

**STATEMENT OF STUDENT KNOWLEDGE OF THEIR ASSESSMENT
OUTCOMES FOR NCA**

SSE PROGRAM at INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Daniel A. Clark
Program Coordinator

Social Studies Education students at ISU come to understand their expected learning outcomes primarily during their various methods courses (SS 305/SS 306 and CIMT 301/302 and 400) and through consultation with the coordinator (again during these methods courses—SS 305/SS 306).

The primary assessment tools outside of their grades are 1) for content: content test (SS 305/306); Praxis II (post graduation) and 2) for pedagogy: lesson/unit plan (SS 305/306); student teaching evaluation (CIMT 401); and student teaching unit report (CIMT 400 or 401). Students know their expected learning outcomes for each of these assessments, and I would refer you to the Assessment Day Report of 2008 and the attached rubrics or assessment descriptions.

In all fairness, however, I think it important to note that students are not systematically presented with an overview of these assessments and the learning outcomes. They occur throughout the course of a student's academic career. Moreover, these assessments were derived as a plan more for a program assessment rather than a direct learning tool for students. In other words, as a package the assessments were intended to provide the coordinator, the SSE Board, and various stake-holders with a tool for measuring the health of the program.

[Back to Initial Form](#)

AGENDA

SSE ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

March 18, 2008

11:00AM

1. Introductions/Announcements
2. Priority Registration for Summer/Fall 08 begins March 31st
 - CIMT and BCP entry—reminder about process
3. (reminder on) Scheduling mandatory courses
4. Assessments Overview
 - Praxis II data (good—100% passing) (*see handout*)
 - Assessment Day and Dispositional Assessment Changes
 - TK20
5. Project PRE (partnering to reform education):
 - SS 305 pilot course this spring and SS 306—Alan Backlar
 - (*see handout on SS 305 Pilot*)
 - Report on Proposed CIMT changes to 301-302 (*see handout*)
 - Discuss Pilot and proposed CIMT changes
6. History 499 (and other “swing” courses)
7. Learning Community for Upcoming Fall
 - Econ 100 (Guell) & History 202 (Clark)
8. Teacher Recruitment Fair—April 18th (8:30-3:30)
9. Council of Academic Advisors (Dean’s Office update)
[nothing new to report]
 - Assessment of Advising
 - Checklist

[Back to Initial Form](#)

ASSESSMENT PLAN SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION

Indiana State University
[adopted in 2004, revised for clarity of presentation 2008]

Daniel A. Clark, Coordinator

[Back to Initial Form](#)

Assessment: Conceptual Framework

The Social Studies Education program at Indiana State University presents a demanding set of challenges for its majors. It is a demanding program owing to the fact that to be a social studies teacher one must become deeply knowledgeable not just of the content one will teach (in Indiana at least three of six content specialization areas), but also of the pedagogical ideals and methods one must employ in the classroom. As a program, then, we face the task of devising an assessment regime that, in short, first, tests whether or not they know the content and, second, whether or not through performance they can teach it. Collaborating with several departments and colleges, the SSE Program has successfully devised such an assessment regime, in a framework consistent with the College of Education's established *Becoming a Complete Professional* model of pre-service teacher development. Additionally, the SSE program relies on the assessment regimes and plans of contributing social science departments. Assessments for the SSE Program essentially fall into one of two categories: 1) Testing of Content Knowledge, and 2) Assessing Content Pedagogy (performance evidence). Through a range of assessments in these two categories, the Coordinator and the SSE Advisory Board can evaluate whether and/or how effectively the program is preparing our graduates. The SSE program since 1999 has collected exit interviews that are shared with the SSE board for an additional exit-level program review.

1. Testing Content Knowledge—Have they Learned It?

The program has been designed with three (3) key benchmarks in mind concerning the assessment of content knowledge. *First*, the Praxis I/PPST is used as a preliminary measure of competency in the area of basic studies: reading, writing, and math. Students must meet performance standards established by the ISU School of Education and IPSB. *Second*, "satisfactory performance" in all content courses is defined as academic performance at or above the letter grade of "C+" or an earned mean grade point average of 2.5 in all content licensure areas. This is tracked through DARS and monitored ultimately by the coordinator. *Third*, students must complete the Praxis II subject area tests and meet the guidelines for licensure prior to student teaching.

In addition to the benchmarks described above, SSE students take a practice Praxis II exam mapped to the IPSB content standards in all areas. Student are required to earn a “C+” or better in licensure areas and perform at a level sufficient to demonstrate rudimentary knowledge.

The key testing assessments providing regular and on-going evidence of SSE student preparation occurs at two critical points in the program (a mid point test and an exit test). First, students take a practice-Praxis II test in SS306, noted in the previous paragraph, designed to assess students in all content areas. Second, the students must complete the Praxis II prior to student teaching pursuant to the College of Educations Becoming a Complete Professional teaching education program. Data on these two tests are collected every year and, since 2006, presented at the Teacher Education Committee’s Annual Assessment Day, affording a yearly programmatic assessment.

- **SS306 Content Test**

Since the practice Praxis II exam is a unique assessment, it warrants further explanation in this plan. Students are required to complete a pre-Praxis II practice exam in SS306. Sample exams in all content areas are located in LiveText. The exams were created by content-area faculty and are mapped to the current IPSB standards for teachers. Students must meet a score 70% or higher in individual licensure areas and 70% across all areas overall. The test has been administered in a couple of different formats. From 2004-2007, the test was administered in two separate class sessions and following content area reviews delivered by content specialists. Part 1 (3 areas) reviews were delivered in 2 or 3 consecutive class sessions and the exam was delivered. Following Part 1, Part 2 reviews were delivered in 2 or 3 consecutive class sessions and the exam was delivered in the following session. Beginning in 2008, SS 306 students taking this practice exam were able to review and take separate subject portions of the exam at their own pace, since the exams were accessible through Blackboard. The content test was designed as a program assessment device and data are used by the SSE faculty, coordinator, & advisors to: (1) identify student weaknesses; (2) to develop effective student remediation for individual students (as appropriate); and (3) consider potential curricular changes.

2. Assessing Content Pedagogy —Can they teach it?

Content-related performances will be assessed at multiple sites within the program. *First*, the primary assessment site is SS305 and SS306. In 305 and/or 306, students will demonstrate vis-à-vis lesson plans and sample units that they have met the IPSB Standards for Teachers and/or properly documented IDOE 5-13 academic standards in an area of licensure (thereby demonstrating they meet teacher standards). The primary documentation system was LiveText

until 2008, when the COE transitioned to TK20. *Second*, students will demonstrate they meet performance based content standards vis-à-vis the student teaching unit report (detailed below). Data on the student teaching unit report and CIMT professional coursework are housed in CIMT. Since 2006 data on all of these assessments is collected and presented annually at the TEC's annual Assessment Day. This presentation is also made to the SSE Advisory Board, as part of our regular assessment review.

Field & Clinical Assessments

Currently, the classroom assessments are a component of the CIMT professional sequence known as *Becoming a Complete Professional*. CIMT faculty in 301, 302, 400, 400L, 401 and 402 have primary responsibility for classroom supervision and assessment. In addition to CIMT faculty, professionals (field supervisors, host teachers, and others) also provide important feedback and participate in the assessment process. In terms of SSE faculty involvement, the participation is structurally limited.

- ***Unit Reports***

That is, SSE faculty—*particularly the coordinator*—participate in the assessment of student unit reports in CIMT400L (when requested) and CIMT401/402. When possible, advisors with expertise in specific content areas participate in the student teaching unit report assessments. To that end, the SSE Coordinator and others participate in the established unit report assessment process that includes a well defined set of rubrics designed to identify proficient, satisfactory, & unsatisfactory work. These reports are assessed based on the ability of students to deliver content in at-least one area of licensure.

- ***Student Teaching***

SSE students participate in a 16-week placement with 8 weeks at both the middle and high school levels. Students are placed in classrooms with teaching responsibilities in at-least two of the three areas of licensure. Mentor teachers, student teacher supervisors, and CIMT faculty assess both content and pedagogy as part of the on-going assessment process and on-site visits. Mentor teachers have been trained by the College of Education professionals and have the capacity to identify content-pedagogy deficiencies and to assess overall content preparation.

NETS (technology proficiency)

As part of PT3, an assessment regime was developed to document the ISTE NETS general and professional performance profiles. The general profile is addressed as part of the GenEd2000 program and the course CIMT272 (or its equivalent). The professional profile is addressed primarily in the CIMT sequence. SS305 and SS306 do address

content-specific profiles components. Additional artifacts pertaining to ISTE NETS proficiency are included in LiveText.

In addition to LiveText efforts, the SSE program has developed an on-line archive that demonstrates on-going efforts within the content courses—as well as the content methods courses to infuse technology into the pre-service training and the k-12 classroom. The digital artifact archive is located at the SSE website and includes examples complex examples from geography that demonstrates the ability of students to acquire, authenticate, manipulate, classify, and present data using information technology and basic office productivity software. Other examples include the identification and utilization of IT as part of the 305 & 306 curriculum.

C. Assessment Resources Outside of SSE

Departmental Undergraduate Outcomes Assessment Plans

All college units and undergraduate major programs—including SSE—have undergraduate assessment plans. These plans and related assessment data are located in individual units. The SSE assessment plan emphasizes the collection of external data as well as a student exit surveys. The objective of the survey is to identify program weaknesses and strengths from the student perspective. As a result of the exit interviews, the undergraduate advising plan has been revised and the advisors have participated in individual and group “training”.

External Assessment Data

In Appendix C, data are presented that have been obtained from ISU Office of Strategic Planning and Institutional Research and Effectiveness and the School of Education’s Education Student Services. The data presents a range of key benchmark data including the pass rates of SSE students on the Praxis exams, student demographics, G.P.A. and a range of other intra-institutional measurements. In nearly all cases, SSE students out perform their peers across the college, university, and state. For example, SSE students who complete the Praxis II specialty tests regularly out perform their peers.

In the area of diversity education, all ISU student complete at-least two courses in multi-cultural studies and one of the courses must be EPSY341. EPSY341 has been designed for secondary education majors and meets the US diversity requirement in the general education program. Additionally, all ISU students complete a second international diversity course, often GEOG130 World Geography.

In closing, the SSE Advisory committee recognizes that in order for student to effectively teach content expertise must be achieved. As such, satisfactory completion of and performance during early field experiences and other placements as part of the CIMT professional sequence demonstrates an ability to deliver content in the classroom. As such, student performance is assessed as based on testing, programmatic, and performance criteria.

LiveText Artifacts

In 2004, SSE faculty began to participate in the ISU College of Arts & Sciences & College of Education LiveText initiative. As part of this initiative, an on-line artifact archive has been created that includes assessments and rubrics for pedagogy centered IPSB Standards 6, 10, 11, 12 & 13. These artifacts also demonstrate content knowledge and the ISTE NETS standards. The goal of the LiveText archive is to identify 5 work samples at each performance level based on the rubric/assessment for each standard. As such, each standard project will have at-least 15 work samples.

Projects with student work samples have been created by the SSE coordinator in LiveText for IPSB Standards 6 and 10-13 to document the performance-based assessment process. Each project file has been shared with the College of Education's NCATE Coordinator, SSE content methods faculty, and the College of Arts & Science's Dean's Office. The projects include samples of Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable student artifacts. The student artifact projects include the assessments used.

D. Exit Interviews

In the Spring of 1999, the SSE program implemented an exit interview for majors following graduations. The survey was created in response to a previous program review that identified concerns with undergraduate advising and the social science content methods courses. The survey is sent to all SSE graduates 4-6 weeks following graduations. The survey consists of 9

questions. Questions 1-2 are demographic and as the return rate is often less than 5—the demographic data has not been reported for privacy reasons. However, questions 3-9 deal explicitly with programmatic issues. The data are presented in Appendix F.

ASSESSMENT DAY REPORT

FOR

SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION PROGRAM

2008

[Back to Initial Form](#)

Submitted by

Daniel A. Clark

Program Coordinator

INTRODUCTION TO 2008 REPORT

Since this report is intended in part to help programs prepare for the Indiana State review and, thus, must be submitted conforming to certain organizational expectations, I have organized this report to conform to “Document 2” of the Indiana Program Review Protocol.

The report is broken down into the following sections:

- A. Content Curriculum
- B. CONTENT Standards Matrix
- C. Assessment Data Matrix
 - Attachments for the Data Matrix
- D. Faculty

A. Content Curriculum

The following is the Advising Sheet for the Social Studies Education Program (SSE). It contains an imbedded link to our SSE website, from which the on line version of this advising sheet and links to the course catalog descriptions of our SSE, CIMT, and affiliated departments courses may be found.

Social Studies Advising Sheet

Social Science Education Advising Basics*

The Social Science Education program is an inter-disciplinary program and a component of the “Becoming A Complete Professional” (BCP) teacher education program at Indiana State University. The content and content methods courses define the SSE major. The BCP teacher education program is housed in the College of Education. SSE Website <http://www1.indstate.edu/ssed/>

Professional Education Sequence

The professional education sequence is administered by the College of Education's (CoE) Department of Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology (CIMT). The courses and their chronological sequence are presented below. As soon as possible, students are **strongly** advised to successfully complete both the Praxis I/PPST and Praxis II exams. Praxis I/PPST and ESPY202 must be completed prior to enrolling in CIMT courses. Additionally, students must apply for and meet all standards for admission and continued enrollment in the CoE's BCP. These requirements include: (1) earning a “C” or better in all prerequisite courses, (2) completing the Praxis I/PPST and Praxis II exams, (3) obtaining a minimum GPA of 2.5, (4) submitting a criminal background check, and (2) requesting a recommendation from your advisor. Students must meet these requirements to proceed through the BCP's phases, please refer to Education Student Services (ESS) or CIMT for more specific information including required test scores, prerequisites, and course 'blocking'. Please note students are **solely** responsible for meeting CoE deadlines and guidelines associated with the BCP.

EPSY 202 Psychology of Childhood & Adolescence - 3 hrs

SPED 226 Exceptional Learning in the Classroom - 3 hrs

CIMT 301 Teaching I - 3 hrs
CIMT 302 Teaching II - 3 hrs
CIMT 400 Teaching III - 3 hrs
CIMT 400L Teaching III Laboratory - 1 hr
CIMT 401 Student Teaching - 11 hrs
CIMT 402 Teaching an Integrated Unit (or equivalent) - 1 hr

Multicultural Education Course

EPSY 341 or equivalent multicultural education course
(see CIMT for list of other acceptable courses) - 3 hours

Suggested IT-Literacy Course

CIMT 272 – 3 Hours

Social Science Education Methods Courses

All SSE majors must complete both 305 and 306. These courses are taught during the spring semester only.

SSE 305 Teaching Social Studies in Secondary Schools - 3 hours
SSE 306 Interdisciplinary Perspectives in Teaching Social Studies – 3 hours

Content Area Curriculum

All students must complete 3 content areas and specific coursework across all social science categories outside of their 3 areas of specialization. All content area specializations require 15 hours of coursework (except for history). History specializations require 24 credit hours. In some cases, a maximum of 1 specified shared course may be counted towards 2 content specializations (please see coordinator for a list of these courses). A maximum of 1 shared course is allowable per content area and no shared course can be counted in more than 2-areas. Students must earn a “C” or better in **all** content courses and have a 2.5 GPA or better in the major and overall.

Content Area Specialization Sequences

Social Science Education majors must complete the course sequences outlined below for at-least 3 content areas.

Economics (ECON)

200 – 3 hrs
201 – 3 hrs
362 – 3 hrs
2 Restricted Electives – 6 hrs
Select from 321, 331, 341, 344, 351 or shared course

Geography (GEOG)

110 – 3 hrs
111 – 3 hrs
115 – 3 hrs
213 – 3 hrs
Elective in GEOG or shared course– 3 hrs

051104

Government (PSCI)

201 – 3 hrs
305 – 3 hrs
280 or 370 – 3 hrs
400-level Directed Elective – 3 hrs
Open Elective or Shared Course – 3 hrs

History (HIST)

101 – 3 hrs
102 – 3 hrs
201 – 3 hrs
202 – 3 hrs
400-level directed elective US – 3 hrs
400-level directed elective World – 3 hrs
400-level directed elective Europe – 3 hrs
Open Elective or Shared Course – 3 hrs

Psychology (PSY)

101 – 3 hrs
201 – 3 hrs
344 – 3 hrs
362 – 3 hrs
Open Elective or Shared Course – 3 hrs

Sociology (SOC)

280 – 4 hrs
220 – 3 hrs
390 – 3 hrs
499 Senior Seminar – 2 hrs
Open Elective or Shared Course – 3 hrs

Required Courses Non-Specializing Areas

In areas outside of your defined content specialization, students must complete the required courses listed

below. For example, economics, geography, and history specialists would then be required to complete the

requirements for psychology, sociology, and government.

Economics ECON100 or ECON200 (effective 2005)

Geography GEOG110 or GEOG213 or GEOG130 (effective 2005)

Government PSCI201

Psychology PSY101

Sociology SOC100 or SOC110 or SOC220 or SOC240

History HIST102 **AND** HIST202

For more information, please contact the Social Science Education Center, the SSE program coordinator, or a content area specialist.

B. CONTENT Standards Matrix

SSE Assessment Matrix for IPSB Content Standards and INTASC Professional Teacher Standards

| | History: US | History: World | Economics | Geography | Government | Psychology | Sociology | 305 | 306 | CIMT 400/400L | CIMT 401/402 |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|------|--------|---------------|--------------|
| IPSB SS1 | | | | | * | | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS2 | * | * | | | | | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS3 | | | | * | | | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS4 | | | | | * | | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS5 | | | * | | | | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS6 | | | | * | * | | | * | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS7 | | | | | | * | | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS8 | | | | | | | * | | * 1 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS9 | * | * | | | | | | *4,6 | *1,4,6 | *4,6,7# | *4,6,7# |
| IPSB SS10 | | | | | | | | *4,6 | *4,6 | *4,6,7 | *4,6,7 |
| IPSB SS11 | | | | | | | | *4,6 | *4,6 | *4,6,7 | *4,6,7 |
| IPSB SS12 | | | | | | | | *4,6 | *4,6 | *4,6,7 | *4,6,7 |
| IPSB SS13 | | | | | | | | *4,6 | *4,6 | *4,6,7 | *4,6,7 |
| INTASC 1-10 | * | * | * | * | * | * | * | *4,6 | *4,6 | *4,6,7 | *7 |

* = teacher standard addressed

Performance Assessment Examples: (1) test, (2) paper, (3) project, (4) portfolio artifact, (5) labs, (6) lesson plan, (7) teaching evaluation, (8) other: Content course syllabi have been examined to verify that relevant content is assessed by test (1), paper (2), or project (3). These outcomes are then met by student attainment of a 2.5 GPA or greater in their licensure areas. # = Content knowledge in a student's appropriate licensure areas is assessed in CIMT 400/400L and 401/402 EFEs and student teaching respectively, via the noted assessment tools.

Content knowledge is addressed, though not formally assessed, through the required course sequences that students take in their chosen licensure areas. Please refer to our advising basics curriculum sheet for these a listing of these courses. Their content licensure area knowledge is assessed in the courses specified above, most specifically through the content test (a practice Praxis II) taken in SS 306. Although not reflected in this matrix, students' must maintain a 2.5 gpa in all of their program courses and licensure areas. This is tracked by the College of Education, the College of Arts and Sciences, the program coordinator and the academic advisors.

[Back to Initial Form](#)

C. Assessment Data Matrix

Social Studies Education Assessment Data Matrix 2008

| Element Assessed | Describe the Assessment Activity | When is it Assessed? | Title of the Instrument or Rubric (attach copies) | Aggregated summary data for last 3 years | Remediation | Content Standards Addressed by Assessment Activity |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates | 1. Praxis II | Prior to Graduation and/or within state guidelines | Praxis II Results | Pass Rate=100% N=61 [See Attachment #1] | | IPSB Standards 1-9 |
| | 2. Content Test by Licensure Area | Junior Year in SS 306 | SS 306 Content Test (Practice Praxis II) | Pass Rate=100% N=74 [See Attachment #2 for Content Test Results] | Students rated unsatisfactory are advised by the program coordinator and retake the exam until passed | IPSB Standards 1-9 |
| Professional & Pedagogical Knowledge and skills for Teacher Knowledge | Lesson Plan and Unit Performance Assessment | Junior year in SS 305/306 | 305/306 Livetext Lesson Plan Rubric [See Attachment #3] | [See Attachments #4 & #5 for Aggregated 2006-07 and for report on 2008, respectively] | Through feedback with Instructor and Program Coordinator | IPSB Standards 6, 10-13* |
| | Student Teaching | Spring Senior Year | Final Evaluation Supervised | See Attachment #6 for 2006- | Through feedback with Education | INTASC Standards 1-10 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| | | (typically) in CIMT 401/402 | Teaching Experience | 07 | Student Services | |
| Student Learning for Teacher Candidates | Unit Report | Fall or Spring of Senior Year in either CIMT 400/L and/or CIMT 401/402 | Unit Report Rubric [See Attachment #7] | See Attachment #8 for 2006-07 and 2007-08 | Through feedback with CIMT and SS Methods faculty (the program coordinator) | IPSB Standards 10-13 INTASC Standards 1-9 |

* = Content Standards 1-9 may also be addressed and assessed as appropriate to the teacher candidates licensure areas



| |
|--------------------------------------|
| Back to Initial Form |
|--------------------------------------|

Attachments for the Assessment Data Matrix

Attachment #1

Social Studies Education Majors at ISU

Praxis II Data for Assessment Day 2008

| 2004- 05 # Tested | # Pass | ISU Pass Rt. | State Pass Rt. | 2005- 06 # Tested | # Pass | ISU Pass Rt. | State Pass Rt. | 2006- 07 # Tested | # Pass | ISU Pass Rt. | State Pass Rt. |
|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 29 | 29 | 100% | 99% | 12 | 12 | 100% | 99% | 20 | 20 | 100% | 99% |

[Back to Matrix](#)

Attachment #2

**SSE CONTENT TEST DATA
("Practice Praxis II")**

Assessment Day Report 2008

All SSE students take a "practice Praxis II" test in their SS 306 methods course. This assessment gauges how well students have mastered the basic concepts and knowledge of the six content areas of the Social Studies curriculum in Indiana. They take a series of six tests, one for each of the six areas. These tests vary in length and have been prepared by faculty members of the six relevant departments who deliver introductory/survey-level courses in the six licensure areas. Students must achieve a 70% or better in the areas in which they will be licensed to teach (usually three), and they must also attain an overall 70% average for all of the tests combined (so a cumulative 70% over all the areas). In those cases where students fail to meet that threshold after their initial attempts, they are required to retake the exams with remediation from instructors as necessary until they pass. So, overall as an assessment tool we achieve a 100% "Meets" rate on this assessment (no "Exceeds" are calculated). For purposes of program assessment we collect and report on the rates of initial passage (first attempt success rate) for each of the content tests. D=Does Not Meet; M=Meets

| | 2006 | | | 2007 | | | 2008 | | |
|------------|------|----|-------|------|----|-------|------|----|-------|
| | D | M | Total | D | M | Total | D | M | Total |
| Economics | 2 | 30 | 32 | 6 | 18 | 24 | 3 | 15 | 18 |
| Geography | 18 | 14 | 32 | 11 | 13 | 24 | 11 | 7 | 18 |
| History | 3 | 29 | 32 | 18 | 6 | 24 | 8 | 10 | 18 |
| Government | 2 | 30 | 32 | 3 | 21 | 24 | 0 | 18 | 18 |
| Psychology | 10 | 22 | 32 | 13 | 9 | 24 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| Sociology | 12 | 20 | 32 | 16 | 8 | 24 | 12 | 6 | 18 |

In 2008, we began offering these content tests via the class Blackboard site. During the transition to this electronic format, some of the test questions on the Sociology test were incorrectly coded. Overall, though, the higher initial failure ("Does Not Meet") rates in both Psychology and Sociology may be attributed to the fact that these are two of the least popular choices for subject area specialization owing to the states curricular requirements (they are electives rather than core classes), thus students are required to take only one course in each subject if not specializing in that area.

Analysis: All of the trends seem consistent with the exception of the History portion, which students initially performed well on in 2006, yet dismally in 2007, with a recovery of sorts in 2008. This warrants further monitoring, and may just be an anomaly. I should add that one of the key reasons for this assessment, aside from a snapshot gauge of basic student knowledge in these content areas, is to help prepare them for the actual Praxis II with a little "shock" therapy.

[Back to Matrix](#)

Attachment #3

SS305/306 LESSON PLAN & UNIT ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

by Daniel A. Clark

Assessment

Context

This assessment will be used to assess students in SS305/306. The assessment is linked to IPSB standards for teachers. As students are required to use basic information technologies and the assessed materials may include technology components, students are (where appropriate) assessed for ISTE NETS within the context of IPSB SS10. Successful deployment and integration of outside electronic resources that support the content pedagogy demonstrate ISTE competency.

Purpose

The purpose of this assessment is to demonstrate that students meet IPSB standards for Social Studies Teachers.

Assessor

Students will be assessed by the instructor of SS305 and SS306

Performance Assessment

| | Performance Assessment | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Not Assessed or Applicable |
| Content Pedgogy Standards as appropriate to individual licensure. | An ability to deliver accurate and engaging content in a licensure area (economics, geography, government, history, psychology, or sociology) using a variety of delivery | The delivery of accurate content using a single delivery method (i.e., lecture, group work, etc..) in a licensure area. The content is delivered in a logical | Unacceptable performance is evidenced by a inaccurate content and an inability to convey content coherently in a logical fashion appropriate | not assessed for this artifact |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | methods. The content is delivered in a logical sequence and objectives are clear. | sequence and objectives are clear. | to the content area. |
| IPSB SS6 Current Events IN-T-DEV- SS.6 IN-T- DEV-SS.6.K1 | Exceptional performance is evidenced by the integration of current events into a content lecture or structured discussion. Additionally, the student teacher makes clear and evident linkages to the content at multiple scales and provides multiple examples. | Acceptable performance is evidenced by Targeted performance is evidenced by the integration of current events into a content lecture or structured discussion for the purposes of illustrating key concepts. | Unacceptable performance is evidenced by a failure to integrate relevant and topical current events. |
| IPSB SS10 Resources IN-IPSB-T- CONTENT - SS.10 | Targeted performance is evidenced by the integration of a variety of outside resources from multiple media sources. Additionally, content delivered using technology and technology-based resources are used effectively. Appropriate classroom technologies are also used by the students. | Acceptable performance is evidenced by the integration of a variety of outside resources from multiple media sources. Student may integrate technology. | Unacceptable performance is evidenced by minimal integration of outside resources by the student and/or inappropriate use of technology given the instructor or student skill sets |
| IPSB SS11 | Teacher clearly | Acceptable | Unacceptable not |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--------------------------------|
| Learning Environment IN-IPSB-T-CONTENT - SS.11 | defines the parameters of the environment and provides a rationale for the range of delivery methods used. Teacher will create lesson plans that articulate a rationale for using multiple modes of delivery. The student will design lessons that engage multiple learning methods and specifically encourage student participation vis-a-vis multiple modes including technology | performance is evidenced by lesson plans and experiences that clearly articulate and define the parameters of the student/pupil's learning environment. That is, the teacher recognizes how the environment influences lesson delivery. | performance is evidenced by a lack of attention paid to broad environmental issues and/or concern for multiple learning methods. | assessed for this artifact |
| IPSB SS12 Assessments IN-IPSB-T-CONTENT - SS.12 | Teacher includes multiple formal and informal assessments such as in-class discussion, Q&A, boardwork, and the like. These assessments include concrete feedback to the students. The informal assessments have been designed to account for multiple learning styles. Targeted performance is | Acceptable performance is evidenced by teachers providing formal and informal feedback and span more than one type (i.e., group work, Q&A, etc..). Acceptable performance is also evidenced by a balanced use of both formal and | Unacceptable performance is evidenced by a lack of informal assessment opportunities and/or feedback relating to these assessments. Unacceptable performance is also evidenced by a lack of diversified informal and formal | not assessed for this artifact |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--------------------------------|
| | also evidenced by a balanced use of both formal and informal mechanisms. | informal mechanisms. | assessments and/or an over reliance on a single approach. | |
| IPSB SS13 Reflection IN-IPSB-T-CONTENT - SS.13 | Student is able to identify multiple areas of improvement (i.e., their training, new materials, and refinement of current lesson/unit plans). Student links classroom to current real world experiences and current/emerging professional practices. Student integrates new materials into their learning environment. Students demonstrate a capacity to reflect on their practice. Student emphasizes the significance of change. | Student reflections identify concrete improvements to be made. Students are able to identify specific new materials and methods that will improve student learning. | Students demonstrate a basic capacity to reflect on their practice -but do not demonstrate an ability to integrate into their lessons and/or alter learning environments . | not assessed for this artifact |

Standards

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| IN-IPSB-T-CONTENT.SS.1 | STANDARD: Teachers of Social Studies understand the ideals, principles, and practices of citizenship in a democratic republic and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students. |
| IN-IPSB-T-CONTENT.SS.2 | STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand the way human beings view themselves in and |

over time and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.3

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand the nature and distribution of Earth's people, places, and environments and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students. Natural and human resources affect how people interact with their environment and each other.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.4

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand how people create and change structures of power, authority, and governance and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.5

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand why and how people organize for the production, exchange, and consumption of goods and services and can use this knowledge to create meaningful experiences for students.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.7

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand individual development and identity and can use this knowledge to create learning experiences designed to promote student growth and reflection.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.8

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand interaction among individuals, groups, and institutions and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.9

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand culture and cultural diversity and can use this knowledge to create meaningful learning experiences for students.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.10

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand the value of using high quality instructional resources, including technology, in teaching.

IN-IPSB-T-
CONTENT.SS.11

STANDARD: Teachers of social studies create and develop a dynamic learning environment that is characterized by positive, productive, and healthy interactions. The learning environment is supportive, congenial, and purposeful. Students are intellectually challenged and encouraged to learn and grow.

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| IN-IPSB-T- CONTENT.SS.12 | STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand and use both formal and informal assessment methods to obtain useful information about student learning and development. |
| IN-IPSB-T- CONTENT.SS.13 | STANDARD: Teachers of social studies reflect on their practice, on students' performance, and on developments in the field to continue their own growth as teachers. |
| IN-T-DEV.SS.6 | STANDARD: Teachers of social studies understand global connections and interdependence and can create meaningful learning experiences for students. |
| IN-T- DEV.SS.6.K1 | K: understand the interdisciplinary nature of social studies and know how to make connections using current events. |
| NETS-T.1 | STANDARD: Technology Operations and Concepts. Teachers demonstrate a sound understanding of technology operations and concepts. Teachers: |
| NETS-T.2 | STANDARD: Planning and Designing Learning Environments and Experiences. Teachers plan and design effective learning environments and experiences supported by technology. Teachers: |
| NETS-T.3 | STANDARD: Teaching, Learning, and the Curriculum. Teachers implement curriculum plans, that include methods and strategies that apply technology to maximize student learning. Teachers: |
| NETS-T.6 | STANDARD: Social, Ethical, Legal, and Human Issues. Teachers understand the social, ethical, legal, and human issues surrounding the use of technology in PreK-12 schools and apply those principles in practice. Teachers: |

[Back to Matrix](#)

Attachment #4

SSE ASSESSMENT DAY DATA

TWO YEAR AGGREGATED—LESSON PLAN

ASSESSMENTS

FOR

PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE, 2006-2007

Prior to Spring 2008, the SSE program assessed our candidates pedagogical content knowledge through a lesson plan composed and presented in SS 306. In Spring 2008, the program coordinator chose to assess an entire unit presented in SS 305. Partially due to the lessons of previous Assessment Days and reflection on exactly what we as a program want this particular assessment to measure, the program coordinator came to believe that the unit (consisting of several lesson plans and assessments) was the more appropriate and constructive format for evaluating the full range of a student's abilities relative to the standards and particularly with regard to a meaningful inclusion of current events and a varied number of assessments. And while reflection could have been mandated on a single lesson plan, it is required in the unit assignment in SS 305. The venue for assessing the unit may change in the near future as one of the methods courses becomes directly aligned with CIMT 400/L and the unit-level extended teaching experience there (piloted in Spring 2008—another reason for the switch), although from now on there will be a unit assignment in both SS 305 and SS 306, either one being appropriate for this assessment.

This switch to assessing an entire unit, however, does render aggregating the assessment data with previous years near impossible, especially since the College LiveText platform assessed documents rather than students, while the spring 2008 unit assessment tracked students. The table below presents two years of aggregated data from 2006 and 2007, when lesson plans were assessed. The table reflects what an imperfect assessment tool this was, particularly with regard to the "Reflection" standard. Since these assessment pieces are so different, I have elected not to try to merge them and instead have chosen to display the 2006-07 data separately from the 2008 data, presented on a separate sheet.

Note that I have altered the ratings for this presentation to reflect the Exceeds, Meets, and Does Not Meet, ratings. The hard copy summary of the actual 2006-2007 reports indicates that the instructor used the terms Target, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory for those reports.

Aggregated Data for 2006-2007 Performance Assessment for SSE Pedagogical Content Knowledge (the first number=number of documents at that rating; the number in parenthesis presents the percentage of the total for that standard)

| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Not Assessed | Total |
|-------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Content Pedagogy | 38 (23%) | 127 (76%) | 0 | 1 (1%) | 166 |
| IPSB SS 6 Current | 13 (8%) | 60 (37%) | 3 (2%) | 85 (53%) | 161 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----|
| Events | | | | | |
| IPSB SS 10 Resources | 33 (20%) | 125 (75%) | 5 (3%) | 3 (2%) | 166 |
| IPSB SS 11 Learning Environment | 31 (19%) | 111 (67%) | 19 (11%) | 5 (3%) | 166 |
| IPSB SS 12 Assessments | 23 (14%) | 91 (56%) | 15 (9%) | 35 (21%) | 164 |
| IPSB SS 13 Reflection | 3 (2%) | 31 (16%) | 3 (2%) | 146 (80%) | 166 |

ANALYSIS & CONCLUSIONS

As previously stated, Assessment Day and the imperfect assessment the single lesson plan afforded (as reflected in this aggregated data), prompted the program coordinator to begin assessing an entire unit (at present) in SS 305. One can see that several standards have an unacceptable level of “not assessed”, which in this case mainly reflects that the single lesson plans chosen for assessment were not broad enough in their topical coverage to afford meaningful engagement of such standards by the student. This switch to assessing an entire unit, coupled with the College of Educations switch from College LiveText to TK20, will also allow the program to more easily assess and track students rather than just there “documents”. Rest assured, however, that in the past instructors and the program coordinators clearly identified and remediated students performing below expectations.

[Back to Matrix](#)

Attachment #5

**SS 305/306 LESSON AND UNIT ASSESSMENT OF PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT
KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHERS**

**COHORT PROGRAM DATA
SOCIAL STUDIES EDUCATION
INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY
SPRING 2008**

This table presents an overview of the ISU Social Studies Education Program (SSE) midpoint program assessment of its students. This assessment piece gauges students' content pedagogy ability—i.e. their ability to communicate clear and accurate content through their understanding of classroom methodology particular to the social studies. For the first time, the student artifact for this assessment was an entire unit, rather than a single lesson plan as in the past. The coordinator judged that assessing an entire unit allows for a much stronger gauge of the student's range of abilities. Please see the accompanying rubric for clarification on assessment expectations with regard to the ratings Exceeds, Meets, Does Not Meet and Not Assessed.

A total of 19 students were assessed. The first numeral reflects the actual number out of the 19 achieving that particular rating, followed by the percentage of the cohort this represents in parentheses.

| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Not Assessed or Not Applicable | Total N=19 |
|---|----------|----------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|
| Content Pedagogy | 10 (53%) | 9 (47%) | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| IPSB SS 6 Current Events * | 3 (16%) | 10 (53%) | 0 | 6 (31%) | 19 |
| IPSB SS 10 Resources | 9 (47%) | 9 (47%) | 1 (6%) | 0 | 19 |
| IPSB SS 11 Learning # Environment | 2 (11%) | 15 (78%) | 2 (11%) | 0 | 19 |
| IPSB SS 12 Assessments | 8 (42%) | 11 (58%) | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| IPSB SS 13 Reflection | 4 (21%) | 10 (53%) | 5 (26%) | 0 | 19 |

* Integrating current events was not made an explicit expectation for the assessed assignment. This reflects the oversight of the instructor. Many met or exceeded this expectation anyway, but several students whose units focused on historical topics made no direct efforts in this direction, again through no fault of their

own. The SSE Coordinator will monitor later program assessments of these students to ensure their performance meets this standard. In the future this expectation will be made more plain.

Integrating a discussion of the learning environment was not an explicit expectation for this assessed assignment, again due to the instructor's oversight. The unit and lesson rationale statements of most students did satisfy this expectation, however.

CONCLUSION AND REMEDIATION: Overall, the performance of this cohort was quite strong, particularly in the key areas of content pedagogy, resources, and assessments. Reflection was a stated requirement in this assignment, and that a quarter of students failed to see the necessity of complying constitutes a disappointment. Impressing the necessity of thoughtful reflection as a standard aspect of teacher development, will be stressed in future assessments and assignments in the program. The SSE Coordinator will communicate any deficiencies and discuss necessary remediation with the students. Future program assessments will be monitored for compliance.

[Back to Matrix](#)

[Back to Initial Form](#)

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|------|----|------|---|-----|---|-----|------|
| 2.1 | Uses understanding of human development | 42 | 71.2 | 16 | 27.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.72 |
| 2.2 | Builds on students' knowledge and experiences | 50 | 84.7 | 9 | 15.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.85 |
| 3. Attention to Student Diversity | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Uses strategies which recognize learner differences | 55 | 93.2 | 4 | 6.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.93 |
| 3.2 | Uses knowledge of student backgrounds | 46 | 78.0 | 9 | 15.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 6.8 | 2.84 |
| 3.3 | Shows respect for and belief in individual students | 57 | 96.6 | 2 | 3.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.97 |
| 4. Use of Suitable Instructional Strategies | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Uses varied instructional strategies | 57 | 96.6 | 2 | 3.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.97 |
| 4.2 | Creates active learning opportunities | 52 | 88.1 | 7 | 11.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.88 |
| 4.3 | Encourages high order thinking | 49 | 83.1 | 10 | 16.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.83 |
| 4.4 | Uses instructional technology effectively | 51 | 86.4 | 8 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.86 |
| 5. Maintenance of Supportive Learning Environment | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Encourages student responsibility for learning | 53 | 89.8 | 6 | 10.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.90 |
| 5.2 | Encourages positive social interactions | 54 | 91.5 | 3 | 5.1 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 3.4 | 2.95 |
| 5.3 | Encourages productive participation by all students | 55 | 93.2 | 3 | 5.1 | 1 | 1.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.92 |
| 5.4 | Responds effectively to student misbehavior | 43 | 72.9 | 16 | 27.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.73 |
| 6. Use of Effective Communication Techniques | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 | Uses appropriate and sensitive language | 55 | 93.2 | 4 | 6.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.93 |
| 6.2 | Conveys content with varied techniques | 52 | 88.1 | 7 | 11.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.88 |
| 6.3 | Uses appropriate voice qualities | 48 | 81.4 | 11 | 18.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.81 |
| 6.4 | Stimulates appropriate communication by students | 53 | 89.8 | 5 | 8.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.91 |
| 7. Planning of Instruction | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 | Bases plans on student needs and curriculum goals | 53 | 89.8 | 6 | 10.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.90 |
| 7.2 | Adjusts plans based on effectiveness of instruction | 51 | 86.8 | 8 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.86 |
| 8. Assessment of Learners | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 | Uses a variety of assessment procedures | 51 | 86.4 | 8 | 13.6 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.86 |
| 8.2 | Maintains useful records of | 54 | 91.5 | 5 | 8.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.92 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------|------|------|------|---|-----|----|------|------|
| student performance | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.3 Encourages self-assessment by students | 43 | 72.9 | 15 | 25.4 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.74 |
| 9. Potential for Growth as a Professional | | | | | | | | | |
| 9.1 Reflects on the effects of instructional decisions | 52 | 88.1 | 6 | 10.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.90 |
| 9.2 Refines instruction based on learning outcomes | 51.8 | 8 | 13.6 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.86 |
| 9.3 Seeks feedback from other professionals | 47 | 79.7 | 9 | 15.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 5.1 | 2.84 |
| 9.4 Demonstrates commitment to the profession | 53 | 89.8 | 5 | 8.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.91 |
| 10. Involvement Beyond the Classroom | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.1 Interacts productively with parents and guardians | 38 | 64.4 | 6 | 10.2 | 0 | 0.0 | 15 | 25.4 | 2.86 |
| 10.2 Interacts productively with other professionals | 52 | 88.1 | 5 | 8.5 | 1 | 1.7 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.88 |
| 10.3 Demonstrates concern for students as people | 54 | 91.5 | 5 | 8.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2.92 |
| 10.4 Participates in school activities beyond classroom | 46 | 78.0 | 7 | 11.9 | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 10.2 | 2.87 |
| Summary Evaluation | 54 | 91.5 | 4 | 6.8 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 1.7 | 2.93 |

FALL 2007 & SPRING 2008 (22 SSE students evaluated)

Final Evaluation of Supervised Teaching Experiences: Social Science Education
(Fall 2007; Spring 2008; N = 83 evaluation forms)

| | E <i>f</i> | E % | M <i>f</i> | M % | D <i>f</i> | D % | NB <i>f</i> | NB % | Mean |
|---|---------------|--------|---------------|--------|---------------|--------|----------------|---------|------|
| 1. Command of Subject Matter | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 Displays understanding of subject matter | 69 | 83.1 | 13 | 15.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.84 |
| 1.2 Explains content effectively | 62 | 74.7 | 21 | 25.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.74 |
| 1.3 Shows enthusiasm for the subject matter | 68 | 81.9 | 14 | 16.9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.83 |
| 1.4 Conveys multiple perspectives toward content | 60 | 72.3 | 21 | 25.3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2.74 |
| 1.5 Engages students in testing hypotheses | 31 | 37.3 | 43 | 51.8 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10.8 | 2.42 |
| 2. Understanding of Development and Learning | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 Uses understanding of human development | 44 | 53.0 | 37 | 44.6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2.54 |
| 2.2 Builds on students' knowledge | 56 | 67.5 | 25 | 30.1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2.69 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----|------|----|------|---|---|---|-----|------|
| and experiences | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Attention to Student Diversity | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 Uses strategies which recognize learner differences | 54 | 65.1 | 28 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.66 |
| 3.2 Uses knowledge of student backgrounds | 44 | 53.0 | 32 | 38.6 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8.4 | 2.58 |
| 3.3 Shows respect for and belief in individual students | 68 | 81.9 | 15 | 18.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.82 |
| 4. Use of Suitable Instructional Strategies | | | | | | | | | |
| 4.1 Uses varied instructional strategies | 68 | 81.9 | 15 | 18.1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.82 |
| 4.2 Creates active learning opportunities | 65 | 78.3 | 17 | 20.5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.79 |
| 4.3 Encourages high order thinking | 50 | 60.2 | 32 | 38.6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.61 |
| 4.4 Uses instructional technology effectively | 62 | 74.7 | 21 | 25.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.74 |
| 5. Maintenance of Supportive Learning Environment | | | | | | | | | |
| 5.1 Encourages student responsibility for learning | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.77 |
| 5.2 Encourages positive social interactions | 62 | 74.7 | 20 | 24.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.76 |
| 5.3 Encourages productive participation by all students | 69 | 83.1 | 13 | 15.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.84 |
| 5.4 Responds effectively to student misbehavior | 49 | 59.0 | 34 | 41.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.59 |
| 6. Use of Effective Communication Techniques | | | | | | | | | |
| 6.1 Uses appropriate and sensitive language | 58 | 69.9 | 24 | 28.9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.71 |
| 6.2 Conveys content with varied techniques | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.77 |
| 6.3 Uses appropriate voice qualities | 52 | 62.7 | 30 | 36.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.63 |
| 6.4 Stimulates appropriate communication by students | 60 | 72.3 | 23 | 27.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.72 |
| 7. Planning of Instruction | | | | | | | | | |
| 7.1 Bases plans on student needs and curriculum goals | 66 | 79.5 | 17 | 20.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.80 |
| 7.2 Adjusts plans based on effectiveness of instruction | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.77 |
| 8. Assessment of Learners | | | | | | | | | |
| 8.1 Uses a variety of assessment procedures | 54 | 65.1 | 28 | 33.7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.66 |
| 8.2 Maintains useful records of student performance | 61 | 73.5 | 22 | 26.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.73 |
| 8.3 Encourages self-assessment by students | 39 | 47.0 | 43 | 51.8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.48 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----|------|----|------|---|---|----|------|------|
| 9. Potential for Growth as a Professional | | | | | | | | | |
| 9.1 Reflects on the effects of instructional decisions | 57 | 68.7 | 25 | 30.1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1.2 | 2.70 |
| 9.2 Refines instruction based on learning outcomes | 64 | 77.1 | 19 | 22.9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.77 |
| 9.3 Seeks feedback from other professionals | 31 | 73.5 | 20 | 24.1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2.75 |
| 9.4 Demonstrates commitment to the profession | 68 | 81.9 | 12 | 14.5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3.6 | 2.85 |
| 10. Involvement Beyond the Classroom | | | | | | | | | |
| 10.1 Interacts productively with parents and guardians | 29 | 34.9 | 15 | 18.1 | 0 | 0 | 39 | 47.0 | 2.66 |
| 10.2 Interacts productively with other professionals | 57 | 68.7 | 26 | 31.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.69 |
| 10.3 Demonstrates concern for students as people | 68 | 81.9 | 13 | 15.7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2.4 | 2.84 |
| 10.4 Participates in school activities beyond classroom | 46 | 55.4 | 20 | 24.0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 9.6 | 2.61 |

[Back to Matrix](#)

Attachment #7

Report on a Student Teaching Unit—The Rubric

A Culminating Assessment Activity for the Senior High-Junior High/
Middle School Education Program and the All-Grade Education Program
of Indiana State University

This activity is based on the core standards for beginning teachers in Indiana—the INTASC standards—and the Student Teaching/Internship Performance Profile standards of the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE). Following certain sections of this document—that is, following paragraphs, sentences, and even phrases—are numbers which refer to the INTASC elements or ISTE standards addressed in the section. For example, the notation “2P1” means that the section addresses the first performance indicator related to the second INTASC standard. The notation “3D2” means the section deals with the second disposition indicator related to the third INTASC standard. The notation “T2” means the section addresses the second ISTE standard for student teachers.

The following guidelines should be considered in identifying the unit upon which the report will be based:

- The teaching segment should be long enough to include both formative and summative assessment of student learning. In most situations, this means the unit should be three to eight days.
- The unit should be completed between week five and week eight of student teaching.
- The student teacher should confer with the host teacher about selection of the class and the unit to be taught.

The seven elements on the following pages—both the descriptive component and the analytical component of each element—must be included in the report on the student teaching unit. If the student teacher prepares a comprehensive unit plan or set of individual lesson plans, that document or set of documents can be appended to the report and cited in responding to the instructions related to the report elements. If the student teacher refers to the plan(s) in the main body of the report, care should be taken to ensure that the reader of the report can readily locate the relevant section of the plan(s) and can easily understand how the section responds to the instructions for preparation of the report. Even better, if the student teacher has a

comprehensive unit plan or individual lessons plans in a computer document, each relevant section can be copied from the document and pasted electronically in the main body of the report at the point at which its relevance to the report will be most easily understood. If the student teacher maintains a journal or log during student teaching, the entries relevant to the report can be appended to the report and cited in the main body of the report. Again in this situation, the student teacher should make certain that the reader of the report can easily locate the relevant section of the journal or log and understand its relevance to the report. In general, a purpose of this culminating activity is not for the student teacher to develop documents solely for the report but, instead, to include in the report, preferably by electronic insertion, the relevant portions of documents prepared for the student teaching experience itself and then to add specified commentary related to those insertions. Although these instructions emphasize the convenience of electronically pasting existing language into the report, the intent is also not to discourage appending actual lesson plan documents and teacher-constructed instructional materials and assessment instruments. If cited appropriately in the report, such appendices can greatly strengthen it.

Elements of the Report

1. Profile of the Class

Description: Prepare a brief descriptive profile of the class chosen for the report on the student teaching unit. In the profile, include information about the subject, grade level, time of day, class size, class personality, student academic performance, cultural and socioeconomic diversity and language backgrounds of students, disabilities and handicaps of students, and other factors that a teacher should consider in designing and teaching a unit.

Analysis: Explain briefly why you selected this class. Considering the types of factors mentioned above, explain what characteristics of the class as a whole and of individual students were factors that you decided you would need to consider in planning and teaching the unit. Identify the factors to which you refer later in the report. (2P1, 3D3, 3P5, 8P2)

2. Context of the Unit

Description: Identify the topic of the unit and the length in class sessions. Describe the circumstances outside the unit itself that partially determined the nature of the unit. Was it developed as part of a school-driven or district-driven curriculum? (7P1) Was it specified by the host teacher because of the overall structure of the course? If so, how did the unit fit into that overall structure? Was the unit developed because of specific student needs or interests as identified by you? (2P1, 7P2) Or was the nature of the unit determined by a combination of these influences? What other teaching segments preceded the unit that partially influenced the nature of the unit? What other teaching segments followed the unit that partially dictated the nature of the unit?

Analysis: Explain why you thought the unit was, or was not, appropriate at the time it was taught and with the class involved. Be certain to take into consideration any of the issues mentioned in the description section above that were relevant to your situation.

3. Goals of the Unit

Description: State the goals, objectives, or intended outcomes of the unit. What content—concepts, principles, and other information—did you want the students to learn or understand? What skills, abilities, or methods of inquiry did you want them to develop or improve? (1P4) What attitudes, values, or perspectives did you hope would be reinforced by the unit? (1P5) Include goals both for the class as a whole and, when appropriate, for individual students or groups of students with special needs. (7P1)

Analysis: Explain why you thought the goals of the unit were appropriate for the class as a whole and for the individuals in it. Include in your explanation references to identified student needs or interests and, if relevant, to a school-driven or district-driven curriculum. Also, discuss briefly the relationship of the goals to the state’s K-12 standards for the subject being taught.

4. Activities of the Unit

Description: Describe the specific learning activities by which you expected the students to achieve the goals or intended outcomes of the unit. Include descriptions of the materials and educational media to which the students were exposed and the experiences by which they interacted with the materials and media. The materials and media might include short stories, videotapes, musical scores, computer slide presentations, softballs, chemicals, websites—any materials, media, or equipment necessary for or supportive of intended student learning. The learning experiences could include analyzing, viewing, singing, throwing, mixing, conducting internet searches, or listening to and taking notes on a computer-enhanced lecture—any planned activities necessary for or supportive of intended student learning. If you prepared instruction sheets, worksheets, computer slide presentations, or other materials or media for any of the learning activities, append a copy of each material to the report and refer to the appendices in the main body of the report.

Analysis: Explain how you incorporated variety into these learning experiences, materials, and media and why you thought they were appropriate for the class as a whole and for the individuals in it. (T2, T3) Explain your use of assistive technologies to meet the special needs of students if required. (T5) Also, explain why you thought each activity was appropriate for leading to the intended outcomes to which it was related. Explain how the activities were designed to draw upon students’ prior knowledge and previous learning and to promote their abilities to problem solve, perform, or think critically. (4P2, 4P5) How did the activities connect the curriculum with the “real” world? How did they help students to transfer knowledge or skills to applications outside of school? (1D3, 1P4, 10P3, T8)) How were the

activities designed to encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, or self-motivation? (5P1, 5P2, T7) How were the activities designed to expand students' skills in speaking, writing, or use of other communicative media? (6P2)

5. Assessment in the Unit

Description: Describe or present the formal and informal assessment procedures and instruments used to determine whether the students achieved the goals, objectives, or intended outcomes of the unit. Append to the report a copy of each quiz, test, and other assessment instrument you used and refer to the appendices in the main body of the report. Explain when and how each procedure or instrument was used in the unit, including whether it was used for formative or summative assessment. If student products, such as written reports, printed projects, or completed tests, resulted from the assessment, include samples showing your written feedback to the students. Describe how productivity tools such as electronic grade books were used to collect, analyze, or interpret data related to student learning and to report results to students or parents.

Analysis: Explain how the assessment was designed to enable you to monitor the learning of the students as individuals and as a group and to make adjustments in implementation of the plans of the unit. (8P1, 8P5) Explain why you believed each procedure and instrument was appropriate for the students as a group and, where applicable, as individuals. (3P3) Explain how the assessment was designed to provide an accurate representation of the students' learning, both as individuals and as a group. (8P1, 8P4) Explain how the procedures, instruments, productivity tools, and your feedback to students were intended to promote self-assessment by them and the setting of personal learning goals. (8P3, T12)

6. Organization of the Unit

Description: Explain or present the way you sequenced the activities and assessments of the unit and organized the physical space of the classroom or other instructional location to accomplish the goals or intended outcomes. Include the timing of activities and assessments and the approaches and procedures used for managing the interaction and movement of students.

Analysis: Justify your organization of the teaching segment or unit. What principles, frameworks, models, or theories guided your organization of the unit? How did you intend for the needs of the students to be addressed by the way you sequenced the content covered and the activities used? (1K1, 1P1, 1P5, 2P2) Explain how both group and individual activities were used to accommodate the needs and abilities of students. How did you intend for your management of the learning environment—the instructional space, the time, the interaction of students—to address the academic, social, emotional, or physical needs of the students? (1P3, 2P1, 3P2, 3P3, 3P7, 5P1, 5P2, 5P3, 5P4, 5P5)

7. Evidence of Unit Effectiveness and Proposed Changes in the Unit

Description: Present your evaluation of the effectiveness of the unit for accomplishing the chosen goals or intended outcomes and provide evidence of its effectiveness. Include a statement of your own judgment of the effectiveness of the unit. As evidence supporting your judgment, include summaries of results of assessments of student learning, summaries of student evaluations of the unit, and a brief written evaluation by your supervising teacher of the actual teaching of the unit and its perceived effectiveness with students.

Analysis: Justify your evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the unit by discussing the appropriateness of the unit goals, the learning experiences and materials, the assessment procedures and instruments, and the organization of the activities and the learning environment. For each of these elements of the unit, cite the evidence, such as learning outcomes and student evaluations, that warrants your evaluation of the element. Also for each element, state clearly whether you would make changes if you were to teach the unit again, what those changes would be, and why you would make them. (8P4, 8P5, 9P1)

Rating of the Report

The report on the student teaching unit will be rated by a two-person team composed of a faculty member in the student teacher's major department and a faculty member in the School of Education. The report will be rated primarily on the design of the activities and assessment in the unit, on the organization of the unit, and on the student teacher's presentation of evidence of unit effectiveness and analysis of how the unit should be changed if it were taught again. To rate these final four elements of the report, the reviewers must understand well the profile of the class taught and the context and goals of the unit. Therefore, those first three elements must be prepared carefully according to the instructions above. To rate the student teacher's analysis of how the unit should be changed, the reviewers must understand the student teacher's evaluation of the unit, the results of assessments used during the unit, the students' evaluation of the unit, and the supervising teacher's evaluation. However, though the reviewers will expect to see this evidence of unit effectiveness, they will not take the positiveness or negativeness of those evaluations into consideration when rating the activities, assessment, organization, and effectiveness components of the report and the report as a whole. In other words, the student teacher should be candid in reporting his or her evaluation of the unit and faithful in summarizing the results of assessments of student learning during the unit and in summarizing student evaluations of the unit. The report will be rated on what the student teacher did in the unit and the explanations of why those things were done, not on how successful the unit was in the eyes of the student teacher, the students, or the supervising teacher.

The activities, assessment, organization, and effectiveness elements of the report will individually be assigned a rating of “Proficient,” “Satisfactory,” or “Unsatisfactory,” as will the report as a whole. The meanings of the rating levels follow:

Exceeds Expectations : The report element or the report as a whole, including the description of what was done and the explanation of why it was done, provides impressive evidence that the student teacher has outstanding abilities in the aspects of instruction related to the element or to all four elements rated. The presentation of that evidence communicates thoroughgoing professionalism.

Meets Expectations : The report element or the report as a whole, including the description of what was done and the explanation of why it was done, provides adequate evidence that the student teacher has satisfactory abilities in the aspects of instruction related to the element or to all four elements rated. The presentation of that evidence communicates professionalism.

Does Not Meet Expectations : The report element or the report as a whole provides inadequate evidence that the student teacher has satisfactory abilities in the aspects of instruction related to the element or to all four elements rated. Or the presentation of evidence does not communicate professionalism.

[Back to Matrix](#)

**SSE ASSESSMENT DAY DATA
CIMT UNIT REPORT EVALUATION**

SSE COHORT SUMMARY FOR 2006-07 & 2007-08
&
AGGREGATED DATA FOR 2006-2008

This table displays an overview of how SSE students performed in their CIMT 400/L Unit Report Assessment. They were evaluated by CIMT faculty, who assessed students according to the categories in the far left column. The ratings were: E=Exceeds Expectations; M=Meets Expectations; and D=Does Not Meet Expectations.

Overall SSE students perform quite well. The one student earning a “Does Not Meet” rating, will receive remediation from CIMT and SSE Methods faculty and must complete this assessment again.

The first number reflects the total number of SSE students receiving that assessment, followed by the percentage out of 29 that this represents. You will note that we have more extensive assessment information available at present for 2007-08, with only the overall assessment of the report for 2006-07. That is owing only to systematic difficulty in readily acquiring the more detailed data, a problem that TK20 should rectify.

2006-2007 CIMT Unit Report Evaluations for SSE Students (Overall Rating Only)

| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Total |
|---------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Overall | 21 (88%) | 3 (12%) | 0 | 24 |

2007-2008 CIMT Unit Report Evaluations for SSE—an Overview

| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Total |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Activities | 21 (72%) | 7 (24%) | 1 (4%) | 29 |
| Assessment | 24 (83%) | 5 (17%) | 0 | 29 |
| Organization | 25 (86%) | 3 (10%) | 1 (4%) | 29 |
| Evaluation | 21 (72%) | 7 (24%) | 1 (4%) | 29 |
| Overall | 25 (86%) | 3 (10%) | 1 (4%) | 29 |

2006-2008 CIMT Unit Report Evaluations for SSE—Two Year Aggregated Overall Rating

| | Exceeds | Meets | Does Not Meet | Total |
|----------------|----------|---------|---------------|-------|
| Overall Rating | 46 (87%) | 6 (11%) | 1 (2%) | 53 |

[Back to Matrix](#)

D. Faculty Section