Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: Education
Department Chair:
Department Assessment Committee Contact:

Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by May 31 each academic year.

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I.   **List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.**

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	Teacher candidates/students will create lesson plans that contain the necessary components as defined by Fitchburg State University's lesson plan rubric.	Semester	Spring 2018
2.	Teacher candidates/students will demonstrate dispositional characteristics necessary to be an effective educator as outlined in by Fitchburg State University's Candidate Disposition rubric.	Semester	Spring 2018

3.	Teacher candidates/students will reflect and self-evaluate on their teaching practice in order to improve their instruction as assessed through the Teacher Work Sample.	Semester	Spring 2018
4.	Teacher candidates/students will make sound professional decisions based upon the analysis of the learners learning as assessed through the Teacher Work Sample.	Semester	Spring 2018
5.	The percentage of teacher candidates/students that remain in the Education department will increase due to an increase in program options.	Semester	
6.	Through data gathered within the Exit Survey teacher candidates/students will receive effective advising throughout their undergraduate program.	Semester	Spring 2018

II. **PLO Assessment** **(Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)**

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4th year, 1st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the "loop closed"?
1	Practicum lesson plan rubrics	4th	All	90% with ratings of 3 or 4	Data was reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.
2	Candidate Disposition	4th year	All	90% with ratings of 3 or 4	Data was reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.
3	Teacher Work Sample	4th	All	90% with ratings of 2 or 3	Data was reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.
4	Teacher Work Sample	4th	All	90% with ratings of 2 or 3	Data was reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.
5	Data gathered on students entering and leaving programs within the Education Department	The Education Department collects their own internal data. Annually by enrollment cohort year.	All		Data will be reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.
6	Exit Survey	4th	All	90% with ratings of 3 or 4	Data was reviewed and disseminated to chairs and faculty.

III. **Summary of Findings:** Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you "closing the loop"?

Other than GPA, what data/ evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)
Successful completion of Massachusetts Candidate Assessment of Performance	The Supervising Practitioner, Program Supervisor and Fitchburg State's Licensure Officer	Specific Changes to course content to provide more scaffolding of knowledge/skills to ensure our teacher candidate have the necessary skills to meet the state's expectation to be well prepared teachers in their field.
Teacher Work Sample	Course Instructor	
Candidate Disposition	Supervisors, Course Instructors, and Chair	
Successful Passing of all MTELs related to license sought.	Advisor and Placement Coordinator	

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan
II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.
III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

☐ Yes

University Data

I. **SSC Data**

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.
Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

    a.   What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
At risk student retention	**Chair forwarded information to all advisors who then personally reached out to each individual student.**	**Satisfied with outcome**
Late registration	**Chair forwarded information about students having not registered to all advisors who then personally reached out to each individual student.**	**Satisfied with outcome**

    b.   What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Program completion rates within education	**To assess the impact the new Educational Studies program is having**	**Advising trainings**	**Increase education program completers by 10%**	**yes**

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II.   Trend Data
Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement.

Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)

b. What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Number of Education completers	To assess the impact the new Educational Studies program is having	Advising trainings	Increase education program completers by 10%	

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. **Programs that fall under Program Review:**
   i. Date of most recent Review:
   ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year

   iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

☐ Yes

II. **Programs with external Accreditation:**
   i. Accreditor: State (MA) and CAEP
   ii. Date of last review: Spring 2013
   iii. Date of next review and type of review: Spring 2021
   iv. List key performance indicators: Please see attached document (Education Preparation Program Approval Criteria List)

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.) (If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.

Ensuring pre-practicum and practicum experiences for candidates within diverse settings	NCATE standards	

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
Expected Timing of Assessment	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
Assessment Tool Quality	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
PLO Assessment	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
Criteria for Success	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but	Criteria for student success not provided.	

			not clearly stated or is not appropriate.		
Summary of Findings	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	

Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Department or Program Assessment Plan	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	

University Data					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
SSC Data for Current Review Period	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/ department for at least one SSC data	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

			point. No plan implemented.		
SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Trend Data for Current Review Period	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/ department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	**Highly Developed (3)**	**Developed (2)**	**Emerging (1)**	**Initial (0)**	**Score**
Only for those under Program Review *Annual Reflection on Program Review*	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for	

				progress discussed.	
Only for those under External Accreditation *Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.*	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.