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1. Brief Introductory Statement:  
   Please review the Introductory Statement and contact information for your department displayed on the assessment site: [**http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html**](http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html) - if this information is current, please indicate as much. No further information is needed. We will indicate “Last Reviewed: [current date]” on the page.  
   If the information is not current, please provide an update:

The major purpose of the professional education programs in teacher education is to prepare candidates for teaching in elementary and secondary schools. Preparation is also provided for teachers of students with mild to moderate disabilities with the special education mild/moderate license. The department prepares students for endorsements in ESL (English as a Second Language), Dual Immersion, Basic Reading (graduate level only), and Education of the Gifted (graduate level only). All programs are approved by the Utah State Board of Education. The educator preparation program is also a Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) candidate member.

**Contact Information**  
Dr. Kristin Hadley  
1351 Edvalson Street, Dept 1304  
Ogden, UT 84408-1304  
Education Bldg, Rm 222  
(801) 626-8653

# B. Mission Statement

Please review the Mission Statement for your department displayed on the assessment site: [**http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html**](http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html) - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.  
If the information is not current, please provide an update:

**Mission Statement of the Weber State University Educator Preparation Program**

*We work within our communities to prepare caring, competent educators and to promote equitable, inclusive, and transformative education practices.*

*Community:* We recognize that effective educator preparation is a cooperative endeavor involving faculty and staff members within the Teacher Education Department, the Moyes College of Education, and Weber State University. Our community also includes school districts, administrators, and teachers as well as professional organizations. Our success depends on effective and consistent collaboration between all groups.

*Caring, Competent Educators:* Our central aim is to ensure that teacher candidates develop necessary skills and dispositions as outlined in the Utah Effective Teaching Standards. We also acknowledge that it is of indispensable importance that each teacher develops an enduring ethic of care—the propensity and ability to meet the educational needs of each student.

*Equitable, Inclusive, and Transformative Education Practices*: We believe that processes and institutions of teaching and learning can and should become increasingly equitable, promoting the well being of all students, with special emphasis on underserved populations. To that end, we are committed, where necessary, to transforming the attitudes and beliefs of teacher candidates and to extending our research and professional outreach in shaping general educational practice and policy.

**C. Student Learning Outcomes**Please review the Student Learning Outcomes for your department displayed on the assessment site: [**http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html**](http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html) - if they are current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed. If they are not current, please provide an update:

The Teacher Education department makes three claims about our graduates that support our mission statement and align with the Utah Effective Teaching Standards (UETS).

Claim/Outcome 1: Graduates meet the needs of diverse learners by creating a safe and equitable learning environment;

Claim/Outcome 2: Graduates use effective instructional practices based on deep and flexible knowledge of content and pedagogy; and

Claim/Outcome 3: Graduates engage in reflective practice, exhibit ethical behavior, and fulfill professional responsibilities.

D. Curriculum

Please review the Curriculum Grid for your department displayed on the assessment site: [**http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html**](http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html) - if it is current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed: [current data]”. No further information is needed.  
If the curriculum grid is not current, please provide an update:

| **Curriculum Map**  *F=assessed formatively*  *S=assessed summatively* | | | Learning Outcomes | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outcome 1: The Learner and Learning | Outcome 2: Instructional Practice | Outcome 3: Professional Responsibility |
| **Elementary Education** | Level 1 | EDUC 3120: Reading Instruction in the Primary Grades |  | F | F |
| EDUC 3140: Educational Psychology | F |  | F |
| EDUC 3205: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching | F |  | F |
| EDUC 3270: Differentiation and Collaboration | F |  | F |
| Level 2 | EDUC 3100: Instructional Planning and Assessment | F | F | F |
| EDUC 3240: Reading Instruction in the Intermediate Grades | F | F | F |
| PEP 3620: Methods of Teaching Physical Education and Health | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4345: Integrating Creative Arts | F | F | F |
| EDUC 3210: Elementary Level 2 Practicum | F |  | F |
| Level3 | EDUC 4300: Elementary Mathematics Methods | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4320: Elementary Language Arts Methods | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4330: Elementary Science Methods |  | F | F |
| EDUC 3280: Elementary Social Studies | F | F | F |
| EDUC 3115: Media Integration in Elementary School Settings |  | F | F |
| EDUC 4210: Elementary Level 3 Practicum | F | F | F |
| ST | EDUC 4840: Student Teaching | S | S | S |
| EDUC 4850: Integrated Elementary Ed Student Teaching Sem. |  | S |  |
| **Special Education** | Level 1 | EDUC 3120: Reading Instruction in the Primary Grades | F | F | F |
| EDUC 3140: Educational Psychology | F |  | F |
| EDUC 3205: Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching | F |  | F |
| EDUC 3270: Differentiation and Collaboration | F |  | F |
| EDUC 4515: Foundations in Special Education Practice and Law | F | F | F |
| Level 2 | EDUC 4530: Assessment in Special Education |  | F | F |
| EDUC 4540: Managing Student Behavior | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4550: Instructional Planning and Learning Environments | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4560: Validated Methods: Mathematics | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4521: Practicum in Special Education | F |  | F |
| Level 3 | EDUC 4555: Validated Methods: Reading | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4570: Validated Methods: Written Expression | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4580: Learning Strategies/Transition for Spec Ed Students | F | F | F |
| EDUC 4581: Pre-Student Teaching in Special Education | F |  | F |
| ST | EDUC 4680: Student Teaching in Special Education | S | S | S |
| EDUC 4686: Special Education Student Teaching Seminar | S | S | S |
| **Secondary Ed** | Pro Core | EDUC 3220: Foundations of Diversity | F | F | F |
| EDUC 3265: The Exceptional Student | F | F |  |
| EDUC 3900: Preparing, Teaching, and Assessing Instruction | F | F |  |
| EDUC 3935: Reading and Writing Across the Sec Curriculum | F | F |  |
| EDUC 3315: Media Integration in the Secondary School Setting |  | F |  |
| EDUC 3910: Secondary Education Practicum | F | F | F |
| ST | EDUC 4940: Student Teaching in Secondary Education | S | S | S |
| EDUC 4950: Integrated Secondary Student Teaching Seminar | S | S | S |

**E. Assessment Plan**  
Please review the Assessment Plan for your department displayed on the assessment site: <http://www.weber.edu/portfolio/departments.html> - if the plan current, please indicate as much; we will mark the web page as “Last Reviewed [current date]”. No further information is needed.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **WSU Educator Preparation Program Outcomes** | 1. Graduates meet the needs of diverse learners by creating a safe and equitable learning environment. | 2. Graduates use effective instructional practices based on deep content knowledge and flexible pedagogical knowledge and skill. | 3. Graduates engage in reflective practice, exhibit ethical behavior, and fulfill professional responsibilities. |
| ***Summative Evidence Collected During Student Teaching*** | TSD Rationale  TSD Lesson Adaptations/  Accommodations  ST Final Evaluations | Praxis II  Graduation GPA  TSD Lessons and Assessments  ST Final Evaluation | TSD Lesson Reflections  ST Final Evaluation – ethics and professional responsibility |

**F. Report of assessment results for the most previous academic year:**

There are a variety of ways in which departments can choose to show evidence of learning. This is one example. The critical pieces to include are 1) what learning outcome is being assessed, 2) what method of measurement was used, 3) what the threshold for ‘acceptable performance’ is for that measurement, 4) what the actual results of the assessment were, 5) how those findings are interpreted, and 6) what is the course of action to be taken based upon the interpretation.

| Evidence of Learning: Courses within the Major | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Measurable Learning Outcome  Students will… | Method of Measurement | Threshold for Evidence of Student Learning | Findings Linked to Learning Outcomes | Interpretation of Findings | Action Plan/Use of Results |
| Learning Outcome 1:  Graduates meet the needs of diverse learners by creating a safe and equitable learning environment. | Measure 1: TWS Contextual factors proxy for TSD Rationale | Measure 1: 80% of students will be Met on the rubric | Measure 1: 100% of students were Met | Measure 1: Students are adept at identifying factors that impact learning. | Measure 1: Implement new TSD criteria and rubrics |
| Measure 2: TWS Adaptations in proxy for TSD Lesson Adaptations/ Accommodations | Measure 2: 80% of students will be Met on the rubric | Measure 2: 95% of students were Met | Measure 2: Students are adept at describing accommodations for diverse learners. | Measure 2: Implement new TSD criteria and rubrics |
| Measure 3: Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Learning Environment | Measure 3: Student mean score of 4.5 or higher. | Measure 3: Student mean is 4.6 | Measure 3: Students are creating an appropriate learning environment. | Measure 3: Implement new evaluation protocol |
| Learning Outcome 2:  Graduates use effective instructional practices based on deep content knowledge and flexible pedagogical knowledge and skill. | Measure 1: Praxis 2 Pass Rates | Measure 1: 100% of student pass the Praxis 2 score. | Measure 1: 85.9% passed on first attempt | Measure 1: Most students are passing the Praxis 2 test. With subsequent attempts, the pass rate nears 100% | Measure 1: Implement Praxis 2 Prep course for elementary, support content majors in Praxis prep |
| Measure 2: Graduation GPA (admission GPA for secondary – awaiting Major GPA report creation) | Measure 2: 100% of graduates at 3.0 or better. | Measure 2:  Elementary - 98% above 3.0 (mean=3.54)  Special Ed – 100% above 3.0 (mean=3.60)  Secondary – 90% above 3.0 (mean=3.48) | Measure 2: Most students meeting the state established criteria of 3.0 GPA at graduation. Some secondary students will need to improve their GPA to meet licensing criteria | Measure 2: Communicate with secondary teaching major advisors and professors about newly established state licensing criteria of 3.0 for licensure. |
| Measure 3: TWS Lessons and Assessment in proxy for TSD Lessons and Assessments | Measure 3:  80% of students will be Met on the rubric | Measure 3: 96% of students were Met | Measure 3: Students create effective lesson plans and assessments. | Measure 3: Implement new rubric and compare data |
| Measure 4: Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Lessons and Assessments | Measure 4: Student mean score of 4.5 or higher. | Measure 4: Student mean is 4.7 | Measure 4: Students are developing appropriate lessons using a variety of strategies. | Measure 4: Implement new evaluation protocol |
| Learning Outcome 3: Graduates engage in reflective practice, exhibit ethical behavior, and fulfill professional responsibilities. | Measure 1: TWS Reflection in proxy for TSD Lesson Reflections | Measure 1: 80% of students will be Met on the rubric | Measure 1: 95% of students were Met | Measure 1: Students effectively reflected on enacted instruction. | Measure 1: Implement new rubric and compare data |
| Measure 2: Student Teaching Final Evaluation: Professional Responsibility | Measure 2: Student mean score of 4.5 or higher. | Measure 2: Student mean is 4.8 | Measure 2: Students fulfill professional responsibilities and behave in an appropriate manner. | Measure 2: Implement new evaluation protocol |

Note: Many of our measures (TSD rubrics and ST evaluations) in the middle of a change. The previous measures are currently being used to estimate the outcomes. While the former measures do evaluate the outcomes, the new measures will be more focused and discerning and will be reported in 2014-2015 (pilot year), and 2015-2016 (final version).

G. Summary of Artifact Collection Procedure

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Artifact | Learning Outcome Measured | When/How Collected? | Where Stored? |
| TSD Rubrics:   * Rationale for Design (includes adaptations and accommodations) * Lesson Plans and Assessments * Lesson Reflection | Outcome 1  Outcome 2  Outcome 3 | End of student teaching semester in student teaching seminar class | TED database |
| Student Teaching Final Evaluation   * The Learner and Learning * Instructional Practices * Professional Responsibility | Outcome 1  Outcome 2  Outcome 3 | Final evaluation of student teaching. Collected at the end of student teaching. | TED database |
| Graduation GPA | Outcome 2 | Collected from institutional research at the end of each academic year. | Institutional research database |
| Praxis 2 | Outcome 2 | Collected from ETS each year | ETS and TED database |

Appendix A

Report of progress on ‘non-learning-outcome recommendations’ from previous 5 year program review (optional):

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Date of Program Review: 2/12/2014 | Recommendation | Progress Description |
| ***Recommendation 1*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| Continue to develop the mission statement and program standards | The program is encouraged to continue the development of the program mission statement and program standards. While strengthening the mission statement and standards, the program should develop ways they will measure if they are accomplishing the statement. | 2014 Progress: Developed mission statement descriptors. Still need work on underpinnings |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |
| ***Recommendation 2*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| Develop program summative assessments | The program should identify and develop program summative assessments for each of the three program levels that will allow the faculty to measure the strengths and weaknesses of each level. This should help the faculty know if the level learning outcomes are being met or not. | 2014 Progress: Summative assessments are being developed. Small pilots are currently underway with a full scale pilot of each measure during Spring 2015 |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |
| ***Recommendation 3*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| The three level teams should work to document, agendas and minutes, the work done in their monthly meetings. | The three level teams should work to document, agendas and minutes, the work done in their monthly meetings. The level teams should incorporate data and evidence reviews as part of their monthly meetings. They should document the findings of these reviews that include plans made for program changes, improvements, and outcomes of previous plans. The level three teams needs to start holding formal meetings, particularly as the new program changes are implemented for new candidates entering the program. | 2014 Progress: All documents, agendas, and minutes are housed on the TED canvas page which all department members are using. Level 3 team is meeting regularly |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Recommendation 4*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| Seek feedback from student teaching supervisors. | The program should find opportunities to seek the insights and feedback from student teaching supervisors. They are uniquely situated to see the teacher candidates in school settings and the successes and failures of the program. They also have insights into the usefulness of the student teaching evaluation instrument, a key part of the program’s assessment system. In particular, Dwayne Hansen, student teaching coordinator, should be given a couple of times a year to formally share with the faculty what he has learned from each previous semester of student teaching. DeWayne should be asked to prepare a written report that faculty can review and call upon for program improvements. | 2014 Progress: The first “Data Discussion” meeting will be held on January 13 with data from ST evaluations and feedback from cooperating teachers and student teaching supervisors. Level teams are also meeting once per semester to discuss key formative assessments as they relate to the outcomes. |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |
| ***Recommendation 5*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| Quarterly advisement coordination meeting with all advisors across WSU. | The program should consider holding a quarterly advisement coordination meeting with all advisors across WSU that provide advisement for teacher education candidates, particularly to support those candidates completing the dual ELED/ECE program. During student interviews, candidates shared that they were aware of students getting one set of advice from the ELED advisor and a different set of advice from the ECE advisor. The program faculty and advisement staff needs to have a regular coordination meeting to keep the advisement staff up-to-date on programmatic and curricular changes so they can provide the best information possible to candidates. | 2014 Progress: No progress yet. |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Program Concern/ Recommendation 3*** | ***Text of recommendation*** |  |
| Availability of advisement | Students shared that the advisement they received was top notch, but it was very difficult to get an appointment when needed. The program should consider how to make more student advisement available, particularly at critical decision times during the year. The team noted that the advisement office was restructured recently and would recommend that the program seek ways to share with students and faculty these changes and additional advisement resource now available. | 2014 Progress: Drop in hours have been established. Restructuring is complete and advisors have greater availability. |
| 2015 Progress: |
| 2016 Progress: |
| 2017 Progress: |

**Appendix B**

Please provide the following information about the full-time and adjunct faculty contracted by your department during the last academic year (summer through spring). Gathering this information each year will help with the headcount reporting that must be done for the final Five Year Program Review document that is shared with the State Board of Regents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Faculty |  |
| Headcount | 22 |
| With Doctoral Degrees (Including MFA and other terminal degrees, as specified by the institution) | 22 |
| Full-time Tenured | 14 |
| Full-time Non-Tenured (includes tenure-track) | 8 |
| Part-time | 0 |
|  |  |
| With Master’s Degrees | 0 |
| Full-time Tenured |  |
| Full-time Non-Tenured |  |
| Part-time |  |
|  |  |
| With Bachelor’s Degrees | 0 |
| Full-time Tenured |  |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |
| Part-time |  |
|  |  |
| Other | 0 |
| Full-time Tenured |  |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |
| Part-time |  |
| Total Headcount Faculty | 22 |
| Full-time Tenured | 22 |
| Full-time Non-tenured |  |
| Part-time |  |

**Please respond to the following questions.**

1. Reflecting on this year’s assessment(s), how does the evidence of student learning impact your faculty’s confidence in the program being reviewed; how does that analysis change when compared with previous assessment evidence?

*The process of this annual review is only a part of an overall process for accreditation. The assessment results presented here, in conjunction with other efforts in the department, give us confidence that the program and the quality assurance system put in place are functioning well. We are in a period of transition as we develop new measures for the claims we make about graduates. Although the results in this report are positive, we will feel more confidence with data collected from our new tools. Many changes have been made in the past two years and faculty are beginning to see a trend in systematic data collection. Additionally, since the measures are being created and piloted by department teams, there is greater investment in the outcomes.*

1. With whom did you share the results of the year’s assessment efforts?

*This year’s assessment efforts are not being shared publicly due to the changing nature of our measures. They were shared with the accreditation team that visited and conducted the audit November 11-13, 2014. They provided favorable feedback. We have not yet received the report from the visit, but feel confident that we are headed in the correct direction.*

1. Based on your program’s assessment findings, what subsequent action will your program take?

*We are continuing the development of our measures. We will also be working on establishing validity and reliability of these measures. When we have valid and reliable measures, we can have confidence they are accurately assessing the outcomes.*