PRAC Report
School of Education
2011 – 2012

Teaching is a complicated and complex profession. The skills, knowledge and dispositions needed to be a good teacher are many. Therefore, the task of assessing whether interns are acquiring the needed skills, knowledge, and dispositions as they move through the program must go beyond just assessing individual course assignments and achieving satisfactory grades in education courses. We know these things are important but we believe there is more.

Preparing interns to be great teachers is like a puzzle. Each piece is important. Coursework and grades are important pieces of the teacher education puzzle. However, the sum of the pieces addressed in courses does not necessarily equate to the whole. We believe that it is possible for a student to be successfully learning individual skills and pieces of knowledge and yet struggle to put the together to "make the whole." Therefore, the School of Education has designed a Unit Assessment System which not only considers course grades when assessing students" professional growth but utilizes benchmark assessments throughout the program.

Benchmarks are assessments which are external to the education classes but are a vital part of the teacher education program. They attempt to provide a means of assessing if students possess the skills, knowledge, and dispositions at key points in the program and they are used in conjunction with course grades to determine if students are making satisfactory progress in their program. They measure aspects of being a good teacher that may not be captured by individual course assignments. They attempt to assess if students are "putting the pieces together" from all their education courses and experiences and moving forward in their professional growth.

The following is a sample of selected data from candidate, program and unit operations assessments.

Assessment I - Benchmark I – Elementary and Secondary

General Outcomes

The Block I instructional team meets at the end of the semester to complete the Benchmark I rubric for each student in Block I. They evaluated each student on (1) knowledge and habits of mind, (2) written and oral communication skills, (3) interaction with teachers and students, and (4) disposition and professional behavior. The team determines if each student has displayed the skills, knowledge and dispositions in these areas that they would expect for an student at this stage of the program. All students are sent personalized e-mail with feedback noting areas for improvement.

How would you know it

The Benchmark I rubric is completed by the team of instructors who have taught the courses each student has completed during that semester. The instructors have the opportunity to not only evaluate the work of each student but to also observe the student during class and working in the schools. Each indicator on the rubric has been discussed over many semesters during Benchmark I assessment meetings which allows for greater reliability

among instructors when assessing each indicator. Decisions are also made jointly by the team of instructors at the end of the semester with each instructor being allowed to provide evidence and feedback on the student's knowledge, skills and dispositions throughout the semester. The rubric, which is provided below, also outlines what should be observed for each indicator.

How will you help students learn it

Throughout the semester the instructors provide multiple opportunities for the student to learn and demonstrate each indicator, such as working with children in the schools, preparing written assignments for class, participating in class discussions and on-line chat rooms, and interacting with peers and instructors. Each student is also asked to complete a self-assessment addressing the indicators at mid-term. The students then meet and discuss this self-assessment with their instructors.

Assessment Findings - Fall 2011 and Spring 2012

Knowledge and Habits of Mind PUL 2 PUL 3 PUL 5						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=117	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N= 55	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=59	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N=44	Overall Category Results Secondary
Demonstrates understanding of the main ideas taught in the block.	13/11%	1/ 2%	In the fall, twenty-seven (23%) of the elementary students received negative indicators. Most students received one or two negative indicators with only two of the students receiving three negative indicators. In the spring, seven (13%) of the elementary students received negative indicators. All of these students received one or two negative indicators.	3/5%	3/7%	In the fall, eleven (19%) of the secondary students received negative indicators in this category. Most students received one or two negative indicators with only one student having three or more negative indicators in this category. That student did not pass all of the Block II courses. In the spring eleven (25%) of the secondary students received negative indicators. Three students (7%) received three or more negative indicators each in this category
Has good foundation of content area knowledge.	1/1%	0/0%		0/0%	1/ 2%	
Engages in critical thinking.	9/8%	2/4%		2/3%	3/7%	
Attentive during class activities and discussions.	0/0%	0/0%		1/ 2%	1/ 2%	
Is respectful of peers and instructors.	2/2%	0/0%		0/0%	1/ 2%	
Careful about assignments preparation for class	9/8%	1/ 2%		5/8%	6/14%	
Accurately judges personal strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing.	7/6%	5/9%		5/8%	8/18%	

Written and Oral Communication PUL 1						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=117	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N= 55	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=59	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N=44	Overall Category Results Secondary
Exhibits competent writing skills ➢ Insightful, solid content. ➢ Appropriate language. ➢ Good organization. ➢ Fluent. ➢ Concise. ➢ Few mechanical errors.	25/21%	8/15%	Writing continues to be a major concern for elementary students. In the fall all negative indicators in this category were for writing In the spring all negative indicators were for writing with the exception that one student also received a negative indicator for speech. Students are most often cited for grammar, clarity, sentence structure, and depth.	7/12%	4/9%	Writing continues to be a major concern for secondary students. In the fall all negative indicators in this category were for writing In the spring all negative indicators were for writing also Students are most often cited for grammar, clarity, and depth.
Models standard English when speaking. Expresses ideas clearly when speaking.	0/0%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	

Interaction with Teachers and Children PUL 5						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=117	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N= 55	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=59	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N=44	Overall Category Results Secondary
Establishes rapport with classroom teachers and students.	3/3%	0/0%	This continues to be a category where most elementary students seem to have few problems and display the skills, knowledge and dispositions assessed.	0/0%	3/7%	This continues to be a category where secondary students seem to have few problems and display the skills, knowledge and dispositions assessed.
Comes to field placement prepared	2/2%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	
Demonstrates willingness to get involved in the classroom.	0/0%	0/0%		0/0%	2/5%	
Show patience when working with students.	2/2%	0/0%		0/0%	1/2%	

Dispositions and Professional Behavior PUL 6						
Indicators The Student-	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=117	# of Elementary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N= 55	Overall Category Results Elementary	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Fall 2011 N=59	# of Secondary with Neg. Indicator – Sp 2012 N=44	Overall Category Results Secondary
Focuses on the positive	4/3%	0/0%	Thirteen (13%) elementary Nineteen students (16%) received negative indicators during the fall. Each received either one or two in this category with the exception of three students (5%) who received three or more. Seven (12%) of the elementary students during the spring received negative indicators with no students receiving more than two.	0/0%	0/0%	Fifteen (25%) of the Thirteen secondary students (30%) received negative indicators in the fall. All received one or two negative indicators. During the spring, seven students (16%) received negative indicators with three (7%) receiving three or more.
Makes adjustments as necessary.	0/0%	0/0%		0/0%	0/0%	
Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds.	1/1%	0/0%		1/ 2%	3/7%	
Appreciates multiple perspectives.	6/5%	0/0%		2/3%	3/7%	
Is willing to give and receive help.	1/1%	0/0%		1/ 2%	1/ 2%	
Commits to being in class. Takes responsibility for making up work.	3/3%	4/7%		6/10%	1/ 2%	
Commits to being on time.	5/4%	2/4%		0/0%	0/0%	
Meets deadlines.	9/7%	3/5%		4/7%	4/9%	
Has good organization.	2/2%	0/0%		0/0%	2/5%	
Is neatly, appropriately dressed.	3/3%	1/ 2%		1/ 2%	0/0%	

Summary of Findings

In the fall, forty-nine of the elementary students (41%) received at least one negative indicator in at least one category. Most elementary students received one or two negative indicators but 15% of the students received three or more negative indicators. In the fall, twenty-six of the secondary students (44%) received one or more negative indicators. Most students received one or two negative indicators with only three students having three or more negative indicators. Two of these students encountered academic problems during Block II. During the spring semester, eighteen elementary students (31%) and thirteen secondary students (30%) received one or more negative indicators. Only one elementary student (2%) and five secondary students (11%) had three or more negative indicators. During 2010-2011, 20-32% of the elementary and 41-89% of the secondary had negative indicators.

In the *Knowledge and Habits of Minds* category, students (N = 176) continue to have the greatest number of negative indicators with 22% of students having one or more negative indicators for the candidate outcomes in fall 2011. The most common negative indicator was "Demonstrates some gaps or misconceptions about central concepts and content of the block" (9%) followed by "Careless about assignments and preparation for class" (8%) and "Misjudges personal strengths and weaknesses when self-assessing" (7%). For spring 2012, overall eighteen students or 18% of the students had one for more negative indicators for these general outcomes. The most common negative indicator (N =99) was "Misjudges personal strengths or weaknesses when self-assessing" (13%) followed by "careless about assignments and preparation for class "(7%).

In 2011-2012, eighteen percent (18%) of students had a negative indicator for these general outcomes in second category, *Written and Oral Communication*, for the fall. Each of these students (N=176) had only one negative indictor, which was for writing. During spring 2012, 12% of students had a negative indicator on this general outcome. (N = 99). Like past semesters, all these students had only one negative indicator, which was for writing.

For the category *Interaction with Teachers and Students*, only 3% of the students (N =176) received a negative indicator for these general outcomes in the fall. During spring 2012, 3% of students (N =99) received one negative indicator on this general outcome with "Shows little aptitude for building rapport with teachers and students" being a negative indicator for all three students.

Under *Dispositions and Professional Behavior*, 18% of students (N=176) received at least one negative indicator in the fall. Seven percent (7%) receiving two or more negative indicators with the largest percentage of students received a negative indicator for "Turns in late assignments" (7%). For spring 2012, 14% of students (N=99) received one or more negative indicators for this general outcome with 6% receiving more than one negative indicator. The largest percentage of these students received a negative indicator for "Turns in late assignments" (7%). This was followed by "Misses 3 or more day worth of classes" (5%).

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

The faculty continue to discuss ways to improve the students' writing skills. More emphasis has been put on writing within the blocks and in assessments. Faculty are seeking ways to determine if requiring a second writing course is having any impact on the students' skills. The secondary chair continues to meet with and develop an improvement plan for students with three or more major concerns. Elementary faculty members have developed a plan to institutionalize earlier intervention and support for students when they have multiple negative indicators in Block I.

Assessment II - Student Performance on Principles of Undergraduate Learning – School of Education

General Outcomes

Each semester, faculty assess students based on selected IUPUI Principles of Undergraduate Learning (PUL). The School of Education has selected critical thinking; integration and application of knowledge; quantitative skills; written, oral and visual communications; intellectual depth, breadth, and adaptiveness; and understanding society and culture as PULS which receive major emphasis in education courses.

How would you know it

Instructors based their assessments of the students on quality of academic work, depth of contributions to class discussions, and observations of students working with children in the field.

How will you help students learn it

Coursework and field experiences are designed to provide all students with the opportunities to display their skills and knowledge, receive feedback, and improve.

Assessment Findings – Spring 2010 – Spring 2012

Faculty Ratings on PULS – Major Emphasis

PUL	Mean	Not Effective	Somewhat Effective	Effective	Very Effective	Total
100-Level & Lower						
2. Critical Thinking	19 3.37	1 5.3%	0 0.0%	9 47.4%	9 47.4%	19 100.0%
200-Level						
2. Critical Thinking	141 3.72	8 5.7%	5 3.5%	5 3.5%	123 87.2%	141 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	112 3.05	7 6.3%	13 11.6%	59 52.7%	33 29.5%	112 100.0%
300-Level						
1B Quantitative Skills	177 3.15	1 0.6%	27 15.3%	94 52.1%	55 31.1%	177 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	91 3.48	1 1.1%	0 0.0%	44 48.4%	46 50.5%	91 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	534 3.30	3 0.6%	70 13.1%	226 42.3%	235 44.0%	534 100.0%
5. Understanding Society and Culture	230 3.30	9 3.9%	38 16.5%	57 24.8%	126 54.8%	230 100.0%
400-Level						
1A Written, Oral & Visual Communication Skills	485 3.05	16 3.3%	74 15.3%	267 55.1%	128 23.4%	485 100.0%
2. Critical Thinking	241 3.00	5 2.1%	33 13.7%	159 66.0%	44 18.3%	241 100.0%
3. Integration and Application of Knowledge	417 2.98	6 1.4%	46 11.0%	323 77.5%	42 10.1%	471 100.0%
4. Intellectual Depth, Breadth, and Adaptiveness	77 3.18	1 1.3%	8 10.4%	44 57.1%	24 31.2%	77 100.0%
Understanding Society and Culture	84 3.98	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	2 2.4%	82 97.6%	84 100.0%

Summary of Findings

This assessment addresses many of the same areas as Benchmark I. The data from the two assessments can be easily examined for patterns. In Benchmark I a range of 9-21% of the students received a negative indicator for writing during 2011-2012. Likewise 18.6% of 400-Level students were assessed as "somewhat effective or not effective." This would seem to support that students who experience writing problems early in the program (Benchmark I) continue to have problems throughout the program (PUL – 400-Level).

Data from the two assessments for critical thinking support that faculty members'expectations for this skill increase as the students progress through the program. While only 5.3% of the students were rated in the lower two categories for Level-100, 16.9% and 15.8% were in these categories for 300-Level and 400-Level respectively. This compares to the 3-8% range of students receiving negative indicators from Benchmark I, which is normally comprised of students in 300-Level courses..

PUL 5, which addresses "Understanding Society and Culture," is especially important to the School of Education and its mission to prepare educators for urban schools. With means of 3.00 and 3.98 for Level-300 and Level 400 respectively, it appears that students are being given the opportunity to develop the skills and knowledge to support all children learning. This is also supported by Benchmark I data which denotes a range of 0-7% of students received a negative indicator for "Works well with different personalities and cultural backgrounds" as well as "Appreciates multiple perspectives."

Assessment III - Elementary Benchmark II – Fall 2010

General Outcomes

Each semester, at the end of Block II (midpoint) of the elementary program, students must complete Benchmark II. This assessment was dramatically changed from fall 2010 to spring 2011. Students are asked to view a video of a lesson, complete a rubric assessing the lesson, and then write a paper supporting their evaluations grounded in the literature. The students are then assessed on the tone of their evaluation, their ability to connect to the research, pedagogical knowledge, content knowledge, and grammar/writing.

How would you know it

The Benchmark II is "blind" scored by School of Education who did not have the student in class during that semester. The faculty members score each Benchmark II using the rubric below. Students must demonstrate at least Level 1 competency in each given criterion in order to successfully complete Benchmark II.

Criteria	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Disposition/Tone (PTE 5 & 6)	Deficit tone; blames the learner	Strengths-based tone is emerging.	Tone is strengths-based with cultural awareness	Tone is strengths-based and culturally responsive
Connection to Research (PTE 6)	No clear connections exist	Some connections exist; most are appropriate	Connections increase in quantity and quality	Work is grounded in research; research goes beyond expectation
Pedagogical Knowledge (PTE 4)	Pedagogy is teacher-centered and/or teacher directed	Pedagogy is child-centered; some evidence of inquiry exists	Demonstrates understanding of inquiry-based pedagogy	Fully embraces inquiry-based pedagogy
Content Knowledge (PTE 1)	Misconceptions with content and/or vocabulary exists	No misconceptions with content and/or vocabulary exists; some areas need more clarity and/or precision	Content knowledge is increasingly clear and precise	Content knowledge is expressed with clarity and precision
Grammar/Writing/APA (PTE 1)	Many errors; not well organized; awkward word choice and/or sentence structure	Some errors exist; fairly well organized with few instances of awkward word choice and/or sentence structure	Virtually free of errors; organized with fairly good flow	No errors exist; well organized with good flow
Completeness and Critical Thinking (PTE 2)	Incomplete and/or no evidence of critical thinking	Complete and little evidence of critical thinking	Complete and some evidence of critical thinking	Complete with evidence of deep critical thinking and work beyond expectations

<u>How will you help students learn it.</u>

During the first half of their elementary teacher education program, students repeated watch and analyze taped teaching episodes and well as live teaching during their field experiences in the schools. There are class discussions about the strengths of the teaching and how the lessons might be changed or improved. This allows the students to develop the skills, knowledge and dispositions to complete this Benchmark II.

Assessment Findings – Fall 2011

Numbers in red represent scores of those failing the benchmark.

Criteria	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Mean*	SD
Disposition/Tone (PTE 5 & 6) PUL 5	0/0% 0	11/15% 6	27/37% 6	35/48% 2	2.33	0.73
Connection to Research (PTE 6) PUL 3 PUL 1	1/1% 1	17/23% 9	33/45% 4	22/30% 0	2.04	0.77
Pedagogical Knowledge (PTE 4) PUL 3	4/5% 4	14/19% 6	40/55% 4	15/21% 0	1.90	0.79
Content Knowledge (PTE 1) PUL 4	3/ 4% 3	20/27% 8	27/37% 3	23/32% 0	1.96	0.87
Grammar/Writing/APA (PTE 1) PUL 6	7/10% 7	26/36% 6	25/34% 1	15/21% 0	1.66	0.92
Completeness and Critical Thinking (PTE 2) PUL 2	3/ 4% 3	10/14% 5	49/67% 6	11/15% 0	1.93	0.67

**N = 73*

Assessment Findings – Spring 2012
Numbers in red represent scores of those failing the benchmark.

Criteria	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Mean*	SD
Disposition/Tone (PTE 5 & 6) PUL 5	0/0% 0	33/32% 4	42/40% 3	30/29% 0	1.97	0.78
Connection to Research (PTE 6) PUL 3 PUL 1	0/0% 0	25/24% 7	50/48% 0	30/29% 0	2.05	0.73
Pedagogical Knowledge (PTE 4) PUL 3	3/3% 3	23/22% 4	50/48% 0	29/28% 0	2.00	0.78
Content Knowledge (PTE 1) PUL 4	3/3% 3	26/25% 3	51/49% 1	25/24% 0	1.93	0.78
Grammar/Writing/APA (PTE 1) PUL 6	6/6% 6	31/30% 0	49/46% 1	19/18% 0	1.77	0.81
Completeness and Critical Thinking (PTE 2) PUL 2	1/1% 1	11/10% 4	70/67% 2	23/22% 0	2.10	0.60

* N=105

Summary of Findings

Of the 73 students completing this benchmark during fall 2011, fourteen or 19% did not receive a passing score. Seven students got a failing score on grammar and writing followed closely by all other categories with three or four students each. Only the category of dispositions/tone did not have a failing score. During spring 2012, seven or 7% did not receive a passing score. Again grammar was the area with the most failing scores with six out of the seven failing in this area (86%). Overall, students received the lowest scores on grammar/writing with means of 1.66 and 1.77 for fall and spring respectively.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

Based on data from this assessment, the School of Education realizes that writing continues to be a challenge for our elementary majors. Discussions continue about how to ensure our students have good writing skills prior to entering the teacher education program. The faculty members realize that

elementary teachers need to be able to construct effective written communications to parents as well as have the ability to teach children to write., so this remains a top priority in our program improvement plans.

Assessment IV - Benchmark IV – Student Teacher Impact on Student Learning Assignment

This benchmark is designed to allow student teachers to provide evidence that they have had an impact on student learning during their student teaching experiences. During the first weeks of Block IV, student teachers are asked to collect evidence of student learning resulting from their teaching. Student teachers are able to select any evidence which they feel documents that students have learned as a result of their teaching. The student teachers are encouraged to select evidence which supports that students have learned at the conceptual/higher order level rather than learned just factual information.

At the end of the sixth week, the student teachers bring the evidence to a post-observation conference with the university coach/faculty. During the conversation, the student teachers provide the rationale for selecting the evidence, an analysis of the student learning which is supported by the evidence, and address how they believe that they impacted the student learning. Student teachers do not need to bring a written document to the meeting but might consider notes to help them talk about the evidence they have selected. After the conference, the coach/faculty complete a rubric which addresses the student teacher's skills, knowledge, and dispositions concerning each student teacher's impact on student learning.

General Outcomes

Benchmark IV is designed to provide data on students' ability to impact children's learning. It addresses students' depth of knowledge of the concepts they are teaching, their abilities to recognize quality evidence of children's learning, their ability to analyze children's learning from the evidence, and their ability to recognize and analyze their own role in the children's learning.

How would you know it

Students meet with their coaches and faculty. They are asked to bring evidence from their student teaching experience that support that the children they were teaching obtained the skills and/or knowledge from the lessons that the student teacher desired. The students bring the evidence to the meeting and then talk about why they selected the evidence, what kind of learning the evidence supports, and what their role was in that learning. The faculty then used the following rubric to evaluate the students.

How will you help students learn it

Throughout the entire teacher education program, class assignments and field experiences prepare the students with the skills and knowledge to successfully complete this assessment.

Student Learning Rubric for Benchmark IV for Elementary Student Teachers

Indicators	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
Depth of knowledge of concepts taught (ACEI 2.1-2.4)	**Student teacher has an in-depth knowledge of concepts taught.**	**Student teacher has knowledge of concepts taught but it does not go beyond that addressed in the textbook and/or lower level knowledge.**	**Student teacher has knowledge of concepts taught but makes some factual errors.**	**Student teacher has some knowledge of concepts taught but has many misconceptions and factual errors.**	**Student teacher has little knowledge of concepts/content taught.**
Quality of evidence (Does the assessment give valuable information about student learning?) (ACEI 4)	**Rich evidence of student learning at conceptual/higher levels of understanding.**	**Evidence supports some student learning at conceptual/higher levels of understanding.**	**Evidence supports some student learning but only at lower levels of learning (memorization, factual, procedural, etc.)**	**Evidence addresses student learning but only at a superficial level.**	**Evidence does not address student learning.**
Analysis of Student Learning (What did the student learn?) (ACEI 4)	**Student teacher provides in-depth and accurate analysis of student learning supported by the evidence.**	**Student teacher speaks to student learning supported by the evidence accurately but the analysis lacks depth.**	**Student teacher speaks to some student learning supported by the evidence but analysis is sometime superficial and/or inaccurate.**	**Student teacher speaks to student learning which is not supported by the evidence.**	**Student teacher has little ability to analyze student learning supported by the evidence.**
Analysis of Student teacher Impact (How did the instruction impact student learning?) (ACEI 4 and 5.1)	**Student teacher is able to accurately analyze his/her impact on student learning supported by the evidence.**	**Student teacher speaks to his/her impact on student learning supported by the evidence. Analysis is accurate and but lacks depth.**	**Student teacher speaks to some impact on student learning supported by the evidence but analysis is sometimes superficial and/or inaccurate.**	**Student teacher speaks to impact on student learning but it is not supported by the evidence.**	**Student teacher is unable to speak to his/her impact on student learning. The student teacher seems confused about how his/her lesson/actions impacted the students.**

Elementary Benchmark IV Data: 2007 - 2011

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
Depth of Knowledge of Concepts Taught (ACEI 2.1-2.4)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	12/44%	15/56%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.44	.51
Fall 2007 N=66	38/58%	24/36%	4/6%	0/0%	0/0%	4.53	.60
Spring 2008 N=67	31/46%	31/46%	6/8%	0/0%	0/0%	4.40	.61
Fall 2008 N = 44	36/82%	5/11%	2/5%	1/ 2%	0/0%	4.00	.66
Spring 2009 N = 76	60/79%	16/21%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.79	.41
Fall 2009 N = 54	45/82%	4/8%	4/8%	1/ 2%	0/0%	4.72	.68
Spring 2010 N = 73	59/81%	14/19%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.80	.40
Fall 2010 N = 59	46/78%	13/22%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.78	.42
Spring 2011 N=68	53/78%	14/21%	1/1%	0/0%	0/0%	4.76	.46
Fall 2011 N=59	42/71%	15/25%	1 /2%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.66	.60
Spring 2012 N = 69	47/68%	22/32%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.68	.47
Quality of Evidence (ACEI 4)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	8/30%	18/67%	1 /3%	0/0%	0/0%	4.26	.53
Fall 2007 N=66	32/49%	28/42%	6/9%	0/0%	0/0%	4.40	.66
Spring 2008 N=67	27/40%	26/39%	14/21%	0/0%	0/0%	4.20	.76
Fall 2008 N = 44	24/55%	16/36%	1/ 2%	3/7%	0/0%	4.34	.86
Spring 2009 N = 76	39/51%	31/41%	6/8%	0/0%	0/0%	4.43	.64
Fall 2009 N = 54	43/80%	6/10%	1/ 2%	4/8%	0/0%	4.63	.85
Spring 2010 N = 73	41/56%	29/40%	3/ 4%	0/0%	0/0%	4.52	.58

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
Fall 2010 N =59	41/69%	18/31%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.69	.46
Spring 2011 N = 68	48/71%	16/24%	4/6%	0/0%	0/0%	4.65	.59
Fall 2011 N=59	37/63%	15/25%	6/10%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.49	.75
Spring 2012 N =69	37/54%	19/28%	12/17%	1/1%	0/0%	4.33	.82
Analysis of Student Learning (ACEI 4)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	7/26%	20/74%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.26	.45
Fall 2007 N=66	38/58%	28/42%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.58	.50
Spring 2008 N=67	25/38%	37/55%	5/7%	0/0%	0/0%	4.30	.59
Fall 2008 N = 44	26/59%	14/31%	2/5%	2/5%	0/0%	4.45	.79
Spring 2009 N = 76	52/68%	24/32%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.68	.47
Fall 2009 N = 54	43/80%	6/11%	2/4%	3/5%	0/0%	4.65	.80
Spring 2010 N = 73	53/73%	20/27%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.73	.45
Fall 2010 N = 59	46/78%	13/22%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.78	.42
Spring 2011 N=68	51/75%	15/22%	2/3%	0/0%	0/0%	4.72	.51
Fall 2011 N=59	39/66%	14/24%	5/8%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.54	.73
Spring 2012 N= 69	42/61%	22/32%	4/6%	1/1%	0/0%	4.52	.68
Analysis of Student Teacher's Impact (ACEI 4 and 5.1)							
Spring 2007 N=27*	9/33%	18/67%	0/0%	0/0%%	0/0%	4.33	.48
Fall 2007 N=66	38/58%	27/40%	1/2 %	0/0%	0/0%	4.56	.54
Spring 2008 N=67	22/33%	42/62%	3/5%	0/0%	0/0%	4.30	.56
Fall 2008 N =44	23/52%	18/41%	0/0%	3/7%	0/0%	4.39	.81
Spring 2009	50/66%	25/33%	1/1%	0/0%	0/0%	4.64	.51

Year	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1	Mean	Standard Deviation
N =76							
Fall 2009 N = 54	38/70%	12/22%	0/0%	4/8%	0/0%	4.56	.84
Spring 2010 N = 73	55/75%	18/25%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.75	.43
Fall 2010 N = 59	43/73%	16/27%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	4.73	.45
Spring 2011 N=68	54/79%	12/18%	1/1%	1/1%	0/0%	4.75	.56
Fall 2011 N=59	41/69%	16/27%	1 /2%	1 /2%	0/0%	4.64	.61
Spring 2012 N = 69	43/62%	23/33%	2/3%	1/1%	0/0%	4.57	.63

***Spring 2007 was the pilot year for this assessment and was used by only two cohorts of students**

Secondary Benchmark IV Rubric

BENCHMARK IV EVALUATION RUBRIC

Overarching Question: How do you know that you have had a positive impact on student learning?

	INTEGRATING (5)	**ENACTING (4)**	**DEVELOPING (3)**	**EMERGING (2)**	**NOT OBSERVED (1)**
	The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in activities that demonstrate skillful integration of multiple standards simultaneously.	The teacher designs, enacts, and assists in activities that demonstrate a complete enactment of the standard.	The teacher designs and enacts activities that demonstrate a partial enactment of the standard.	One or more elements of the standard are enacted.	The standard is not observed.
Learning from Assessment Processes: (NCTE 4.10) How have you used an assessment process, using both formative and summative assessments, to inform your instruction and decision making?	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he uses an assessment plan to inform instruction where the methods of assessment are a) coherent with methods of teaching, b) varied (traditional and authentic), c) formative and summative, *AND* d) used to support individual student development.	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he sets/presents standards for quality student performance, provides students with feedback on their performance, *AND* demonstrates the quality of student learning by analyzing a) an assessment <u>process</u>, b) <u>varied measures</u> of learning from (traditional and authentic) assessment tasks; *OR* c) <u>multiple measures</u> (formative and summative) of student learning.	The teacher candidate demonstrates how s/he a) sets/presents a standard for quality student performance; *OR* b) provides students feedback on their performance; *OR* c) uses a single, summative assessment of student learning which audits learning.	Instructional activities do not result in measurable or anecdotal evidence of student growth.
Impact on Student Learning: (NCTE 2.3 and 4.10) What evidence do you have that you have impacted student learning through your efforts to teach?	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	Using description, reflection, and deconstruction to frame evidence of student learning, the teacher candidate demonstrates an ability to reframe *AND* take action for the benefit of future teaching or improved student learning.	Using evidence, the teacher candidate demonstrates impact on student learning by describing, AND reflecting, (using both feelings and thoughts), AND deconstructing the impact on student learning using concepts of learning, teaching, assessment, and student diversity.	The teacher candidate provides evidence/artifacts of student learning *AND* a) describes quality student performance; *OR* b) describes how students received feedback on their performance; *OR* c) describes how data from assessments show evidence of learning outcomes.	No evidence or artifacts of student learning presented.
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: How has your knowledge of your students, subject matter, and pedagogy come together in your learning what it means to teach? (NCTE 4.0)	*The teacher designs or implements instruction that demonstrates skillful integration of multiple quality standards simultaneously.*	The teacher demonstrates ability to design instruction that a) focuses on significant learning goals; *AND* b) identifies and builds on student strengths and needs; *AND* c) flexibly uses instructional strategies and classroom organizations that are most likely to hook students into new ideas across a lesson or unit; *AND* d) produce quality evidence of student learning.	Using differentiated purposes based on student characteristics, the teacher demonstrates an ability design instruction that flexibly creates a feedback or assistance loop for students *AND* results in students demonstrating comprehension of academic content.	The teacher candidate demonstrates an understanding of a) <u>purposes</u> for learning; *OR* b) how to check for or anticipates <u>students</u>' understanding or misunderstandings prior to or during instruction; *OR* c) how to <u>pedagogically</u> adapt materials or activities to the characteristics of specific students.	Views teaching from the perspective of being only about content knowledge.

English Education Majors Data: 2009-20012

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes: (NCTE 4.10)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	2	1	2	2	0	3.43	1.27
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	3	1	0	3.57	1.13
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	0	4	2	0	2.67	0.52
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	1.00
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	3	1	1	3.13	1.24
Fall 2011 N = 12	0	4	2	5	1	2.75	1.06
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	2	3	2	0	3.60	1.17
Impact on Student Learning: (NCTE 2.3 and 4.10)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	1	1	3	2	0	3.14	1.07
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	3	1	0	3.57	1.13
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	0	6	0	0	3.00	0.00
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	2	0	1	0	3.33	1.15
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	3	2	0	3.25	1.04
Fall 2011 N= 12	0	2	1	9	0	2.42	0.79
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	3	3	1	0	3.80	1.03

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: (NCTE 4.0)							
Spring 2009 N = 7	2	2	0	3	0	3.43	1.40
Fall 2009 N = 7	2	1	2	2	0	3.43	1.27
Spring 2010 N = 6	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	0.89
Fall 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	0	0	3.00	1.00
Spring 2011 N = 8	1	2	2	3	0	3.13	1.13
Fall 2011 N = 12	0	2	2	7	1	2.42	0.90
Spring 2012 N = 10	3	3	4	0	0	3.90	0.88

Social Studies Education Majors Data: 2008-2012

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 8 Candidates=8	1(1)	3(3)	3(3)	0(0)	1(1)	3.38	1.15
Fall 2009 *** N=10	1	3	3	3	0	3.20	1.03
Spring 2010 N = 9	0	0	4	4	1	2.33	0.71
Fall 2010 N = 9	0	4	5	0	0	3.44	0.53
Spring 2011 N = 6	0	3	2	1	0	3.33	0.82
Fall 2011 N - 18	1	6	4	4	3	2.89	1.23
Spring 2012 N = 12	3	2	3	4	0	3.42	1.08

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Impact on Student Learning:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 8 Candidates=8	**1(1)**	**2(2)**	**5(5)**	**0(0)**	**0(0)**	**3.50**	**.73**
Fall 2009* N =10**	**1**	**3**	**2**	**4**	**0**	**3.10**	**1.00**
Spring 2010 N = 9	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**1**	**1.89**	**0.33**
Fall 2010 N = 9	**0**	**7**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3.67**	**0.71**
Spring 2011 N = 6	**0**	**4**	**1**	**1**	**0**	**3.50**	**0.84**
Fall 2011 N = 18	**1**	**7**	**3**	**6**	**1**	**3.06**	**1.11**
Spring 2012 N = 12	3	1	6	2	0	3.42	1.08
Pedagogical Content Knowledge:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 8 Candidates=8	**1(1)**	**3(3)**	**3(3)**	**0(0)**	**1(1)**	**3.38**	**1.15**
Fall 2009* N = 10**	**1**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**3.20**	**1.03**
Spring 2010 N = 9	**0**	**0**	**0**	**8**	**1**	**1.89**	**0.33**
Fall 2010 N = 9	**0**	**6**	**3**	**0**	**0**	**3.67**	**0.50**
Spring 2011 N = 6	**0**	**3**	**2**	**0**	**1**	**3.17**	**1.17**
Fall 2011 N = 18	**1**	**8**	**4**	**4**	**1**	**3.22**	**1.06**
Spring 2012 N = 12	**3**	**3**	**3**	**3**	**0**	**3.50**	**1.17**

Mathematics Education Data: 2009-2012

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes: (NCTM 7)							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	1	0	0	3.67	0.58
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	1	2	0	2.75	0.96
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	1	2	0	0	3.33	0.58
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	3	1	1	0	3.40	0.89
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	1	4	0	0	3.25	0.50
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	1	0	0	0	4.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	3	1	2	0	3.17	0.98
Impact on Student Learning: (NCTM 8)							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	0	2	0	2.67	1.15
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	0	3	0	2.50	1.00
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	0.00
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	3	1	1	0	3.40	0.89
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	1	4	0	0	3.25	0.50
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	1	0	0	0	4.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	3	3	0	0	3.50	0.55
Pedagogical Content Knowledge: (NCTM 8)							
Spring 2009 N = 3	0	2	0	1	0	3.33	1.15
Fall 2009 N = 4	0	1	1	2	0	2.75	0.96

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Spring 2010 N = 3	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1.00
Fall 2010 N = 5	0	2	2	1	0	3.20	0.84
Spring 2011 N = 5	0	2	2	1	0	3.20	0.84
Fall 2011 N = 1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	0.00
Spring 2012 N = 6	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	0.89

Foreign Language Education Data: 2009-2012

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
Learning from Assessment Processes:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 4 Candidates=2	2(2)	2(2)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3.50	0.58
Fall 2009 *** N=1	1	0	0	0	0	5.00	0.00
Spring 2010 N = 2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	0.00
Fall 2010 N = 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2011 N = 5	1	1	3	0	0	3.60	0.89
Fall 2011 N - 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Spring 2012 N = 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impact on Student Learning:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 4 Candidates=2	2(1)	2(1)	0(0)	0(0)	0(0)	3.50	0.58
Fall 2009*** N = 1	1	0	0	0	0	5.00	0.00
Spring 2010	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	0.00

Year	INTEGRATING (5)	ENACTING (4)	DEVELOPING (3)	EMERGING (2)	NOT OBSERVED (1)	Mean	Standard Deviation
N = 2							
Fall 2010 N = 0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Spring 2011 N = 5	**1**	**0**	**4**	**0**	**0**	**3.40**	**0.89**
Fall 2011 N = 0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Spring 2012 N = 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pedagogical Content Knowledge:							
Spring 2009 Completed Rubric = 4 Candidates=2	**2(2)**	**2(2)**	**0(0)**	**0(0)**	**0(0)**	**3.50**	**0.58**
Fall 2009* N = 1**	**1**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**5.00**	**0.00**
Spring 2010 N = 2	**0**	**0**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**3.00**	**0.00**
Fall 2010 N = 0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Spring 2011 N = 5	**1**	**2**	**2**	**0**	**0**	**3.80**	**0.84**
Fall 2011 N = 0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Spring 2012 N = 0	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

Summary of Findings

Over the past four years, elementary majors have done well on this assessment. Averages over the years have fluctuated slightly but always remained above a 4.00 overall. Secondary students average slightly lower on this assessment. However, the use of a more detailed and demanding rubric may results in evaluations which are more critical yet more realistic for the secondary students. Across both programs the vast majority of students are rating as “Developing” or higher.

What improvements have been made based on assessment findings

The School of Education finds longitudinal data to be very valuable in evaluations of programs and the Unit Assessment System itself. Faculty members continue to discuss the validity and reliability of this assessment. Because of the consistently high scores for elementary students, there is some concern that the way the assessment is administered does not distinguish between those who have the skills and those who do not.

Graduate Program Assessments

Y520 Literature Review Assignment

The goal of Y520 is to help graduate students become familiar with the discourses and practices of educational inquiry. The course prepares students to be critical readers of research and to understand how researchers build on knowledge generated via inquiry to arrive at researchable questions and informed methods of conducting inquiry.

One key process that all researchers conduct is the literature review. This process of searching out the relevant secondary sources (literature reviews) and primary sources (reports of peer-reviewed studies that include a description of methods, sampling and data collection strategies, and data analysis and results) leads to a better understanding of their topic and possibilities for a study of their own. You will be supported in undertaking this process so you are prepared to "think like a researcher" and to make sense of educational research when you need to tackle complex issues in your own professional life.
Conducting a literature review requires many different skills, including: searching online data bases, knowing relevant journals, recognizing the difference between secondary and primary sources, effective and organized reading and note-taking, synthesizing across multiple articles, and preparing a scholarly meta-analysis. Many of these will be new skills for you, but this process will provide you with an authentic task that requires you to learn by doing and being reflective.

Your literature review should provide readers with an understanding of a topic of your choice that would be good for researching. It should enable readers to see where your focus and questions for possible research fit in with existing knowledge about the topic. It should set the broad context, narrow the boundaries, and provide a rationale for your area of interest.

Your literature review is supposed to be a critical analysis of secondary sources and primary research studies published in professional journals. The studies included in the review need to be central to your topic, and you need to attend to the strengths and weaknesses of the research available. In the end, your process will be assessed using the criteria described by Mertens in chapter 3.

In our class this semester, we will work our way through the steps in the Literature Review process and you will turn in assignments as we go. The details about how to complete these assignments are contained in the modules and the syllabus.

Instructions for the Literature Review Assignment

This paper will be developed from articles you review through your library research. As you search for peer-reviewed scholarly articles (see "Resources" in OnCourse to help in identification of scholarly articles as well as tips provided in Galvan Chapter 4), make sure you **identify between 4-6 qualitative and 4-6 quantitative articles** relevant to your topic of study. If you are using mixed methods articles for your literature review, you can count those toward either the quantitative or qualitative requirement, but not both.

A literature review is a *synthesis* of the literature organized around themes. It is NOT simply a regurgitation of research studies or a summary of the articles you find. The Writing Resources folder under the Resources tab in Oncourse includes helpful tips and articles. Your paper should include:

a. A title page including the title of your paper, your name, the course, and the date;
b. An introduction to your topic of interest by way of providing background, contextual information, definitions important in understanding the topic, etc. In other words, what would an intelligent reader who is not familiar with your topic need to know to understand your paper?;
c. A well-organized and thoughtful synthesis of the research articles you located and determined to be empirical, peer-reviewed, scholarly pieces;
d. A well-organized and thoughtful discussion of how the quantitative and qualitative articles differed and were similar with regard to purpose, research questions, methods of data collection, methods of data analysis, discussion of findings, and conclusions;
e. A brief explanation regarding how this topic is relevant and important in your work;
f. A brief description of how your review of the literature might inform your and/or others' practice;
g. An APA style reference sheet.

This paper will be graded on content as well as form. That is, be sure you proofread for grammar, typographical errors, spelling, etc. Use APA format for the paper (see the APA reference sheet under "Writing Resources"). Use 12 point font, Times New Roman, 1" margins. Include page numbers. This paper should be no more than 8 double spaced pages (excluding the title page and references). Letters b, c, and d from the above should make of the bulk of the paper. If you need to visit the Writing Center on campus, please make an appointment (274-2049) well in advance of the due date.

Data Point: Literature Review in Y520

	Level 1: Exceeds(5)	***Level 2: Target(4)***	***Level 3: Acceptable (3)***	***Level 4: Emerging (2)***	**Level 5: Unacceptable(1)**
Section 33769 Spr 12 N=15	3	3	3	4	2
Section 33289 Fall 11 N= 17	7	5	2	2	1

	Level 1: Exceeds(5)	*Level 2: Target(4)*	*Level 3: Acceptable (3)*	*Level 4: Emerging (2)*	**Level 5: Unacceptable(1)**
Section 15051 Sum 11 N = 22	11	5	3	3	0
Section 3591 Sum 10 N=24	8	12	4	0	0
Section 1802 Sum 11 N=25	5	11	4	4	1
Section 15141 Fall 11 N=22	6	16	0	1	0
Section 9335 Spr 12 N=25	9	12	0	1	3
Section 22193 Spr 11 N-23	4	18	0	1	0

Y510: Action Research Personal Action Research Proposal

Final Paper and Related Construction Pieces

Your final paper for the semester will be a proposal for an action research project you plan to implement. Your proposal will be based on systematic inquiry into your practice. This preliminary work will be conducted throughout our time together and will take the form of construction pieces due at various points during the semester. For each of the construction pieces, and for the final paper, please follow the guidelines below.

- Each assignment should follow APA guidelines. Specifically, the assignments should include a cover page, a running head, page numbers, appropriate headings and citations, and correct spelling, grammar, and mechanics as denoted by standard APA format.
- Each assignment should be typed and double spaced. Please use one inch margins and either Times New Roman or Cambria 12 point font.
- Each assignment should include a list of references formatted to APA specifications.

Introduction/Framing of Question (5% of course grade)

The introduction to your paper should demonstrate your knowledge of the course readings and include a minimum of the following:

- Information about you (your name, what you do, etc.)
- Relevant contextual information about your setting, population, school, class (es) etc.
- Your research question and a rationale for why you chose this question (What prompted this question? Why is it important to you and/or your teaching?)
- A question that:
    - Positions YOU as the agent of change
    - Builds on the strengths and resources of the other participants (as opposed to a deficit perspective)
    - Allows you to be open to what the data tells you (avoiding an agenda)
- Approximate length: 5 pages

Literature Review (5% of course grade)

A thoughtfully constructed review of the educational literature that relates to your research question should include a minimum of the following:

- A description of how the literature review was conducted
- References to at least 10 research articles or books related to your topic
- References to at least 2 teacher research studies
- A synthesis of the research findings (What are the similarities and differences across the studies? Where does your question fall in relation to these other studies?)
- Approximate length: 5 pages
-

Data Collection & Analysis (5% of course grade)

Your Data Collection and Analysis section should build on course readings and discussions and include a minimum of the following:

- Instruments for data collection (Which instruments will you use- surveys, interviews, artifact analysis, etc.? From whom will you collect data? How often?)
- Samples of preliminary data that helped you frame the question and begin the research process
- A description of the process you intend to use to analyze your data
- Approximate length: 5 pages
-

Timeline/Ethical Considerations (5% of course grade)

The final construction piece will include both a timeline for the project and any ethical considerations related to your study. This piece should include a minimum of the following:

- A projected timeline for the collection of each piece of data set, data analysis, and production of a written report related to your research project
- An awareness of the ethical considerations related to teacher research (generally) and your project (specifically)
- A description of the ways in which these ethical considerations will be addressed throughout the project
- Approximate length: 5 pages
-

Final Paper (30% of your course grade, due on April 29th)
Based on the feedback you receive from your peers and from me, you will revise the construction pieces to build your final paper. Your final paper should show a comprehensive understanding of course readings and discussions, the process of teacher research, and the educational literature related to your study. The final paper should be approximately 20 pages in length, follow the guidelines set forth at the start of this document, and demonstrate your attention to the feedback received on your construction pieces.

Data Point: Personal Action Research Proposal in Y510

	Level 1: Exceeds (5)	Level 2: Target (4)	Level 3: Acceptable (3)	Level 4: Emerging (2)	Level 5: Unacceptable (1)
Section Spr 11 27159 N=18	1	4	9	3	1
Section Spr 12 32731 N=16	8/50%	2/13%	1/6%	3/19%	2/13%
Section Spr 12 32732 N= 16	6/38%	4/25%	1/6%	4/25%	1/6%
Section Spr 12 32733 N = 19	5/26%	8/42%	4/21%	2/11%	0/0%
Section Spr 12 13471 N = 10	5/50%	2/20%	2/20%	1/10%	0/0%

Advising Survey

An electronic survey was sent to a random sample of students who had visiting an undergraduate advisor in the School of Education during the last academic year. The students were asked to rate their agreement with each statement on a scale of "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree." Eighty students completed the survey, representing a 32% return rate.

Data from 2012 Survey

1. The information I received from my advisor is accurate and helpful.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.0% 2 - Disagree 6.3% 3- Agree 41.3% **4-Strongly Agree 46.3%**

2. My advisor is knowledgeable about course content and compatibility
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 3.8% 2 - Disagree 6.3% 3- Agree 41.8% 33 **4-Strongly Agree 45.6%**

3. My advisor is knowledgeable about my degree program, the requirements, and school procedures.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 3.8% - 2 - Disagree 5.0% - 3- Agree 37.5% **- 4-Strongly Agree 51.3%**

4. My advisor is professional and courteous
1 - Strongly Disagree 3.8% - 2 - Disagree 2.5% - 3- Agree 38.8% **- 4-Strongly Agree 52.5%**

5. I am satisfied with the information I receive in my advising session.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 6.3% - 2 - Disagree 6.3% **- 3- Agree 44.3%** - 4-Strongly Agree 41.8%

7. My advisor spends as much time with me as I need
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.3% - 2 - Disagree 6.6% - 3- Agree 30.3% **- 4-Strongly Agree 52.6%**

8. My advisor responds promptly to phone messages
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.0% - 2 - Disagree 7.5% - 3- Agree 17.5% - 4-Strongly Agree 11.3%

9. My advisor treats me with respect
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 2.5% - 2 - Disagree 3.8% 3- Agree 40.0% **4-Strongly Agree 53.8%**

10. My advisor understands my questions and concerns.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.1% - 2 - Disagree 3.8% - 3- Agree 41.8% **- 4-Strongly Agree 45.6%**

11. My advisor offers suggestions but encourages me to make my own decisions.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 2.5% - 2 - Disagree 6.3% - 3- Agree 33.8% **- 4-Strongly Agree 50.0%**

12. My advisor responds promptly to e-mails
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.0% - 2 - Disagree 11.3% **3- Agree 31.3%** 4-Strongly Agree 25.0%

13. My advisor can refer me to resources on campus that can help me solve my problems

- 1 - Strongly Disagree 1.3% - 2 - Disagree 6.3% - 3- Agree 34.2% **- 4-Strongly Agree 36.7%**

14. My advisor seems interested in my academic progress
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 3.8% - 2 - Disagree 15.2% **- 3- Agree 35.4%** - NA 11.4%

15. My advisor assists me with career guidance if asked.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 0.0% - 2 - Disagree 5.0% - 3- Agree 26.3% - 4-Strongly Agree 28.8%

16. I prefer to meet with the same advisor each time.
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 2.5% - 2 - Disagree 7.5% - 3- Agree 27.5% **- 4-Strongly Agree 58.8%**

17. I prefer to have a scheduled appointment with my advisor
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 1.3% - 2 - Disagree 25.3% **- 3- Agree 41.8%** 4-Strongly Agree 19.0%

18. I prefer to come for advising on a walk-in basis
1 - Strongly Disagree 2.5% - 2 - Disagree 22.8% **- 3- Agree 39.2%** - 4-Strongly Agree 22.8%

19. I would recommend my advisor to other students
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 5.0% - 2 - Disagree 15.0% - 3- Agree 27.5% **- 4-Strongly Agree 47.5%**

20. I am satisfied with my advising experiences in the School of Education
- 1 - Strongly Disagree 8.9% - 2 - Disagree 15.2% - 3- Agree 34.2% **- 4 -Strongly Agree 40.5%**

Summary of Findings

Most students agreed (87%) that the information they receive from their advisors in the School of Education was accurate and that their advisor was knowledgeable about courses (87%) and programs (88%). Eighty-six percent of the respondents were satisfied with the information they received. Student felt the advisors were professional and courteous (91%) and spent sufficient amount of time with them (82%). The majority felt the advisors treated them with respect (93%) and understood their questions and concerns (87%). Eight –three percent of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the advisors offered suggestions but allowed them to make their own decision.