| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (1) Subject Matter - Students will understand the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches. | Alumni will self-assess subj ect matter knowledge after one year in-service on the alumni survey. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate subject matter knowledge a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. Of the BSIS alumni, 28 ( $100 \%$ ) rated knowledge of subject matter a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were $4-8$ alumni. Both groups rated knowledge of subject matter a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | Faculty noted that students' perceive they know their content and are prepared to teach. We continued to track the data of alumni. Faculty determined that the principal survey is not an effective measure for subject matter learning. The data for students' perception of their knowledge of subject matter was disaggregated to give faculty additional information. | This disaggregated data provided us with more insight into the perceptions of the different EC-6 and 4-8 programs. Both groups are confident in their subject matter knowledge. If the disaggregated data is the same for another year (two years in a row) we will raise the percentage criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the $4-8$ UTeach math/ science program. |  |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by supervisor in Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of $4.0-5$. 0 or higher on subject matter subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 65 ( $100 \%$ ) scored an average rubric score of $4.0-$ 5.0 or higher on subj ect matter subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed 80\%for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criterion and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |
|  | Score on standardized test. | 90\%of students earn a minimum scaled score of 240 or higher on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TEXES) Content exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 163 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 110 ( $67.48 \%$ ) earned a minimum scaled score of 240 or higher on the TEXES Content exam on first attempt. | Not Met | Additional study materials will be placed on the SOE website to facilitate students being prepared for their subject area tests. | Additional materials were placed on the website to assist students in preparation for their content area TExES (certification) exam. We continued to examine data on student TExES scores. | Starting in the 2013-2014 academic year, students entering Phase II or Block 2 will be given a representative content area test for diagnostic purposes. This will allow students to determine where their areas of weakness so that remediation can be sought in those areas. |  |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess subj ect matter knowledge upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate subj ect matter knowledge 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. of the graduating teacher candidates, 135 (95.07\%) rated subject matter knowledge 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on teacher candidates perception of their knowledge of subject matter. | As this is the second year with the standard being met, we will increase the criterion level to 92\% | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Criterion level increased to } \\ & 92 \% \end{aligned}$ |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Implementation Feedback } \\ \text { 2012-2013 } \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (2) Student LearningStudents will understand learning opportunities for children that support their intellectual, social and personal development. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of student learning after one year in-service on the alumni survey. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate knowledge of student learning a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, 28 (100\%) rated knowledge of student learning a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were 4-8 alumni. Both groups rated knowledge of student learning a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | The different certification program levels (EC-6 and 4-8 programs) spent the 2012- <br> 2013 year devising assessment plans that would allow us to better assess our students with respect to student learning. We also determined that the principal survey is not an effective measure for student learning. Data related to alumni's perspectives of their knowledge of student learning was disaggregated by program level to give faculty increased information. | The disaggregated data provides us with insight that the EC-6 and $4-8$ programs are confident in their knowledge related to student learning. If the disaggregated data meets the criterion for another year (two years in a row) we will raise the percentage criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the 4.8 UTeach math/ science program. |  |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by site supervisors in Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of 4.0-5.0. or higher on student learning subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 65 ( $100 \%$ scored an average rubric score of 4.0 5.0 or higher on student learning subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $80 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |
|  | Domain III score on standardized test. | 90\%of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/ 70\%or higher on Domain III on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 102 (73.91\%) earned a minimum scaled score of $70 \%$ or higher on Domain III of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be $K$ 12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | We continued to monitor our students' scores on the PPR exam. We changed the content in our courses (specifically the Educational Psychology course) to reflect the K -12 span needed for this certification test. We also examined the state averages on passing Domain III on the TExES PPR. | We will continue to strive for high standards with a criterion of $90 \%$ passing Domain III on their first attempt on the PPR. The statewide average for Domain III is $72 \%$ We are increasing the number of TEXES PPR sessions student can take in a face-to-face format. |  |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Use of Results 2011 } \\ 2012 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of student learning upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate student learning 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 139 ( $97.89 \%$ ) rated knowledge of student learning 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to monitor students' perceptions of their ability to understand the complexities associated with student learning. | As this is the second year of the criterion being reached, we will raise the criterion to read that $92 \%$ of the graduating candidates rate student learning 3 or above. | Raised criterion to $92 \%$ |  |
| (3) Diverse Learners Students will demonstrate knowledge of how children differ in their approaches to learning and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse learners. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of diverse learners after one year in-service on the alumni survey. | 90\%of alumni will rate knowledge of diverse learners a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, $26(92.86 \%$ rated knowledge of diverse learners a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were $4-8$ alumni. Of the respondents, 21 ( $91.30 \%$ EC-6 and $5(100 \%$ ) 4-8 alumni rated knowledge of diverse learners a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. In addition, we will look at our courses to determine where increased addition to the needs of diverse learners can be increased. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | The different certification program levels (EC-6 and 4-8 programs) spent the year devising assessment plans that would allow us to better assess our students with respect to working with diverse learners. We also determined that the principal survey is not an effective measure for student learning. In addition, we continued to monitor data on how alumni reported their confidence in working with diverse student populations in a variety of educational environments. | The disaggregated data provides us with insight that the EC-6 and $4-8$ programs are confident in their knowledge related to diverse learners. If the disaggregated data indicates that the criterion has been met for another year (two years in a row) we will raise the percentage criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the 48 UTeach math/ science program. |  |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by site supervisor in Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of $4.0-5$. 0 . or higher on diversity subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, $65(100 \%)$ scored an average rubric score of 4.0 5.0 or higher on diverse learners subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $80 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Domain I score on standardized test. | $90 \%$ of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/70\%or higher on Domain I on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 113 ( $81.88 \%$ ) earned a minimum scaled score of $70 \%$ or higher on Domain I of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be $K$ 12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | We have altered content in our courses (specifically in the educational psychology courses) to better reflect the change in span of knowledge needed. We also continue to monitor our students scores on Domain I of the TExES PPR. | We continue to hold high standards for our students and their initial attempt on Domain I of the TExES PPR. Overall, the statewide average (depending on testing months) is $74 \%$ We will also increase the number of face-to-face sessions where students can get assistance in preparing for the PPR. <br> The state changed the PPR test to be K-12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-$6,4-8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. |  |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of diverse learners upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate knowledge of diverse learners 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the self assessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 134 ( $94.37 \%$ ) rated knowledge of diverse learners 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to monitor our students perceptions in their ability to work with diverse student populations. | As this is the second year that the criterion for working with diverse learners has been exceeded, we will increase the criterion to $92 \%$ | Criterion level increased to 92\% |  |
| (4) Instructional Strategies students will use a variety of instructional strategies to encourage development of critical thinking, problem solving and performance skills. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of instructional strategies after one year inservice on the alumni survey. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate knowledge of instructional strategies a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 <br> undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, 27 (96.43\%) rated knowledge of instructional strategies a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were 4-8 alumni. Of the respondents, 22 (95.65\%) EC-6 and 5 ( $100 \% 4$ 4-8 alumni rated knowledge of instructional strategies a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | The data for understanding of instructional strategies was disaggregated to provided a better understanding of the perceptions of students from the different program areas. | Both program levels in the BSIS degree indicated they are comfortable with their knowledge of different instructional strategies. We will continue to look at the disaggregated results and if next year, this criterion is met, we will increase the criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the 48 UTeach math/ science program. |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | Use of Results 2011 <br> 2012 | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by instructor during Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of 4.0-5.0. or higher on instructional strategies subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, $65(100 \%$ scored an average rubric score of 4.05.0 or higher on instructional strategies subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed 80\%for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |
|  | Domain III score on standardized test. | $90 \%$ of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/70\%or higher on Domain III of the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TEXES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 102 ( $73.91 \%$ ) earned a minimum scaled score of $70 \%$ or higher on Domain III of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be K 12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | We continued to monitor our students' scores on the PPR exam. We changed the content in our courses (specifically our educational psychology courses) to reflect the K-12 span needed for this certification test. We also examined the state averages on passing Domain III on the TExES PPR. Depending upon texting month, the statewide average score on this domain is generally $72 \%$ | We will continue to strive for high standards with a criterion of $90 \%$ passing Domain III on their first attempt on the PPR. Depending on testing month, the statewide average for Domain III is $72 \%$ We are increasing the number of TEXES PPR sessions student can take in a face-to-face format. <br> The state changed the PPR test to be K-12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-$6,4-8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. |  |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of instructional strategies upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate knowledge of instructional strategies 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 138 ( $97.18 \%$ rated knowledge of instructional strategies 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on our students' perceptions of their knowledge of different instructional strategies. | As this is the second year the criterion has been exceeded, we will increase the criterion for graduating candidates to rate their knowledge of instructional strategies to $92 \%$ | Criterion level increased to 92\% |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Implementation Feedback } \\ \text { 2012-2013 } \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (5) Learning Environment Students will create a learning environment that encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of appropriate learning environments after one year in-service on the alumni survey. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate knowledge of appropriate learning environments a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, 26 (92.86\%) rated knowledge of learning environment a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were $4-8$ alumni. Of the respondents, 21 ( $91.30 \%$ EC-6 and 5 ( $100 \% 4$ 4-8 alumni rated knowledge of learning environment a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | We continued to collect data on our alumni's perceptions of creating rigorous and meaningful learning environments. The disaggregated data shows that our alumni to think their knowledge of learning environments their expectations and those of external stakeholders. | This is the first year we have disaggregated data for the program areas. Therefore, if the criterion for this student learning outcome related to learning environment is met with the disaggregated data for a second year, we will raise the criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the $4-8$ UTeach math/ science program. |  |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by instructor during Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of 4.0-5.0. or higher on learning environment subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 65 ( $100 \%$ scored an average rubric score of 4.0 5.0 or higher on learning environment subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $80 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |
|  | Domain II score on standardized test. | $90 \%$ of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/70\%or higher on Domain II on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 104 ( $75.36 \%$ ) earned a minimum scaled score of $70 \%$ or higher on Domain II of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be $K$ 12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | Faculty changed the content of courses (specifically educational psychology) to better meet the needs of the PPR. | We strive for high standards for our students in Domain II of the PPR. We will increase the number of sections of face-toface preparation help sessions for students. The statewide average percentage passing Domain II is $78 \%$ |  |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results 2011 } \\ 2012 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline \text { Implementation Feedback } \\ \text { 2012-2013 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of learning environment upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate knowledge of learning environment 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 137 ( $96.48 \%$ ) rated knowledge of learning environment 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | Data related to students' perspective of their ability to create and implement positive learning environments was collected. | This was the second year that the criterion was exceeded. Therefore, we will increase the criterion. 92\%of graduating teacher candidates will rate their knowledge of learning environments 3 or above. |  | Criterion level increased to 92\% |
| (7) Planning Instruction Students will plan instruction based upon knowledge of subject matter, curriculum goals, and instructional design. | Alumni will self-assess planning instruction after one year in-service on the alumni survey. | 90\%of alumni will rate planning instruction a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, $27(96.43 \%$ rated knowledge of planning instruction a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were 4-8 alumni. Of the respondents, 22 ( $95.65 \%$ ) EC-6 and 5 ( $100 \% 4$ 4-8 alumni rated knowledge of planning instruction a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | The disaggregated data for the program areas allowed faculty to determine that alumni are confident in their ability to plan instruction for their classrooms. | With the disaggregated data, we will continue to collect data and if alumni report their confidence in their ability to plan effective meets the criterion for a second year, we will raise the criterion level. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the $4-8$ UTeach math/ science program. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the 4-8 UTeach math/ science program. |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by site supervisor during Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: $80 \%$ of students will score an average rubric score of 4.0-5.0. or higher on planning instruction subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, $65(100 \%$ scored an average rubric score of 4.0 5.0 or higher on planning instruction subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $80 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Domain III score on standardized test. | $90 \%$ of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/70\%or higher on Domain III of the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam on first attempt. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 102 (73.91\%) earned a minimum scaled score of $70 \%$ or higher on Domain III of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be K12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | We altered the content of courses (specifically the educational psychology courses) to better prepare students in this domain. | We hold high expectations for our students and having $90 \%$ of our students pass Domain III on the TExES PPR is a very high expectation. The statewide average on the percentage of students passing Domain III is $72 \%$ We will increase the number of face-to-face preparation sessions for students. <br> The state changed the PPR test to be K-12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-$6,4-8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. |  |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess planning instruction upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate planning instruction 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 141 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 130 ( $92.20 \%$ rated knowledge of planning instruction 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on students' perceptions of their ability to plan instruction. | As this is the second year that the criterion for planning of instruction has been met, we will raise the criterion to $92 \%$ | Criterion level increased to 92\% |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Use of Results 2011 } \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (8) Assessment - Students will use formal and informal assessment strategies. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of formal and informal assessment strategies after one year inservice. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate knowledge of formal and informal assessment strategies a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale on the alumni survey. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. 28 of the respondents were BSIS alumni. Of the BSIS alumni, 27 (96.43\%) rated knowledge of assessment a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were $4-8$ alumni. Of the respondents, 22 ( $95.65 \%$ ) EC-6 and $5(100 \%) 4-8$ alumni rated knowledge of assessment a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. In addition, SOE faculty will examine our courses and determine how to strengthen students' acquisition of knowledge related to assessment. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | Having the disaggregated data allowed faculty to see that alumni from the EC-6 and 4-8 programs rate their knowledge of assessment to the point where the criterion is surpassed. The faculty examined the principal survey and this is not an appropriate survey from which to gain additional information. | As this is the first year that the criterion has been met with the disaggregated data, we will continue to collect data for the 2013-2014 year. If the criteria is surpassed for a second year, we will rise the criterion. |  |  |
|  | Clinical Observation Rubric completed by site supervisor during Phase IV clinical experiences. | Phase IV: 80\%of students will score an average rubric score of 4.0-5. 0. or higher on assessment subset on the summative evaluation. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 65 ( $100 \%$ scored an average rubric score of 4.0 5.0 or higher on assessment subset on the summative evaluation. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed 80\%for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on student progress using the Clinical Observation Form in terms of subj ect matter knowledge. During the 20122013 year, the faculty agreed and designed a new assessment instrument, which was piloted fall 2012, to be used in Phase IV clinical experiences. We now have the Clinical Evaluation Form. | This is the second year that our percentage exceeded $80 \%$ on this criteria and should increase the criterion. However, as we will be using a new assessment, the Clinical Evaluation Form, we recommend the percentage be kept at $80 \%$ to determine students progress with this new assessment instrument. |  | Note that a new assessment will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Use of Results } 2011 \\ 2012 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Implementation Feedback } \\ \text { 2011-2012 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Use of Results 2012-2013 | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Implementation Feedback } \\ \text { 2012-2013 } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Domain IV score on standardized test. | $90 \%$ of students evaluated will earn a passing score of 240/70\%on Domain IV on the Texas Examinations of Educator Standards (TExES) Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) exam. | 2012-2013: 138 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 99 ( $71.74 \%$ ) earned a minimum scaled score of 70\%or higher on Domain IV of the TExES PPR exam on first attempt. | Not Met | SOE Faculty will examine the newly revised PPR and determine the courses where content needs to be infused for the PPR. The state changed the PPR test to be K 12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4 -$8,6-12$ ) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. | We changed the content of our courses (specifically the educational psychology course) to reflect the change in content of the PPR test. | Students are not reaching the $90 \%$ level in terms of passing Domain IV on the TExES PPR exam. The statewide average of percent passing Domain IV of the PPR is $77 \%$ We want to not only meet the statewide percentage passing but exceed that. We are increasing the number of face-to-face preparation sessions for students. | The state changed the PPR test to be K-12 instead of differentiated by age group (EC-6, 4-8, 6-12) so this is a different test than students have taken in the past. Due to the difference in tests, we will have to alter our content in various courses to ensure students do well on this certification exam. |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of use of formal and informal assessments upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate knowledge of use of formal and informal assessments 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the self assessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 139 ( $97.89 \%$ rated knowledge of use of formal and informal assessments 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed $90 \%$ for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data on our students confidence in their knowledge of assessment. | As this is the second year the criterion for assessment has been met, we will increase the criterion to $92 \%$ for the upcoming year. | Criterion level increased to 92\% |  |
| (9) Reflection and Professional Practice Students will perform as a reflective practitioner and professional. | Alumni will self-assess performance as a reflective practitioner after one year inservice on the alumni survey. | $90 \%$ of alumni will rate performance as a reflective practitioner a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. Of the BSIS alumni, 28 ( $100 \%$ ) rated knowledge of reflection and professional practice a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were 48 alumni. Both groups rated knowledge of reflection and professional practice a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. In addition, SOE faculty will place more emphasis on the importance of being reflective about ones practice on a daily basis. | The disaggregated data provided faculty that both certification groups are confident in their ability to be reflective practitioners. | This is the first year we have had the disaggregated data showing the perceptions of the separate certification levels. We will continue to collect data. If the second year of disaggregated data meets the criterion, we will increase the criterion. |  |  |


| Outcome | Assessment Method | Criterion | Result | Result Type | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \begin{array}{c} \text { Use of Results 2011- } \\ 2012 \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Implementation Feedback 2011-2012 | Use of Results 2012-2013 | Implementation Feedback 2012-2013 | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Student Learning Outcomes Reflection Rubric completed by site supervisor: Teacher candidates in Phase IV will be assessed on reflections of performance on each of the Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's). | 80\%of teacher candidates will score an overall average of proficient or higher on the SLO Rubric. | 2012-2013: 65 students were assessed. Of the students assessed, 64 ( $98.46 \%$ ) scored an overall average of proficient or higher on the SLO rubric. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed 80\%for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data and also looked at how we could increase the rigor of the Student Learning Outcomes (the InTASC standards) in terms of the products produced. | Students will have a more rigor criterion in terms of what is acceptable for the Student Learning Outcomes/ Standards portfolio. |  | New instrument was piloted during the fall 2012 semester. Data only reflects spring 2013. The new instrument piloted will be used starting in the 2013-2014 academic year. |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess performance as a reflective practitioner upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate their overall performance as a reflective practitioner 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 140 (98.59\%) rated their overall performance as a reflective practitioner 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | Continue to collect data. If the percentage exceed 90\%for one more additional year (for a total of two years) we will increase the percentage found in our criteria. | We continued to collect data related to students perceptions of their ability to be a reflective practitioner. | As this is the second year of the criterion for reflective practice being met. Therefore, we will increase the criterion to $92 \%$ | Criterion level increased to 92\% |  |
| (10) Collaboration - Students will communicate and interact with parents/guardians, families, school colleagues, and the community. | Alumni will self-assess knowledge of communication and interaction with parents/ guardians, etc., upon completion of the program on the alumni survey. | 90\%of alumni will rate knowledge of communication and interaction with parents/ guardians, etc., a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | 2012-2013: 28/ 164 undergraduate alumni responded. Of the BSIS alumni, 28 ( $100 \%$ ) rated knowledge of collaboration a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. 23 respondents were EC-6 alumni and 5 were 4-8 alumni. Both groups rated knowledge of collaboration a 3 (meets expectations) or higher on a 5 point scale. | Met | In order to have a clearer <br> understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. We will also continue to collect data. If the percentage exceeds 90\%again next year and we have two years of increased, we will raise the percentage. We are also going to look at the principal survey to determine if this is another external evaluation that should be added to this learning outcome. | We studied the principals' survey and faculty noted that this was not an appropriate external measure for alumni's ability to collaborate with other. | The disaggregated data provides us with our students confidence level in their ability to effectively collaborative and communicate with parents and the community via program level. As this is the first year with the disaggregated data, we will continue to examine data and if the disaggregated data meets or exceeds the criterion for a second year, we will increase the criterion. | We examined the principal survey and determined it is not an appropriate venue for this student learning outcome. In addition, with the budget cuts at TEA, we have not received the results of the TEA administered principal survey for the 20122013 academic year. With the ELAR and SS 4-8 programs on hold due to low enrollments, the 4-8 category will be students in the 4.8 UTeach math/ science program. |  |
|  | Teacher candidates will selfassess knowledge of communication and interaction with parents/ guardians, etc., upon completion of the program on the exit survey. | On a 5 point scale, $90 \%$ of graduating teacher candidates rate knowledge of communication and interaction with parents/ guardians, etc., 3 or above ("meets expectations" or above). | 2012-2013: 142 teacher candidates completed the selfassessment. Of the graduating teacher candidates, 133 ( $93.66 \%$ rated knowledge of collaboration 3 (meets expectations) or above. | Met | In order to have a clearer understanding of the learning in each of the different program areas, the data will be disaggregated by the different BSIS program areas. | We continued to seek data on students' confidence in collaborating with educational stakeholders. We also continued to examine the opportunities that students have to interact communicate with families and implemented a new course in the EC-6 program. | The data was not disaggregated by the different BSIS levels. Therefore, we will make sure that the future data is separated according to program in the BSIS degree. We will continue to look at the opportunities students EC-6 and $4-8$ students can have and increased ways to showcase their interactions with these educational stakeholders. |  |  |

