

**PLANNING FOR LEARNING AND ASSESSMENT**  
**School of Education – Elementary Education**

1. <b>What general outcome are you seeking?</b>	2. <b>How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it?</b> (What will the student know or be able to do?)	3. <b>How will you help students learn it?</b> (in class or out of class)	4. <b>How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?</b>	5. <b>What are the assessment findings?</b>	6. <b>What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?</b>
<b>Benchmark I</b>					
<p><b>Knowledge and Habits of Mind</b></p>	<p>Understand central concepts in Block I</p> <p>Have foundational knowledge of the areas he/she will teach</p> <p>Be a critical thinker</p> <p>Be attentive and actively involved in class activities</p> <p>Have respect for peers and instructors</p> <p>Comes to class prepared with all class assignments completed</p> <p>Efficacy guides conscientious self-assessments</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class Discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Clear Expectations</li> </ol>	<p>All desired behaviors are assessed by the block team of instructors who have had the students in class during the semester. Instructors meet as a group to evaluate each student in each area. Results are put in a database and individual results are sent to students via e-mail.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2005</u></p> <p>Twenty-five percent (25%) of students had one or more negative indicators on this general outcome. The most common negative indicator was that of being a critical thinker with 19% of the students receiving a negative indicator on this item. N=100</p> <p><u>Spring 2006</u></p> <p>Twenty-six percent (26%) of students had one or more negative indicators on this general outcome. The most common negative indicator was that of being a critical thinker with 20% of the students receiving a negative indicator on this item. N=82</p>	<p>A summary of results from the fall Benchmark I assessments was shared with the elementary faculty during the spring semester. Areas of concern were noted and discussions are underway to determine ways to address these concerns.</p> <p><u>Areas of Concern from fall 2005</u></p> <p>Improving the writing skills of our students prior to entering the program.</p> <p>Providing opportunities for students to improve depth of reflection and abilities as critical thinkers.</p>

<p><b>Written and Oral Communication</b></p>	<p>Writing ability – Insightful solid content; appropriate language’ good organization; fluent; few mechanical errors</p> <p>Speaking ability – speaks clearly and models good English</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Written assignments</li> <li>3. Feedback on work</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Class presentations</li> <li>6. Field experience lessons</li> </ol>		<p><u>Fall 2005</u></p> <p>Twenty-six percent (26%) of students had one or more negative indicators on this general outcome. All 26 had a negative indicator in writing and three also had a negative indicator in speaking N=100</p> <p><u>Spring 2006</u></p> <p>Sixteen percent (16%) of students had one or more negative indicators on this general outcome. These students only had negative indicators for writing. N=82</p>	<p>Spring data will be shared with the faculty in the fall.</p> <p>The School of Education decided to implement the completion of Benchmark I a second time after the end of the second semester. At that time students are given feedback on their progress for the areas of concern noted by the Block I team and any new areas of concern are noted.</p>
<p><b>Interaction with Teachers and Students</b></p>	<p>Able to build rapport with teachers and students in the field</p> <p>Comes to field experience prepared</p> <p>Takes initiative to ask questions and help where needed in the classroom</p> <p>Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> </ol>		<p><u>Fall 2005</u></p> <p>Four percent (4%) of students received at least one negative indicator for this general outcome. The negative indicators were evenly distributed among concerns for preparedness, enthusiasm and rapport. N= 100</p> <p><u>Spring 2006</u></p> <p>Five percent (5%) of students received one negative indicator on this general outcome. One half received a negative indicator for rapport and one-half for initiative. N=82</p>	

<p><b>Disposition and Professional Behavior</b></p>	<p>Focuses on the positive</p> <p>Flexible - makes adjustments as needed</p> <p>Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds</p> <p>Appreciates multiple perspectives</p> <p>Willing to give and receive help</p> <p>Commits to class. Takes responsibility for making up work</p> <p>Commits to being on time</p> <p>Meets deadlines –on time to class</p> <p>Has good organizational skills</p> <p>Dresses professionally in the field</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Individual conferences</li> <li>6. Focus groups</li> </ol>		<p><u>Fall 2005</u></p> <p>Twenty-four percent (24%) of students received one or more negative indicators for this general outcome with 10% receiving two or more. The largest percentage of these students received a negative indicator for organization followed by meeting deadlines and appreciates multiple perspectives. N=100</p> <p><u>Spring 2006</u></p> <p>Eighteen percent (18%) of students received one or more negative indicators for this general outcome with 9% receiving more than one negative indicator. The largest percentage of these students received a negative indicator for appreciates multiple perspectives and meets deadlines.</p> <p>N=82</p>	
<p><b>Benchmark II</b></p>					

<p><b>Conceptual Understanding</b></p>	<p>Sensible choice of concept supported by clear knowledge of children’s mathematical development.</p> <p>Choice of task, questions, and responses to the child reflect thorough understanding of math concept.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Math Courses</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Individual conferences</li> </ol>	<p>Each student in Block II completes Benchmark II at the end of the semester and submits it electronically. Benchmarks are “blindly” scored by two faculty members who have completed scorers’ training. Individual feedback is recorder by each scorer and is sent to the student. Students receiving two “failing” scores must complete a follow-up to the assessment during Block III.</p>	<p>During Fall 2005, eight – five students completed the Benchmark II assessment. For this cohort, 60% received passing scores from both scorers. Thirty-two percent (32%) received a split score and were re-evaluated and passed the benchmark. Eight percent (8%) received failing scores from both scorers and were required to do the Benchmark II follow-up during the spring semester. The following general trends were seen in the feedback to the students:</p> <p><b><u>Strengths</u></b></p> <p>Looking Beyond Procedural Knowledge</p> <p>Task Design</p> <p>Questioning</p> <p>Attending to the Responses of Children</p>	<p>The School of Education continues to work on inter-rater reliability. Scorers will re-calibrate before scoring in the spring. Two graduates of the program, who completed the Benchmark II as students, will be trained to score the benchmarks in the spring.</p> <p>Funding for a follow-up study has been obtained. This will allow faculty to follow graduates into the P-12 classroom to determine if the benchmark is a good predictor of our graduates’ impact on P-12 student learning.</p>
<p><b>Quality of Written Report</b></p>	<p>Easy to read. Relatively error free.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Writing courses</li> <li>2. Class assignments</li> <li>3. Feedback from instructors and assessments</li> </ol>			<p>The School continues to work to refine the Benchmark II to provide better data to answer the three guiding questions below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does the intern’s mathematical knowledge have the potential to support student thinking about mathematics with understanding?</li> </ol>

<p><b>Assessment of Learner's Development and Knowledge</b></p>	<p>Purposefully invites and probes the learner's thinking.</p> <p>Demonstrates a highly developed sense of how to analyze the learner's thinking.</p> <p>Accurate, insightful analysis of the learner. Suggests good instructional follow-up.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Individual conferences</li> </ol>
<p><b>Self-Evaluation of the Task Selection and Interview</b></p>	<p>Reflects meaningfully on personal performance from informed perspectives.</p> <p>Accurate about what is working, what needs to be improved, and how to improve it.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Individual conferences</li> </ol>
<p><b>Overall Effectiveness of the Reflective Cycle of Teaching</b></p>	<p>The performance provides a convincing demonstration that the student understands and can implement reflective practice.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Individual conferences</li> </ol>

<p><b><u>Areas for Growth</u></b></p> <p>Transfer: Moving between individual and whole class analysis of understanding</p> <p>Interpreting Responses of Children</p> <p>Issues of Equity</p> <p>The results from the spring Benchmark II assessment are not available at the time of this report. The benchmarks have been submitted and are being sent to the scorers.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Is the intern beginning to understand how to assess student thinking using interviews. (attends to student responses, bases comments on evidence from data, uses questions to probe student thinking)?</li> <li>3. Has the intern intellectually engaged in making sense of material from Block I &amp; II (respect for students, child centered, bases follow-up on evidence)?</li> </ol>
---	--

**PRAC REPORT**  
**School of Education – Secondary Education**

<b>1. What general outcome are you seeking?</b>	<b>2. How would you know it (the outcome) if you saw it?</b> (What will the student know or be able to do?)	<b>3. How will you help students learn it?</b> (in class or out of class)	<b>4. How could you measure each of the desired behaviors listed in #2?</b>	<b>5. What are the assessment findings?</b>	<b>6. What improvements have been made based on assessment findings?</b>
<b>Benchmarks I &amp; II</b>					

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Knowledge and Habits of Mind</b></p>	<p>Articulates central concepts in Block I</p> <p>Writing reflects knowledge of the areas he/she will teach</p> <p>Journal entries demonstrate critically thinking skills</p> <p>Is actively involved in class activities</p> <p>Shows respect for peers and instructors</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Field Experiences</li> <li>2. Class Discussions</li> <li>3. Readings</li> <li>4. Cooperative learning exercises</li> <li>5. Analyzing case studies of teaching</li> </ol>	<p>All secondary education benchmark items have been modified to fit a 4-point Likert scale to increase variability and item reliability. In addition to benchmark items, student complete an academic motivation survey, so that we can control for the impact of individual difference at entry.</p> <p>All desired behaviors are assessed by the students at the beginning of the program (pre-test), end of Block 1, and end of Block 2. A team of instructors who have had the students in class during the fall and spring semester respectively meet as a group to rate each student on each of the items representing one of the 6 constructs (PTEs).</p>	<p><u>Fall 2005 Cohort (n = 49)</u></p> <p>After two semesters, student mean scores on the Knowledge of and Habits of Mind subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.46</math>; <math>M = 2.81</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in the following areas: personal reflection, (39%); takes an active role in the class (37%); accurately judges personal strengths and weaknesses (31%).</p> <p><u>Spring 2006 Cohort (n =42)</u></p> <p>After the first semester, student mean scores on the Knowledge of and Habits of Mind subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.42</math>; <math>M = 2.89</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in the following areas: engage in critical thinking (17.5%); reflection of personal attributes about teaching (22.5%); take an active role in the class (30%)</p>	<p>A total of 9 students (not official until census date in the fall) from the Fall 2005 cohort have dropped out or stopped out of the Teacher Education program. Faculty are concerned about that figure and will discuss innovative ways to intervene with students experiencing academic or social challenges in the first year.</p> <p>A summary of results from the fall Benchmark I assessments was shared with the secondary faculty during the spring semester. Areas of concern were noted and discussions are underway to determine ways to addresses these concerns.</p>
--	--	---	---	---	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Written and Oral Communication</b></p>	<p>Writing ability – Insightful solid content; appropriate language’ good organization; fluent; few mechanical errors</p> <p>Speaking ability – speaks clearly and models good English</p> <p>Use APA-writing Style</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. APA-citation assignments</li> <li>2. Critical Journals</li> <li>3. Readings</li> <li>4. Class presentations-video and oral</li> <li>5. Working with middle school students in field placement</li> </ol>	<p>Results are put into SPSS and analyzed for patterns on individual items and PTEs. Discrepancies between instructor and student ratings are discussed and a reflection writing prompt is being developed. After Block II next year, students will be provided an individual chart of the results and asked to reflect on their growth over-time and explain their perspective on any discrepancies. Currently, individual results are sent to students via e-mail after each semester.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2005 (n = 49)</u></p> <p>After two semesters, student mean scores on the Writing and Oral Communication were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.30</math>; <math>M = 3.05</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in the ability to use APA-writing style for papers (14%).</p> <p><u>Spring 2006 (n =40)</u></p> <p>After the first semester, student mean scores on the Writing and Oral Communication subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.21</math>; <math>M = 2.95</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in overall writing competency (20%).</p>	<p>Spring data will be shared in the secondary education faculty retreat on May 12, 2006 and used for course planning in the coming year.</p> <p>Benchmark 3 is under development and is being piloted in the areas of Language Arts and Social Studies education. Student will view a teaching video case and then respond to a series of questions. They will be instructed to bring materials from the three Block courses prior to the benchmark.</p> <p>Revised supervisory sheets and reflection prompts for student teaching are being developed.</p>
--	---	--	--	---	--



<p><b>Interaction with Teachers and Students/Field Place Experiences</b></p>	<p>Builds rapport with teachers and students in the field</p> <p>Comes to field experience prepared</p> <p>Asks questions and help where needed in the classroom</p> <p>Demonstrates enthusiasm for teaching</p> <p>Appreciates multiple perspectives</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Community Assessment</li> </ol>	<p>Benchmark III is under development and is being piloted in the areas of Language Arts and Social Studies education. Student will view a teaching video case and then respond to a series of questions. They will be instructed to bring materials from the three Block courses prior to the benchmark.</p> <p>Revised supervisory sheets and reflection prompts for student teaching are being developed.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2005 (n = 49)</u></p> <p>After two semesters, student mean scores on the Interactions with Teachers and Students/Field Placement subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.49</math>; <math>M = 2.75</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in the following areas: works well with different personalities (31%); appreciates multiple perspectives (40%); focuses on the positive under challenging circumstance (39%); offers to help peers (43%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2006 (n =40)</u></p> <p>with Teachers and Students/Field Placement subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.34</math>; <math>M = 2.96</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who were lacking in the ability to focuses on the positive under challenging circumstance (20%)</p>	<p>All assessment activities will interface with the ePortfolio, providing students and faculty with an opportunity to engage in continuous feedback and reflection throughout the program.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	---

<p><b>Disposition and Professional Behavior</b></p>	<p>Focuses on the positive</p> <p>Flexible - makes adjustments as needed</p> <p>Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds</p> <p>Appreciates multiple perspectives</p> <p>Willing to give and receive help</p> <p>Commits to class. Takes responsibility for making up work</p> <p>Comes to class on time</p> <p>Meets deadlines</p> <p>Dresses professionally in the field</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Modeling</li> <li>2. Field Experiences</li> <li>3. Class discussions</li> <li>4. Readings</li> <li>5. Individual conferences</li> <li>6. Focus groups</li> </ol>	<p>All assessment activities will interface with the ePortfolio, providing students and faculty with an opportunity to engage in continuous feedback and reflection throughout the program.</p>	<p><u>Fall 2005 (n =49)</u></p> <p>After two semesters, student mean scores on the Professionalism subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.31</math>; <math>M = 2.75</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who abilities were lacking in the following areas: receive help and constructive feedback (31%); completes readings prior to each class (55%); meets deadlines (40%); displays good time management skills (35%)</p> <p><u>Spring 2006 (n = 40)</u></p> <p>After the first semester, student mean scores on the Disposition subscale were significantly higher than instructors scores (<math>M = 3.27</math>; <math>M = 2.92</math>, respectively). In particular, faculty were concerned with the percentage of students who were not completing readings prior to class (17.5%).</p>	
---	--	--	---	---	--