

**Curriculum and Instruction  
Assessment of Student Learning Report  
2019**

**A. Program Information**

Department:	Curriculum and Instruction
Program:	Curriculum and Instruction (BSE)
Contact Name:	Todd Goodson
Contact Email:	<a href="mailto:tgoodson@ksu.edu">tgoodson@ksu.edu</a>
Program assessment website:	

**B. Preface**

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction adopted a new Undergraduate Portfolio for the Fall 2018 semester completed during the Student Teaching Semester. This new portfolio is aligned directly to the new Conceptual Framework adopted by the Department which is aligned to the Kansas State Department of Education standards for education preparation programs and the NTASC standards upon which KSDE has drawn their standards.

**C. Outcome Reporting**

**1. Student Learning Outcome**

**Learner Development.** The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate, relevant, and rigorous learning experiences.

**Assessment Method**

Entry 1 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their understanding of how learners develop and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

## Results

### Entry 1 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	123 (43.9%)	157 (56.1%)
317	2018-2019	0 (0%)	4 (1.3%)	108 (34.1%)	205 (64.7%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this entry is excellent with all candidates meeting or exceeding expected performance prior to remediation. Of what will be a common theme in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. Where this entry evaluates candidate understanding of student learning, the department is pleased with its current programming and will continue to monitor performance.

## 2. Student Learning Outcome

**Learning Differences.** The teacher uses understanding of differences in individuals, languages, cultures, and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet rigorous standards.

### Assessment Method

Entry 2 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their understanding of how learners are different and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

## Results

### Entry 2 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	2 (0.7%)	125 (44.6%)	153 (54.6%)
317	2018-2019	0 (0%)	7 (2.2%)	113 (35.6%)	197 (62.1%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this category is high as over 99% of candidates met or exceeded expected performance prior to remediation. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This entry evaluated candidate understanding of the differences of their students. The department will continue to monitor candidate performance.

### 3. Student Learning Outcome

**Learning Environment.** The teacher works with others to create learning environments that support individual and collaborative learning, includes teacher and student use of technology, and encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

#### Assessment Method

Entry 3 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their ability to establish a conducive learning environment and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

#### Results

##### Entry 3 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	119 (42.5%)	161 (57.5%)
317	2018-2019	1 (.3%)	6 (1.9%)	101 (31.9%)	209 (65.9%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this category is high as all candidates met or exceeded expected performance prior to remediation. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This entry evaluated the candidate’s ability to create a productive learning environment. The department will continue to monitor candidate performance.

#### 4. Student Learning Outcome

**Content Knowledge.** The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates content-specific learning and literacy experiences that make the discipline accessible and relevant to assure mastery of the content.

##### Assessment Method

Entry 4 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their content knowledge and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

##### Results

###### Entry 4 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	1 (.4%)	1 (.4%)	143 (51.1%)	135 (48.2%)
317	2018-2019	1 (.3%)	5 (1.6%)	105 (33.1%)	206 (65%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

##### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this entry is high as over 98% of candidates met or exceeded expected performance prior to remediation. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This entry evaluates candidate content knowledge and will be continually monitored. With the future potential of statistical disaggregation, this will become even more closely monitored for each individual program.

#### 5. Student Learning Outcome

**Application of Content.** The teacher understands how to engage learners through interdisciplinary lessons that utilize concept based teaching and authentic learning experiences to engage students in effective communication and collaboration, and in critical and creative thinking.

##### Assessment Method

Entry 5 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their ability to apply their content to student learning and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is

assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

**Results**

**Entry 5 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019**

<b>Number of Students</b>	<b>Academic Year</b>	<b>Unsatisfactory 0-1</b>	<b>Developing 2</b>	<b>Acceptable 3</b>	<b>Exemplary 4</b>
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	142 (50.7%)	138 (49.3%)
317	2018-2019	0 (0%)	4 (1.3%)	115 (36.3%)	198 (62.5%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Candidate performance for this entry is high as over 98% of candidates met or exceeded expected performance prior to remediation. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This entry evaluates the candidate’s ability to apply content to instruction. This category will continue to be monitored, but will be more closely monitored as we develop the ability to disaggregate data by level and content area.

**6. Student Learning Outcome**

**Assessment.** The teacher understands how to use multiple measures to monitor and assess individual student learning, engage learners in self-assessment, and use data to make decisions.

**Assessment Method**

Entry 6 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their understanding and use of assessment and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

**Results**

**Entry 6 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	136 (48.6%)	144(51.4%)
317	2018-2019	0 (0%)	4 (1.3%)	102 (32.2%)	211 (66.6%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

#### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this entry is high with all candidates having met or exceeded the level of performance. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. Assessment is a key part of the department’s programming, thus the score is not surprising. Continued monitoring of this score will be key in evaluating candidate preparation.

#### 7. Student Learning Outcome

**Planning for Instruction.** The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, technology, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

#### Assessment Method

Entry 7 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a unit plan documenting their ability to plan meaningful instruction during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

#### Results

##### Entry 7 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	3 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	112 (40%)	165 (58.9%)
317	2018-2019	3 (.9%)	3 (.9%)	112 (35.3%)	199 (62.8%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

#### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this entry was high with over 98% of candidates having met

or exceeded the expected score. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This category requires candidates to present a unit of their instruction from their internship. Like the content entries (4 & 5), the department will be able to glean even more meaningful data when it can be disaggregated by content area. The department will continue to monitor this data.

**8. Student Learning Outcome**

**Instructional Strategies.** The teacher understands and uses a variety of appropriate instructional strategies and resources to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in relevant ways.

**Assessment Method**

Entry 8 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their ability to use multiple and meaningful instructional strategies and how it affects their teaching during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

**Results**

**Entry 8 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)	148 (52.9%)	131 (46.8%)
317	2018-2019	1 (.3%)	3 (.9%)	133 (42.0%)	180 (56.8%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Candidate performance for this entry was high with over 9% of candidates having met or exceeded the expected score. Of concern in the data of this entry is the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This category requires candidates to present how they utilized multiple learning strategies in their instruction. The department will continue to monitor the data and also will look forward to disaggregating data by level and content area in the future.

## 9. Student Learning Outcome

**Professional Learning and Ethical Practice.** The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

### Assessment Method

Entry 9 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their development as professionals and ethical practitioners during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

### Results

#### Entry 9 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	141 (50.3%)	139 (49.7%)
317	2018-2019	0 (0%)	7 (2.2%)	96 (30.3%)	214 (67.5%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

### DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION

Candidate performance for this entry was high with all candidates having met or exceeded the expected score. Of concern in the data of this entry the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. This category requires candidates to reflect upon their development as professional and ethical educators and is a hallmark of the department. The department will closely monitor additional data yearly.

## 10. Student Learning Outcome

**Leadership and Collaboration.** The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, support staff, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

### Assessment Method

Entry 10 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a reflective essay and curate three artifacts documenting their developing leadership and

collaboration as burgeoning professionals during their internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

**Results**

**Entry 10 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	0 (0%)	2 (.7%)	148 (52.9%)	130 (46.4%)
317	2018-2019	1 (.3%)	4 (1.3%)	76 (24%)	236 (74.4%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

While over 99% of candidates exceeded or met the target score, of concern in the data of this entry the decline of exemplary ratings to acceptable scores. This entry in particular has data of particular concern. This may be attributed to calibration of scoring methods in preparation of CAEP visits resulting in more stringent scoring or the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and modifying of the semester. Careful monitoring to see if this is a trend will be needed.

**11. Student Learning Outcome**

**Data Analysis.** This outcome evaluates candidate ability to use data to make educational decisions.

**Assessment Method**

Entry 11 of the student teaching portfolio requires candidates to complete a data analysis of assessment data from the teaching of one of their units during the internship. The entry is assessed through a four-point rubric that discriminates among levels of performance. The department has established a score of 3 out of 4 as the baseline level of student performance. The target level of performance is represented by the ratings of “acceptable” or “exemplary.”

**Results**

**Entry 11 Scores for Academic Year 2018-2019**

Number of Students	Academic Year	Unsatisfactory 0-1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Exemplary 4
280	2019-2020	2 (.7%)	4 (1.4%)	128 (45.7%)	146 (52.1%)
317	2018-2019	4 (1.3%)	9 (2.8%)	130 (41%)	174 (54.9%)

*\*Data provided is pre-remediation*

**DATA SUMMARY AND REFLECTION**

Over 97% of candidates met or exceeded the target for this entry. This entry has the largest number of candidates who did not meet the target score. There is some concern as to whether or not students simply did not follow instructions or provided sub-standard answers in the data interpretation. We will monitor this closely on the second cycle of data collection with these entries. Additionally, as these are pre-remediation data, this bears further observation.