
Biology n=17	37-50	0	1
Chemistry n=8	44-50	0	0
Earth/Space Science n=0	---	---	---
English n=67	41-51**	0	0
French n=0	---	---	---
German n=0	---	---	---
Spanish n=4	43-50	0	0
Geography n=0	---	---	---
History n=22	40-52**	0	0
Mathematics n=6	29-50	2*	0
Music n=31	35-53**	0	2
Political Science n=2	48	0	0
Theater n=4	49-51**	0	0
Unit aggregated n = 486 evaluations	29-55**	11	14

*Results are based on number of *evaluations completed*, not necessarily number of *candidates* in the program. In some programs, several faculty complete evaluations on one candidate.

** Totals include “not observed” which reflects some scores of 6.

*** An unusual number of “not observed” - names sent to program chair

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates are meeting the dispositional requirements of the unit. Programs faculty determined how they would use the two-tiered faculty evaluation. With that said, some program candidates were evaluated by more than one faculty member and others by only one faculty member. Faculty are encouraged to use this check system at various points in the program. The majority of candidates display appropriate dispositions as rated by faculty.

Action to Take Based on Data:

This year the Associate Dean notified program directors during the second weeks in October and in March that a window for online evaluation is open. Faculty were given a two week window to complete evaluations on their candidates, then reports of candidates needing help was generated and sent to program chairs. In order to make this data more accessible. The information was forwarded to program directors in a spreadsheet one month prior to the end of the semester, so that interventions can be initiated if faculty have not already done so. For those programs using Taskstream, the Associate Dean is entering this assessment into their unit folders. A trigger activity will be set so that more complete data will be collected.

Additional Data-Tracking Complaints and Dispositions Alerts

Assessment: Tracking of Complaints-Associate Dean

Criterion for passing: Fewer than 25 complaints with no noticeable pattern

Findings: There were 16 complaints/issues originating in 3 initial programs and 1 advanced program. Six disposition alerts were issued. Twelve requests for clinical placement changes were submitted (11 from initial programs and 1 from an advanced program). See columns below for enhanced explanations of findings, outcomes, and actions to take based on data.

Overall, program faculty are doing a good job of monitoring students' dispositions on campus and in their field placements. They identify behaviors that are not appropriate in school settings. An ad hoc committee is being formed to review departmental operating paper language about handling complaints, academic and dispositional issues, and their repercussions.

Table of Complaints and Dispositions Alerts for Initial Programs (2014-2015)

Assessment	Criterion for passing	Findings	What did we learn about our candidates?	Actions to Take Based on Data
Tracking of Complaints-Associate Dean	Fewer than 25 complaints overall with no noticeable pattern (program where complaint originated, type of complaint)	<p>Total # Issues=16</p> <p>Program where issue originated: Elem Ed. Initial: 9 Special Ed. Initial: 1 Secondary: 4</p> <p>Type of issue:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Misconduct-1 • Inappropriate dispositions - 11 <p>Other:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work quality-1 • Unhappy with clinical placement-1 • Clinical-unable to meet standards-1 	Most complaints from initial elementary education; Disposition issues occurred in clinical sites and on campus; Professional behavior (absences, lack of interpersonal skills, poor collaboration skills, and lack of respect) resulted in 13 disposition alerts.	Continue to monitor candidate dispositions on campus and in the field placements. Continue to inform candidates of the need to act professionally and use the disposition support system as needed.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unable to pass state licensure test - 1 <p>Formal Dispositions Alert Issued: 13</p> <p>Resolution*</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal resolution=10 Formal grievance=1 Removal from program=1 Degree change-1 Withdrew from student teaching-2 Placement changed-1 <p>*NOTE: Some conflicts resulted in more than one resolution</p>		
Candidate appeal of clinical or field placements	Individual review of each situation by faculty, program director, administrators; decision by consensus; if no extenuating circumstances, consistently apply policy to deny requests	Total # of requests for field/clinical placement changes: 15 (15 initial; 0 advanced) Total # approved: 7 Total # denied: 7 Other: 1	Appeals by program: Early Childhood: 5 Elementary: 3 Special Ed: 2 Secondary: 5 Majority were for personal/medical reasons	None; all approvals had extenuating circumstances (e.g., single parent with child care issues); denials did not demonstrate extenuating circumstances (e.g., don't want a particular grade level)

Note: Some complaints are listed in more than one category

Assessment: Professional Education Grade Point Average (GPA)

Note: Data are based on cohorts determined by the date the candidate was admitted to the particular program.

Each program determines the cluster of professional education coursework required and the required grade point average for retention in the program.

Criterion for passing:

Candidates must have 3.0 GPA (Special Education) or 2.5 (all other programs) in professional education coursework to be retained in the program.

Findings:

Early Childhood

Professional Education GPA ¹⁰:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
Fall 2010	3.38 – 4.00	3.88	24

¹⁰Professional Education GPA for Early Childhood Education students is calculated using CI 421, SPE 400, SPPA 490, EPFR 320, EPFR 315, CI 316, CI 301, SPE 440, CI 316, CI 317, CI 323, CI 316, CI 324, CI 343, CI 426 and CI 414. Professional Education GPA will be collected after the Fall semester prior to the Spring student teaching semester.

Fall 2011	3.26 – 4.00	3.79	18
Fall 2012	3.10 - 4.00	3.67	23
Fall 2013	3.00 – 4.00	3.82	17
Fall 2014	2.83 – 4.00	3.75	24
Fall 2015			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2016

Professional Education GPA (Off-Campus Cohort-Echoes)

Cohort	Range	Mean	Student who have reached this point
Fall 2010	3.68 – 4.00	3.91	5
Fall 2011	3.68 - 3.89	3.78	2
Fall 2012	4.00	4.00	1
Fall 2013	3.88-4.00	3.96	3
Fall 2014			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015
Fall 2015			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2016

Elementary Education

Professional Education GPA ¹¹:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
Fall 2010	3.22 – 4.00	3.87	97
Fall 2011	3.50 – 4.00	3.89	71
Fall 2012	3.10 - 4.00	3.80	93
Fall 2013	3.13 – 4.00	3.84	79
Fall 2014*			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2015
Fall 2015			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2016

*New Elementary Education begins Fall 2014

Secondary Education

Professional Education GPA ¹²:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students how have reached this point
2010-2011	3.00-4.00	3.78	115
2011-2012	2.60-4.00	3.72	102
2012-2013	3.75-4.00	3.78	80
2013-2014	2.93-4.00	3.84	53
2014-2015	2.40-4.00	3.74	67

Special Education

Professional Education GPA ¹³:

¹¹Professional Education GPA for Elementary Education students is calculated using SPE 400, ART 300A, KIN 330, EPFR 320, EPFR 315, CI 311, CI 312, CI 337, CI 413, CI 415, CI 442, CI 411, CI 307, CI 338, CI 343 and CI 445. Professional Education GPA will be collected after the Fall semester prior to the Spring student teaching semester.

¹²Professional Education GPA for Secondary Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, SPE 400, CI 440 and CI 315a. Art Education and Kinesiology students do not take CI 440 or CI 315a. Health Education and Music Education students do not take CI 315a.

¹³ Professional Education GPA is calculated the term prior to student teaching. Professional Education GPA for Special Education students is calculated using EPFR 315, EPFR 320, KIN 325, SPE 405, SPE 412, SPE 415, SPE 416, SPE 430, SPE 450, SPE 470, SPE 471, SPPA 490, SPE 417a, SPE 417b, SPE 418 and SPE 421.

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2010-2011	3.30 – 4.00	3.81	34
2011-2012	3.00 - 4.00	3.78	32
2012-2013	3.06 – 3.94	3.61	15
2013-2014	3.20 – 4.00	3.66	16
2014-2015	3.06 – 4.00	3.65	23
2015-2016			Data for this cohort will be available at the end of Fall 2016

Unit aggregate

Professional Education GPA:

Cohort	Range	Mean	Students who have reached this point
2010-2011	2.67 - 4.0	3.79	210
2011-2012	2.75 - 4.0	3.79	247
2012-2013	2.6 – 4.0	3.74	219
2013-2014	2.93 – 4.0	3.81	179
2014-2015	Incomplete data set – 2-year program data not available until after fall semester 2015		

*Incomplete data – PETE candidates not included

What did we learn about our candidates?

Almost all candidates met or exceeded requirements for Professional Education grade point average. Data indicated that candidates displayed strong professional knowledge, skills and dispositions.

Actions to be taken based on data:

Continue to monitor retention of candidates based on these assessments. Please note that the school health education program has been approved for discontinuation.

TRANSITION POINT III: PROGRAM COMPLETION

Assessment: Student Teaching Evaluation (2014-2015)

Assessment: Unit student teaching evaluation; Faculty & Cooperating Teacher(s) complete an online evaluation consisting of a base of set of 25 forced choice statements, along with space for comments.** Programs were encouraged to add SPA specific questions to the base 25 questions and some programs did this.

Criterion for passing: Candidates are evaluated with a five-level scale:

Level 5 - Outstanding foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher (top1%)

Level 4 - Advanced foundation of knowledge and skills for a beginning teacher

Level 3 - Acceptable skills for a beginning teacher

Level 2 - Developing skills, but needs more practice to teacher-of-record.

Level 1 - Struggling candidate, not ready to teach and not observed

Level 5 = exceeds

Levels 4 and 3 = meets

Levels 2 and 1 = does not meet

‘Not observed’ is not counted against the candidate.

Program Name	Exceeds	Meets	Does not meet	Not observed	Areas not observed (>9% per question)
ECH (all) (n=67)*	31.67%	61.33%	4.11%	2.90%	Q: 17, 18
ECH campus (n=55)	33.89%	60.08%	4.59%	1.44%	
ECH ESTL (n=3)	17.33%	52.00%	2.67%	28.00%	
ECH So. Roxana 1 (n=3)	6.67%	88.00%	0.00%	5.33%	
ECH So. Roxana 2 (n=4)	29.33%	67.33%	1.00%	2.33%	
ELEM (n=85)	37.26%	59.95%	1.23%	1.56%	
SPED (n=67)	33.49%	62.51%	1.31%	2.69%	
Secondary (All) (N=155)	23.74%	69.19%	3.52%	3.55%	Q: 4, 17, 21, 22
English (n=55)	15.56%	76.58%	3.78%	4.07%	Q:4,17,21,22
Math (n=14)	25.71%	68.29%	5.71%	0.00%	
Music (n=22)	20.55%	70.73%	4.73%	0.00%	
Theater and Dance (n=4)	2.00%	90.00%	0.00%	8.00%	Q: 12,15,16,17, 21,22,25
Visual Arts (n=20)	54.86%	40.19%	2.29%	2.67%	Q:4,12,16,17, 18,21
All Sciences (n=31)	13.81%	77.29%	4.90%	4.00%	Q:16,17,19,22
Biology (n=22)	18.36%	77.27%	1.45%	2.91%	
Chemistry (n=9)	2.67%	77.33%	13.33%	6.67%	
Earth Space Science (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All Social Sciences (n=16)	43.25%	53.00%	0.00%	3.75%	Q:4,17,19,21,22
Geography (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
History (n=16)	12.55%	79.09%	4.00%	4.36%	
Political Science (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All Foreign Languages (n=5)	8.00%	90.40%	0.00%	1.60%	Q:17,21
Spanish (n=5)	8.00%	90.40%	0.00%	1.60%	
French (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
German (n=0)	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
All initial programs combined (n=374)	30.03%	64.56%	2.77%	2.64%	Q4: 7.69% Q17: 17.11% Q21: 7.22%

* Three incomplete EC evaluations

Findings*: This was the third year for the new student teaching evaluation form, which was based on the 2013 Illinois Professional Teaching Standards. The evaluation results were combined by program to show the percentage of evaluations which were scored in the ranges explained above. The data includes the 25 standard questions that all programs use for evaluation. Some programs have additional questions related to their SPA requirements. Minor confusion occurred when three supervisors completed the wrong form.

**Findings reported as overall mean and percent of *evaluations completed* that exceeded, met, or did not meet expectations. Some candidates had multiple evaluations because of several placements.

NOTE: Scores for each question for each program are available on the SOE shared drive for program faculty review

What did we learn about candidates? Candidates displayed the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to be successful during student teaching. **Actions to Take Based on Data:** The previous student teaching evaluation did not have the option, “not observed,” the new instrument revealed interesting data from university supervisors and cooperating teachers. Last year the top 4 questions were identified as not being observed – Q4, 17, 21. The “not observed” average last year was slightly lower at 2.45%. The following questions were identified for the past two years as ones “not observed”:

Q4. Addresses goals and objectives when planning, assessing, and implementing plans developed under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, individualized education programs (IEP), or individual family service plans (IFSP) for students with special needs, ELLs, and students who are gifted.

Q17. Maintains, accurately interprets, and clearly communicates records of student work and performance to students, parents or guardians, colleagues, and the community in a confidential manner that complies with the requirements of the Illinois School Student Records Act and the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA).

Q21. Engages in self-assessment and adjusts practice to enhance personal growth and development; participates in professional development, professional organizations, and learning communities.

Faculty should continue to review the questions where candidates could not be evaluated. Some suggestions for actions: (a) Faculty could modify the experiences required in student teaching, (b) they could change assignments/lesson plans to cover the items “not observed” and/or (c) require university supervisors to verify that these experiences are being included through writing or oral communications. This evaluation will be moved into Taskstream this year. This should eliminate the possibility of supervisors using an incorrect form.

Assessment: Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT)

All candidates must pass the State-administered Assessment of Professional Teaching (APT) prior to certification. The APT is designed to assess candidates’ pedagogical knowledge. In September 2014, the state changed from four tests (101-104) suited to specific grades to a universal test covering all grade levels. The 101 to 104 tests addressed six subareas, which include: foundations, characteristics, and assessment; planning and delivering instruction; managing the learning environment; collaboration, communication, and professionalism; language arts; and educational technology. In addition, candidates must respond to constructed response questions focusing on pedagogy knowledge and skills. The new test (188) includes four subareas: Development and Learning; Learning Environment; Instruction and Assessment; and Professional Environment as well as two constructed response questions.

Criteria for passing:

Overall scores of 240 or above are considered passing. Because subarea (100-300) scores are on the same scale, subarea scores below 240 could suggest areas of relative weakness.

Findings:

New TEST CODE 188

<i>Program</i>	<i>Area 1</i>	<i>Area 2</i>	<i>Area 3</i>	<i>Area 4</i>	<i>Area 5</i>	<i>Mean</i>
<i>Early Childhood (n=9)</i>	246	259	254	266	235 (3 out of 9 candidates scored <240)	252
<i>Elementary Education (n=72)</i>	245	261	256	257	250	254

<i>Physical Education (n=4)</i>	212	237	210	190	215	214
<i>Special Education (n=16)</i>	255	257	261	265	247	257
<i>Secondary Education (n=48)</i>	243	256	251	260	257	253
Unit aggregate* (n=149)	244	258	253	256	250	252

All Subarea scores by program are located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data)

Note: Scaled Score of 240 or above indicates satisfactory performance

Subarea 1=Development and Learning; Subarea 2=Learning Environment; Subarea 3= Instruction and Assessment; Subarea 4 = Professional Environment; Subarea 5 Constructed Response

Old TEST CODES (101,102,103,104)

Program	Area 1	Area 2	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6	Area 7	Mean
<i>Early Childhood (n=8)</i>	274	270	279	277	277	277	243	269
<i>Elementary Education (n=5)</i>	268	267	270	271	276	275	266	271
<i>Physical Education (n=1)</i>	285	300	284	300	282	293	285	289
<i>Special Education (n=1)</i>	274	274	271	279	266	259	244	264
<i>Secondary Education (n=14)</i>	266	274	257	278	269	271	241	265
Unit aggregate* (n=29)	269	272	266	277	272	273	247	267

All Subarea scores by program are located on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data)

Note: Scaled Score of 240 or above indicates satisfactory performance

Subarea 1=Foundations, Characteristics, and Assessment; Subarea 2=Planning and Delivering Instruction; Subarea 3=Managing the Learning Environment; Subarea 4=Collaboration, Communication, and Professionalism; Subarea 5=Language Arts; Subarea 6=Educational Technology; Subarea 7=Constructed Response on Pedagogy

What did we learn about our candidates?

Tests 101-104: There appears to be a pattern of low candidate scores in Subarea 7, Constructed Response in Pedagogy. No other unit-level pattern of Subarea scores was apparent.

Test 188: When comparing the two versions of the test, the aggregate scores on the new test appear to be at least 20 points lower in the non-constructed response question subareas. Area 1: Development and Learning is the lowest scoring subtest. This could be due to the questions covering extensive grade ranges.

Actions to take based on data:

All program faculty need to review their specific program's data for the APT on the shared drive, as the aggregated data may not represent their program. All programs should review the objectives associated with each Subarea, especially Subarea 7, Constructed Response in Pedagogy. If appropriate, action at the program level should occur to increase these scores. Faculty should also review program-level data for other Subareas, review associated test objectives, and determine what, if any, action should occur. Test information has been included in each program's summary data folder on the shared drive or it can be found at <http://www.il.nesinc.com/>

TRANSITION POINT IV: FOLLOW-UP

Assessment: Exit Survey (Initial Candidates)-2014-2015 (See SOE shared drive for more detailed program level data)

Initial candidates in teacher education programs assess the quality of their programs via a 26-item inventory. The exit survey is completed just prior to graduation. On statements 1-16, candidates provided opinions on a Likert scale, where A=Strongly Disagree (1), B=Disagree (2), C=Agree (3), and D=Strongly Agree (4). On statements 17-26, candidates were asked to reflect on their level of preparation in a variety of areas using a Likert scale, where A=No Preparation (1), B=Minimal Preparation (2), C=Adequate Preparation (3), and D=Extensive Preparation (4). Means were computed for each statement across all programs. Data was also sorted into the following categories: Does not meet criteria-means less than 3.0; Meets criteria-means of 3.0-3.49; Exceeds criteria-means greater than 3.49.

Criteria for passing:

Means for each item, by program, should be at least 3.0 (i.e., agree or adequate preparation) *AND* at least 75% of candidates should have means of at least 3.0. Questions that were flagged for faculty review were those where 25% or more respondents did not meet expectations *AND* the overall mean for the question did not meet expectations.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Exit surveys were completed by 151 graduating candidates. The range of scores spanned 2.85 to 3.63, with only question #7 below the 3.0 mark. Question 7: *The general education courses were helpful in my overall preparation for teaching* continues to be a problem as it has scored below 3.0 for the past few years. The majority of candidates rated their experiences and preparation favorably as shown in the 3.34 mean for all categories. Three questions received ratings just above 3.0:

Q5: *It appeared that the teacher education program was comprised of students from diverse backgrounds* with a score of 3.04

Level of preparation questions:

Q19: *Effectively use learning technologies* with a score of 3.09

Q22: *Acquire multicultural and global perspectives* with a score of 3.09

Actions to take based on data: Across all programs, candidates met the criteria for passing this assessment. With the new Lincoln (General Education) Program gradually being phased in, we hope to see changes in the response to question 7. Candidates entering their programs in 2013 have experienced a modified version of the new curriculum whereas candidates entering the program in 2014 will have experienced the entire new curriculum. By 2016, we hope to have a better response to this question.

It might also be helpful to define what is meant by *general education* courses. It is possible that some candidates define general education courses as those during the first two years at the university and others view these courses as the core courses in professional education.

Until this shared definition is communicated, it is difficult to interpret results. The implementation of the Lincoln Plan may also help to improve candidates' view of their general education courses.

Note: the State of Illinois will assume the collection of exit surveys in 2018 as well as one year and five year out surveys. We will be piloting the new version this year.

Assessment: Illinois Public Colleges Teacher Graduate Survey – One year after graduation-2012 Survey Results-based on 2010-2011 graduates

Initial program completers state-wide who are teaching in Illinois public schools and their supervisors are surveyed during the spring of the first year of full-time teaching. Aggregate responses are available for all public state universities and institution-specific data is disaggregated.

Criterion for passing:

This survey provides qualitative data about relative strengths and weaknesses in our teacher education programs. Relative strengths are areas where more than 90% of candidates were satisfied or felt prepared. Relative weaknesses are areas where less than 75% of candidates were satisfied or felt prepared. Patterns of increase or decrease in levels of satisfaction or perceived preparation are also indicative of relative strength or weakness.

Select Findings (with comparisons to previous surveys; SIUE graduates):

Note: These items represent some highlights. The entire survey results are available in the Dean's office.

Extent to which your teacher education program prepared you to (% extremely or mostly prepared)

Question	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
Accommodate students with exceptionalities	78.4%	67.6%	72%	72%	77%	77%	76%	65%	83%	62%
Teach English language learners	24.3%	26.9%	18.3%	16%	20%	14%	12%	32%	6%	37%
Using multicultural education strategies	59.5%	58.8%	60%	62%	53%	58%	57%	57%	53%	63%
Use technology for classroom instruction	56.8%	66.2%	64%	70%	68%	70%	60%	43%	24%	81%
Address issues of socioeconomic diversity	64.9%	47.1%	60%	67%	60%	70%	66%	67%	77%	69%
Teach literacy skills in your subject area	75.7%	70.6%	72%	64%	59%	80%	74%	74%	53%	81%
Work with school administration	45.9%	35.8%	46%	51%	53%	43%	53%	67%	53%	69%
Work with parents or guardians	48.6%	33.8%	52%	64%	57%	51%	66%	47%	47%	75%
Work in a high accountability environment	57.4%	54.4%	56%	67%	71%	67%	69%	61%	64%	85%

Manage student behavior	----	----	----	----	77%	71%	68%	54%	58%	50%
*Implementing Response to Intervention Strategies	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	47%
*Implementing Common Core Standards	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	80%
*Assessing student learning	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	71%
*Teacher Evaluation Process	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	62%

*new question

Other SIUE 1st year teacher survey results:

- 100% are satisfied with their decision to become a teacher
- 100% are satisfied with their choice of grade level and subject area for licensure
- 88% are satisfied with their interaction the teacher preparation faculty.
- 81% are satisfied with the teacher education program advising.
- 94% are satisfied with the overall quality of the teacher education program.
- 88% are satisfied with student teaching supervision.

What did we learn about our SIUE candidates one year after completion?

Note: These items represent some highlights. The entire survey results are available in the Dean's office.

- Some Relative Strengths
 - 81% felt prepared to use technology for classroom instruction (marked increase from the 2013 score of 24% and also the lowest score on record.)
 - 81% felt prepared to teach literacy skills in their subject area.
 - 85% felt prepared to work in a high accountability environment.
 - 80% felt prepared to implement the Common Core Standards
- Some Relative Weaknesses
 - 37% felt prepared to teach English language learners (a marked increase from 6% and also the lowest score on record)
 - 47% felt prepared to use RtI strategies (a new question added this year)
 - 50% felt prepared to manage student behavior (a decrease from last year's score)

Actions to take based on data:

The elementary education faculty redesigned their program to address many of these areas needing improvement: teaching English language learners, use of technology for classroom instruction, use of strategies used in multicultural education, how to address issues of socioeconomic diversity, working with school administrators, working with parents/guardians, preparation for working in a high accountability environment, and managing student behavior. New courses in diversity, technology, assessment, differentiated instruction, and communication were created as a core which the majority of candidates will be required to take regardless of their educational program option. Elementary education candidates taking this survey did not take these new course offerings, nor have they experienced the full impact of the edTPA. Since this program was first implemented in fall 2014, it will take two or more years before we can determine if the identified weak areas are addressed in the program.

Faculty in other teacher education programs also engaged in revising curriculums to include new 1) the Teacher Performance Assessment (edTPA), 2) the Illinois Professional

Teaching Standards (IPTTS) and revised SPA standards, many of which are reflected in the relative areas of weakness identified in this survey. These program modifications will be demonstrated in later years.

Additional Program Assessment Data

As part of an effort to align SIUE Assessment Plans for all programs with the Unit Assessment Plan and to comply with NCATE (i.e., summarize more data across programs), the following assessment data was collected: *Effect on Student Learning*, *Senior Assignment*, and *Planning Instruction* which are program-specific. The assessment, *Planning Instruction*, was reported above under *Admission to Student Teaching*, Transition Point 2). These additional assessments allowed the Unit to evaluate important issues across all programs. These assessments are fully described (by program) on the SOE Shared Drive (under SOE Data).

Assessment: Candidate Effect on Student Learning

Each program developed and administered an assessment of candidate effect on student learning. Data was reported by program as the number of candidates who exceeded, met, or did not meet program expectations for this assessment.

Criterion for passing:

Each program specified the criterion for candidates to exceed, meet, or not meet program expectations for this assessment. It was expected that at least 80% of all candidates would meet or exceed expectations.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Findings
Early childhood (n=31 all locations)	86% of NAEYC Standards for impact on student learning were exceeded or met
Elementary Education (n=78)	98% of ACEI Standard 4 elements for impact on student learning were exceeded or met
Special education (n=18)	92% of CEC Standards for impact on student learning were exceeded or met
Unit aggregate (n =127)	94.2% of a SPA Standards for impact on student learning were exceeded or met

*Assessment includes projects that we completed. 14 students were unable to videotape or their videos were not uploaded properly.

Note: Data from secondary content area majors was collected by the content department

What did we learn about our candidates?

All candidates demonstrated the ability to impact student learning by surpassing the goal of 80% meeting or exceeding program-specific expectations. Early Childhood and Elementary Education programs used edTPA Task #3 and Special Education used their Behavior Change Project for this assessment. The Physical Education program assessed its last few candidates this year.

Actions to take based on data:

Faculty should continue to study this data for the purpose of preparing teacher candidates to be effective educators. The focus of student learning needs to be highlighted when these assessments are introduced to candidates. Teacher candidates need a rich experience which focuses on using data to improve instruction.

Assessment: Senior Assignment

All three programs used the edTPA as their senior assignment. All programs used the portfolio's 15 rubrics. The edTPA aligns with most SPA standards at this time. The Special Education

program submitted a data table aligned with the CEC Standards. Program faculty scored the edTPAs.

Criterion for passing:

It was expected that candidates would score a 2 or higher on each rubric. The percentages included in the table represent the scores receiving a 2 or higher.

Findings:

Program (and number of candidates)	Findings
Early childhood (n=16)	94% of edTPA scores exceeded or met expectations
Elementary education (n =78)	98% of edTPA scores exceeded or met expectations
Special education (n= 14)	100% of CEC Standards aligned with the edTPA exceeded or met expectations
Unit aggregate (n=108)	97.7% of candidates exceeded or met expectations

Note: Data from secondary content area majors was collected by the content department.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Across programs, candidates met or exceeded expectations; most candidates demonstrated skills and competencies in major area of study and general education coursework. Local scoring appears to be inflated when compared to national scoring benchmarks.

Actions to take based on data:

Continue to improve and refine the quality of candidate preparation for the edTPA. Program faculty have access to scores of their candidates and should analyze the data in all three task areas. Programs should use this data to inform changes that will positively affect candidates. If local scoring is used within the program, calibration exercises are warranted.

Contributors to this report:

Barbara O'Donnell, Associate Dean,

Mary Weishaar, Associate Dean

Gretchen Fricke, Director, OCECA

December, 2015

Data Summary
School of Education, Health and Human Behavior Unit Assessment System
Advanced Teacher Education Programs
2014-2015

TRANSITION POINT: Entry to Graduate Education

Assessment: Minimum grade point average (GPA) in undergraduate and graduate (if appropriate) degrees; Must hold bachelor's degree

Description: Entry grade point average for each program and location is summarized annually.

Criterion for passing: Candidates must hold at least 2.5 GPA and a bachelor's degree to enter a graduate program.

Findings:

Admission GPA Data

Program	Number of Candidates	Mean Grade Point Average
Curriculum and Instruction (pedagogy-on campus)	24	3.278
Curriculum and Instruction (Millstadt)	10	3.113
Educational Administration (EDAD MSED – on-campus)	19	3.473
Educational Administration (Principal-MSED, Cert. only- on-campus)	6	3.31
Educational Administration (Specialist General – on- campus)	10	3.292
Educational Administration (Superintendent- on campus)	5	3.281
Educational Administration - Doctorate	12	3.033
Instructional Technology (on- line)	31	3.211
Learning, Culture, Society (on campus)	7	3.281
Literacy (on campus)	15	3.481
Literacy Post-Masters (on campus)	4	3.115
Special Education (Master's)	13	3.231
Aggregate Data	156	3.258

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates met or exceeded the required grade point average requirements and all candidates held a bachelor's degree upon entry to their programs. There were no observable differences in locations off-campus or programs on campus. Candidates admitted to each program displayed adequate content knowledge necessary to pursue advanced study in their fields.

Actions to take based on data:

None

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Self-Assessment) (2014-2015)

Description: Upon entry to their programs, candidates complete an online self-assessment survey on four dispositions.

Rubric: 1=I display this disposition; 2=I do not display this disposition; 3=I do not know if I display this disposition.

Dispositions: 1. I act on the belief that all individuals can learn; 2. I respect the diversity of all learners; 3. I treat learners equitably and fairly; 4. I have a sense of professional responsibility and value life-long learning

Criterion for Passing: Candidate self-assessment of 4 dispositions; All candidates must meet 100% of dispositions

Findings:

Program	Number of Candidates	Percent of Candidates who met dispositions*
Curriculum and Instruction-pedagogy (on-campus)	11	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Educational Administration - MSED	17	94% of candidates met all dispositions; 1 candidate did not know if they displayed areas A & C; 1 candidate did not display area B
Educational Administration –Gen Administrative	3	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Educational Administration - Superintendent	1	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Instructional Technology	24	95% of candidates met all dispositions; 1 candidate did not know if they displayed areas A & B; 1 candidate did not display area D
Learning Culture Society	3	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Literacy	7	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Special Education (general and subsequent certification)	4	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Aggregated data	70	68 out of 70 candidates met all dispositions with 1 candidate ‘not meeting’ in area B: Respecting the diversity of learners and 1 candidate ‘not meeting’ in area D: Professional responsibility and life-long learning

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?

Candidates who took this assessment perceived themselves as displaying these dispositions; Candidates displayed awareness of the expected dispositions.

Note: The number of dispositions self-evaluations is down from 238 (2011-2012) to 70, which indicates that graduate programs have fewer candidates entering their programs or candidates are not completing this evaluation. Educational Administration had a record number of candidates in 2011-12, due to many candidates wanting to finish before new state guidelines for principal preparation are being enacted.

Actions to take based on data:

The associate dean will check with program chairs about incoming candidates completing this evaluation. Additionally, recruitment of new graduate students needs to be a priority. The new

teacher leader endorsement, approved by the state this year has no enrollment. Potential teacher leader and principal candidates take the same entry level course, but so far all candidates have opted for the principal track.

TRANSITION POINT: Mid-Point Check

Assessment: Content Knowledge – 15 Hour Grade Point Average Check

Description: After taking 15 semester hours, program directors and the graduate coordinator are notified by the graduate school about students who do not maintain the minimum 3.0 grade point average. Program directors individually work with candidates who fall behind.

Criterion for passing: Candidates must hold minimum of grade point average 3.0 for the master’s degree and 3.25 grade point average for specialist’s degree after 15 semester hours.

Findings:

15-hour GPA Check Data

Program	Number of candidates who <i>did not</i> meet the minimum requirements*
Curriculum and Instruction	0
*Educational Administration	0
Instructional Technology	1
Learning Culture Society	0
Literacy	0
*Special Education	1
Aggregated data	2

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?

Almost all candidates displayed the necessary content knowledge after 15 semester hours, based upon GPA. Due to strict admission requirements, nearly all candidates are able to demonstrate the content knowledge needed to succeed.

Actions to take based on data: There is no specific trend in the data. Program directors need to take note of any candidates who are struggling in their classes, notify their instructors and offer options to successfully finish their program.

Assessment: Ability to plan instruction or learning environment (for non-teaching programs) 2014-2015

Description: This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment)

Criterion for passing: Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to plan instruction or the learning environment (for non-teaching programs).

Findings:

Planning Instruction/Learning Environment Data

Program	# of Candidates	# who Did Not Meet Expectations	# who Met Expectations	# who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	10	0	9	1
*Educational Administration	30	0	2	28

**Instructional Technology	14	2	11	1
Learning Culture and Society	4	0	4	0
Literacy	20	0	10	10
Special Education	11	2	5	4
Aggregated data	89	4 (4%)	41 (46%)	44 (49%)

*averaged from disaggregated data

** collected from three courses, so some parts of the assessment are still in progress. The data represented here is from IT481, the first course in the sequence.

What did we learn about our candidates? With the exception of four candidates, the remainder of the candidates met or exceeded expectations in instructional planning or planning a learning environment. It is important to note that two of the instructional technology candidates have not progressed in their programs to the point where the entirety of this assessment is administered, hence the numbers in this data table may differ from other assessments.

Actions to take based on data:

Continue to monitor assessment completion.

Assessment: Internship/Field Evaluation (2014-2015)

Description: This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment). Candidates carry out a project or experience within a field or internship setting.

Criterion for passing: Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates either meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to succeed in a field or internship project or placement.

Findings:

Internship Data

Program	# Candidates	# Candidates who Did Not Meet Expectations	# Candidates who Met Expectations	# Candidates who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	16	0	14	2
*Educational Administration	27	0	1	26
Instructional Technology	9**	1	8	0
Learning Culture Society	1	0	0	1
Literacy	4	0	1	3
*Special Education	0	0	0	0
Aggregated data	57**	1 (2%)	24 (42%)	32 (56%)

*aggregated from disaggregated data

**students complete the internship in three courses, so one of the students' work is in progress. The data represented here is from IT571, the first course in the sequence.

What did we learn about our candidates?

Of those candidates who were assessed, 56 out of 57 candidates met or exceeded expectations. The “did not meet” candidate is enrolled in a three course assessment and may not be at end point in the assessment process.

Actions to take based on data:

Continue to monitor completion of this assessment for all program candidates.

Assessment: Impact on Student Learning (2014-2015)

Description: This is a program-specific assessment and specific assessment descriptions are included on the SOE Shared Drive (SOE Data, Advanced Program Assessment)

Criterion for passing: Programs specify the specific criterion for passing. Candidates either meet, exceed, or do not meet program-specific expectations involving their ability to effect student learning.

Findings:

Providing a Supportive Environment for Student Learning Data

Program	# Candidates	# Candidates who Did Not Meet Expectations	# Candidates who Met Expectations	# Candidates who Exceeded Expectations
Curriculum and Instruction	16	0	13	3
*Educational Administration	50	0	38	12
**Instructional Technology	14	2	12	0
Learning Culture Society	1	0	0	1
Literacy	4	0	1	3
*Special Education	0	0	0	0
Aggregated data	85	2 (2%)	64 (75%)	19 (22%)

*averaged from disaggregated data

** collected from two courses, so some parts of the assessment are still in progress. The data represented here is from IT481, the first course in the sequence.

What did we learn about our candidates? Two of the 85 candidates did not meet expectations for impact on student learning. These two candidates' scores are dependent on completing a two course sequence and their scores reflect the possibility that they are in the middle of a long-term assessment. Educational administration candidates' scores are predominately at the "meets" level. In past years their scores were predominately at the "exceeds" level. This change is due to the rigor of the new principal preparation program.

Actions to take based on data: Continue to monitor the trends in the data.

TRANSITION POINT: Program Completion

Assessment: Dispositions Checklist (Faculty-Assessment)

Description: Candidate self-assesses 4 dispositions using an online form at the start of their program. Faculty complete a dispositions evaluation near program completion.

Rubric: Candidate displays disposition; Candidate does not display disposition; No opportunity to observe
Dispositions: 1. (A) Acts on belief that all students can learn; 2. (B) Respects the diversity of all learners; 3. (C) Treats learners equitably and fairly; 4. (D) Has a sense of professional responsibility and values life-long learning

Criterion for Passing: All candidates must meet 100% of dispositions

Findings: N= 66 Evaluations

Advanced Program Dispositions Data

Program	Number of Candidates	Percent of Candidates who met dispositions*
Curriculum and Instruction-pedagogy (on-campus)	12	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Curriculum and Instruction (Belleville)	17	100% of candidates met all dispositions (with 1 candidate 'not knowing' in area D)

Educational Administration - Principal	29	90% of candidates met all dispositions; 3 candidates 'did not meet in area D
Educational Administration - Superintendent	14	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Instructional Technology	5	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Learning Culture Society	5	80% of candidates met all dispositions; 1 candidate did not meet in area D and 3 candidates had 1 not observed rating (1 in area B and 2 in area C
Literacy	11	100% of candidates met all dispositions
Special Education (general and subsequent certification)	0	No candidates were evaluated
Aggregated data	66	94% or 62 out of 66 candidates met all dispositions with 4 candidates 'not meeting' in area D: Professional responsibility and life-long learning

*aggregated from disaggregated data

What did we learn about our candidates?

Four candidates struggled with one of the four dispositions, area D: Candidate has a sense of professional responsibility and value life-long learning, recording the largest number of “does not display.” All but one candidate is in the Educational Administration programs. The data on the shared drive shows that these three candidates are in the general administrative program.

Actions to take based on data: Faculty are aware of these candidates and are supporting their efforts to improve their sense of professional responsibility. The completion of this assessment by faculty has improved over last year – more assessments are being completed, but the unit will continue to monitor assessment completion.

Assessment: Exit Survey (2014-2015)

Description: Graduate students (including those in non-teacher education programs) assess the quality of their graduate program via a 17-item inventory. The exit survey is completed just prior to graduation, following completion of an exit project or examination. In addition to 16 items tapping specific aspects of the program, the final item asks respondents to rate their overall graduate education experience at SIUE. Therefore, two different Likert scale response formats are used:

Questions 1-16

- 1=Strongly Disagree
- 2=Disagree
- 3=Agree
- 4=Strongly Agree

Question 17 (Overall rating of graduate program)

- 1=Very Poor
- 2=Poor
- 3=Fair
- 4=Good
- 5=Excellent

Criteria for passing: Questions 1-16: Means for each question, across all programs, and for each program are at least 3.0. (Does not meet=less than 3; Meets=3.0-3.49; Exceeds=greater than 3.49).

Findings:

NOTES ON DATA CHARTS BELOW: Data disaggregated by *program* is located on the shared drive under each program's summary data. **The charts below summarize all graduate programs and locations. The number of surveys in the data set is 57.**

1. In general, the quality of instruction I received in my program area was very high.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.56/4.0	4	0	13	40

2. In general, my professors were well prepared and competent.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.39/4.0	4	0	23	30

3. My professors shared information from updated, useful research and best practice.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.47/4.0	3	1	19	34

4. Faculty members were available and interested in helping me pursue my academic and career interests.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.46/4.0	4	1	17	35

5. There seemed to be sufficient resources (e.g., library materials, laboratory facilities, audio visual aids, computers) to support my program of study.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.39/4.0	4	0	23	30

6. My program improved my ability to think critically/analytically about issues related to my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.49/4.0	5	0	14	38

7. My program addressed the major theories, concepts, models, and issues related to my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.53/4.0	4	0	15	38

8. My program provided instruction on the methods and techniques employed in my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.49/4.0	4	0	17	37

9. I was regularly engaged in discussions examining the values, ethics, and best practices of my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.47/4.0	4	0	18	35

10. My program was designed in such a way that I could readily apply knowledge and skills to problems and issues I will experience in my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.46/4.0	4	0	19	34

11. My program adequately prepared me (in terms of breadth and depth of knowledge) for employment in the field for which I was being prepared.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.37/4.0	4	2	20	31

12. My program improved my ability to communicate knowledge (written, oral) concerning my field.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.53/4.0	4	0	15	38

13. The days, times, and locations of course offerings were convenient for me.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.32/4.0	4	3	21	29

14. The exit requirement in my program was an appropriate learning experience.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.30/4.0	3	5	21	28

15. Advisors were helpful and available.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.33/4.0	4	3	20	30

16. Requirements for program admission and completion were clearly communicated.

Mean	# Strongly Disagree	# Disagree	# Agree	# Strongly Agree
3.30/4.0	4	1	26	26

17. My overall rating of my graduate degree is:

Mean	# Very Poor	# Poor	# Fair	# Good	#Excellent
4.65/5.0	0	0	3	14	40

What did we learn about our candidates? Across all locations and type of instruction (i.e., online), means are 3.0 or above. There are less graduate students this year so we received less exit surveys than last year. Candidates indicated that they were pleased with their program of study and their professors, demonstrating that SIUE offers effective programs in teacher education. It should be noted that some candidates scored their program with 1's across all categories, but recorded positive comments and high marks for the overall experience. These candidates may have marked their evaluations incorrectly. Subsequently all scores on all questions are lower than last year.

Actions to Take Based on Data: Across locations and programs and by type of instructional delivery (i.e., online), programs were perceived as quality programs by candidates. When administering the exit survey, make sure that the directions and scales are explained. Continue providing candidates worthwhile experiences and programs.

The following people contributed to this report:

Barbara O'Donnell, Associate Dean
 Angie White, Graduate Coordinator
 Gretchen Fricke, Director of OCECA
 December, 2014