Annual Goals for Elementary Education

2010-2011

Title: Collaborative Special Education

Description: Explore plans for Collaborative Special Education dual certification

Budget: 0.00

University Goals: 1,3

Strategic Goals:

Responsibility: Department Chair

Participation: Faculty

Results: During the 2010 academic year, the Department of Elementary Education received a $15,000 planning grant from the Special Education Division of the Alabama State Department of Education to improve pre-service teacher preparation. Specifically, IHEs that received the monies were asked to enhance the preparation of prospective special education teachers in the area of reading and language arts instruction and to prepare elementary education teacher candidates to better meet the needs of students with disabilities in the general education classroom.

Actions: A team of faculty members comprised of Drs. Linda Armstrong, Pam Chaney, Ann Dillon, and Victoria Hulsey sent out surveys to area administrators to determine viability of the program. Based on those data, the team developed a dual certification program in Collaborative K-6 and Elementary Education that has been approved by both the College of Education and the university. State department and ACHE approval is anticipated to be forthcoming this summer and the department intends to begin offering the program in spring 2012. Survey summary data, course syllabi and program check sheet are available in Department Chair Electronic files.

Improvements:

Title: Curriculum

Description: Use assessment results to make curricular changes.

Budget:	0.00
University Goals:	1,2
Strategic Goals:	
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty, P-6 partners
Results:	The department meets regularly to review and analyze data from our numerous assessments.
Actions:	Several changes in how the department assesses aspects of clinical experiences have been made this year. The department now has one standard log, reflection, and evaluation form use in all clinical experiences. We created a list of possible family involvement events candidates could participate in during one or both intern placements, and added this requirement to Internship (undergraduate). We reviewed and revised clinical and intern assessments in terms of AQTS and PATS.
Improvements:	

Title:	Student Learning Outcomes
Description:	Collect student learning outcomes assessment data and analyze
Budget:	0.00
University Goals:	1,2,3
Strategic Goals:	
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty
Results:	The department chair and program coordinator have reviewed the student learning outcomes assessment data and included it in the appropriate sections of this report.
Actions:	
Improvements:	The department chair and program coordinator have not met with the faculty to review the student learning outcomes assessment data from 2010-11 yet. This will occur at the first faculty meeting in the fall.

Title:	Maintain Accreditation
Description:	Meet State/National Mandates and Maintain Accreditation
Budget:	0.00
University Goals:	1,2
Strategic Goals:	
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty, Dean
Results:	Each faculty member in the College of Education is assigned to a continuous improvement committee. Each committee meets regularly to review state and national accreditation requirements. These requirements guide everything we do.
Actions:	The department assisted in all aspects of the state department and NCATE accreditation continuous improvement process. Each department updated the class-by-class chart indicating grade levels, content areas, and school sites for field placements (undergraduate). Each graduate program developed a chart for field placements that require candidates to critique and synthesize educational theory related to classroom practice. With the Office of Clinical Experiences, we adopted criteria for diverse clinical placements, and a method to track them. One chart attached; other documentation mentioned available in Department Chair's electronic files.
Improvements:	

Title:	Five Year Program Review
Description:	Complete a 5-year Program Review for all programs in the department prescribed by the University.
Budget:	0.00
University Goals:	1
Strategic Goals:	
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty

Results:	The department chair and program coordinator have completed the five yer program review prescribed by the university.
Actions:	
Improvements:	Program recommendations are located at the end of each program assessment in the five year report. Electronic file and all data files available in Department Chair's office.

Student Learning Outcomes for Elementary Education

2010-2011

Title:	Learning Needs
Description:	Assess the learning needs of students.
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty
Direct Assessments	

Indirect Assessments

Results: Results suggest our teacher candidates are able to assess the needs of their students. In EED 405, candidates work one on one with a student. Fall 2010, 96% of teacher candidates were successful in assessing the needs of students according to the rubric used. Spring 2011, 58% scored target, 29% scored acceptable and 11% scored unacceptable. In EED 472, candidates assess the needs of their entire class. In Fall 2010, 100% of candidates were successful in assessing the needs of students according to the rubric used. In Spring 2011, 86% scored target and 13% scored acceptable in assessing their students. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: none at this time

Actions: Based on the rubrics, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are assessing the learning needs of their students, and implementing procedures to affect student learning. We know what we require our candidates to do, but the criterion on the rubric does not accurately reflect this outcome. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubrics and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric. One rubric attached.

Improvements:

Title: Diverse Learners

Description: Design and implement diverse learning experiences based on assessed needs

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Internship Supervisors
Participation:	Department Chair
Direct Assessments	

EED 472 Project USA Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: In Spring 2011, based on assessed needs of an entire class of elementary students, 75% of teacher candidates were able to implement appropriate, diverse strategies at the target level, 22% at the acceptable level, and 2% at the unacceptable level during internship. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: Based on the rubric, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are assessing the learning needs of their students, and implementing diverse procedures to affect student learning. The assignment description asks for examples of instructional decision making based on student's learning, but the criterion on the rubric does not accurately reflect this outcome. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubric and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric. One rubric attached.

Improvements: None at this time.

Title:	Collaboration
Description:	Collaborate with school personnel to meet the educational needs of students
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Internship Supervisors
Participation:	Department Chair

Direct Assessments

EED 472 Professional Development Plan Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: In Fall 2010, 100% of the teacher candidates were successful at the target level in collaborating with school personnel to meet the needs of their students during internship. At the target level, candidates provide evidence in three or more collaborations on best practices with school personnel in their internship portfolio. In Spring 2011, 80% of the teacher candidates were successful at the target level in collaborating with school personnel to meet

the needs of their students during internship, and 19% were successful at the acceptable level. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum:	None at this time.
Actions:	none at this time
Improvements:	Continue to monitor the internship experience and the results of this assessment.

Title:	Technology
Description:	Infuse technology into unit and lesson planning
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Internship Supervisors
Participation:	Department Chair

Direct Assessments

EED 472 Project USA Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results:	The data from these outcomes are assessed in the Project USA project completed during student internship. Technology is assessed in four sections of the project: planning, assessment, implementation and whole group analysis. In 2010-11, 56 teacher candidates completed the project. In the planning section, 52 candidates earned target and 4 earned acceptable. In the assessment section, 51 candidates earned target, and 5 earned acceptable. In the implementation section, 47 scored in the target range, 8 in the acceptable range and 1 in the unacceptable range. In the whole group analysis section, 49 scored target, and 7 scored in the acceptable range. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.
Curriculum:	None at this time.
Actions:	Based on the rubric, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are infusing technology into lesson and unit planning. The assignment description gives directions for what technology is required in each section of the unit. Assignment description attached (technology requirements highlighted). The criterion for technology requirements is not accurately reflected in the rubric. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubric and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric.

Improvements:

Title:	Content Knowledge
Description:	Demonstrate content knowledge
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes

Responsibility: Certification Office

Participation: Department Chair

**Direct
Assessments**

PRAXIS II

**Indirect
Assessments**

Results: This is a standardized test that compares our teacher candidates with other teacher candidates in the nation. In 2010-2011, 94 elementary candidates took the exam, and 93 passed the PRAXIS II with the minimum score of 137 required by the Alabama State Department. Raw data provided by the Certification Office and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: None at this time.

Improvements: Continue to monitor the results of this assessment.

Student Learning Outcomes for Elementary Education

2010-2011

Title: Learning Needs

Description: Assess the learning needs of students.

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies:	1,2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty
Direct Assessments	

EED 405 Case Study Rubric and EED 472 Project USA Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: Results suggest our teacher candidates are able to assess the needs of their students. In EED 405, candidates work one on one with a student. Fall 2010, 96% of teacher candidates were successful in assessing the needs of students according to the rubric used. Spring 2011, 58% scored target, 29% scored acceptable and 11% scored unacceptable. In EED 472, candidates assess the needs of their entire class. In Fall 2010, 100% of candidates were successful in assessing the needs of students according to the rubric used. In Spring 2011, 86% scored target and 13% scored acceptable in assessing their students. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: none at this time

Actions: Based on the rubrics, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are assessing the learning needs of their students, and implementing

procedures to affect student learning. We know what we require our candidates to do, but the criteria on the rubric do not accurately reflect this outcome. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubrics and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric. One rubric attached.

Improvements:

Title:	Diverse Learners
Description:	Design and implement diverse learning experiences based on assessed needs
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Internship Supervisors
Participation:	Department Chair
Direct Assessments	

EED 472 Project USA Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: In Spring 2011, based on assessed needs of an entire class of elementary

students, 75% of teacher candidates were able to implement appropriate, diverse strategies at the target level, 22% at the acceptable level, and 2% at the unacceptable level during internship. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: none at this time.

Actions: Based on the rubric, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are assessing the learning needs of their students, and implementing diverse procedures to affect student learning. The assignment description asks for examples of instructional decision making based on student's learning, but the criteria on the rubric do not accurately reflect this outcome. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubric and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric. One rubric attached.

Improvements: None at this time.

Title: Collaboration

Description: Collaborate with school personnel to meet the educational needs of students

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

How Often: Per semester

Assessed this Year?   Yes

Responsibility: Internship Supervisors

Participation: Department Chair

Direct Assessments

EED 472 Professional Development Plan Rubric

**Indirect
Assessments**

Results: In Fall 2010, 100% of the teacher candidates were successful at the target level in collaborating with school personnel to meet the needs of their students during internship. At the target level, candidates provide evidence in three or more collaborations on best practices with school personnel in their internship portfolio. In Spring 2011, 80% of the teacher candidates were successful at the target level in collaborating with school personnel to meet the needs of their students during internship, and 19% were successful at the acceptable level. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: none at this time

Improvements: Continue to monitor the internship experience and the results of this assessment.

Title: Technology

Description: Infuse technology into unit and lesson planning

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

How Often: Per semester

Assessed this Year?   Yes

Responsibility: Internship Supervisors

Participation: Department Chair

Direct Assessments

EED 472 Project USA Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: The data from these outcomes are assessed in the Project USA project completed during student internship. Technology is assessed in four sections of the project: planning, assessment, implementation and whole group analysis. In 2010-11, 56 teacher candidates completed the project. In the planning section, 52 candidates earned target and 4 earned acceptable. In the assessment section, 51 candidates earned target, and 5 earned acceptable. In the implementation section, 47 scored in the target range, 8 in the acceptable range and 1 in the unacceptable range. In the whole group analysis section, 49 scored target, and 7 scored in the acceptable range. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: Based on the rubric, it is difficult to discern specifically, how our candidates are infusing technology into lesson and unit planning. The assignment description gives directions for what technology is required in each section of the unit. Assignment description attached (technology requirements highlighted). The criterion for technology requirements is not accurately reflected in the rubric. A subcommittee is meeting the week of June 20 to review the rubric and recommend appropriate changes in the assignment description and assessment rubric.

Improvements:

Title: Content Knowledge

Description: Demonstrate content knowledge

Budget: $0.00

Core   2,4

Competencies:

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies: 2,4

How Often: Per semester

Assessed this Year?   Yes

Responsibility: Certification Office

Participation: Department Chair

Direct Assessments

PRAXIS II

Indirect Assessments

Results: This is a standardized test that compares our teacher candidates with other teacher candidates in the nation. In 2010-2011, 94 elementary candidates took the exam, and 93 passed the PRAXIS II with the minimum score of 137 required by the Alabama State Department. Raw data provided by the Certification Office and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: None at this time.

Improvements: Continue to monitor the results of this assessment.

Student Learning Outcomes for Master of Arts in Education - Elementary Education K-6

2010-2011

Title:	Professional Dispositions
Description:	Self-assess professional disposition development and create a plan if needed.
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,3,4,5
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,3,4,5
How Often:	other
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Teacher Candidates
Participation:	Department Chair and Faculty
Direct Assessments	

Self-Assessment of Professional Disposition Form/rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results:	This outcome is assessed by the graduate teacher candidates at the beginning and end of their program. 24% of new candidates consider themselves proficient in demonstrating dedication to life-long learning, compared to 70% of program completers. 32% of new candidates consider themselves proficient in holding high expectations for all learners and demonstrating respect for cultural and individual differences by providing equitable learning opportunities for all in comparison to 80 % of program completers. 16% of new candidates rate themselves proficient in their commitment to collaboration with other professionals to improve the overall learning of students, compared to 60% of program completers. In addition, 100% of program completers rated themselves as proficient or evolving in all seven dispositions. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.
Curriculum:	None at this time.
Actions:	The department will continue to monitor professional dispositions of teacher candidates by emphasizing professional behavior in our classes, and assessing their dispositions in our classes.
Improvements:	This assessment has been taken on an electronic form. The COE adopted a rubric for 2011-12.

Title:	Data Interpretation
Description:	Collect analyze and interpret data to make instructional decisions.
Budget:	$0.00
Core Competencies:	1,2,3,4
25% Online:	
50% Online:	
Core Competencies:	1,2,3,4
How Often:	Per semester
Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty
Direct	

Assessments

Collect analyze and interpret data to make instructional decisions. EED 678 Action Research Project Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: This outcome is measured in EED 678 Teacher Action Research Project. On the rubric, data and instructional decisions are assessed within the teacher-researcher learning section and the implications for practice section. In 2010-11, 40 teacher candidates completed this project. In the teacher-researcher learning section, 13 were rated in the target range, 21 in the acceptable range, and 6 in the unacceptable range. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: None at this time.

Improvements: The department will monitor the ability of teacher candidates to analyze and interpret data to make instructional decisions.

Title: Research Based Instruction

Description: Use research-based strategies to plan instruction

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies: 1,2,3,4

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies: 1,2,3,4

How Often: Per semester

Assessed this Year?	Yes
Responsibility:	Department Chair
Participation:	Faculty
Direct Assessments	

EED 611 and EED 615 COE Lesson Plan Rubric EED 678 Action Research Project Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: This outcome is measured in various sections of the COE lesson plan, required in EED 611 (required course) and EED 615 (elective course). In 2010-2011, 62 lesson plans were assessed. Research based strategies are assessed in the Assessment, Instruction/Review and Purpose, Instruction/Pedagogy and Guided/Independent Practice Sections. In the assessment section, 20 scored in the target range, 29 in the acceptable range, and 13 in the unacceptable range. In the Instruction/Review and Purpose section, 33 scored target, 38 scored acceptable and 2 scored unacceptable. In the Instruction/Pedagogy section, 33 scored target and 40 scored acceptable. In the Guided/Independent Practice section, 30 scored acceptable, 32 scored acceptable. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: None at this time.

Improvements: The department will continue to monitor how our teacher candidates use research-based strategies to plan effective instruction.

Title: Theory to Practice

Description: Apply theoretical problems to practical applications

Budget: $0.00

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

25% Online:

50% Online:

Core Competencies: 1,2,4

How Often: Per semester

Assessed this Year? Yes

Responsibility: Department Chair

Participation: Faculty

Direct Assessments

EED 678 Action Research Project Rubric

Indirect Assessments

Results: This outcome is measured in two sections of the EED 678 Action Research Project: the Wonderings and Purpose section, and the Teacher-Researcher Design section. In 2010-11, 40 teacher candidates' projects were assessed with this rubric. In the Wonderings and Purpose section, 13 scored in the target range, 21 in the acceptable range, and 6 in the unacceptable range. In the Teacher-Researcher Design section, 13 scored in the target range, 20 in the acceptable range, and 7 in the unacceptable range. Raw data provided by the Director of Continuous Improvement and is available in Department Chair's electronic file.

Curriculum: None at this time.

Actions: None at this time.

Improvements: The department will continue to monitor these assessment results.