

Data Use for Program Improvement Report

After reviewing program data for the academic year, provide a brief explanation of how the program faculty and stakeholders intend to use the results to improve the identified areas in need of improvement. Program improvements could be to address program curriculum, program courses, pedagogy, program assessments, and so forth. Identify specific methods for addressing the area in need of improvement and the targeted level of proficiency/success.

Area in Need of Improvement 1:

We need to focus on recruiting students and retaining our current students. After reviewing the data available since 2014, VSU's Art Education Program has continued to decline in enrollment. During the 2014-2015 school year, seven degrees were conferred. Whereas the 2015-2016 school year resulted in only two. During the 2017-2018 school year nobody completed the program and this year we expect only one student to graduate. With low enrollment numbers, the program must first work recruit and retain to be able to implement these assessments and collect data needed.

One specific way to help improve our numbers immediately is to understand why students are not passing ARED 2999. This course is a prerequisite for art education course work and works as a gatekeeper for our students. During the 2017-2018 school year only 8 students passed this course. Over the three semesters the course was provided, there were 19 attempts to pass this course. For the breakdown of numbers, please see chart below.

Semester	Students Taking ARED 2999	Students Passing ARED 2999
Fall 2017	6 students	1 student passed
Spring 2018	11 students	6 students passed
Summer 2018	2 students	1 student passed
Fall 2018	3 students	N/A

Understanding that students are unable to take art education courses until they pass ARED 2999, the program must examine the problems associated with this course and provide solutions for our students. X problems were articulated by students as to why they fail this course. 1) ARED 2999 it costs up to \$647 to complete. It is a zero credit hour course, which means that students often have to purchase supplies for at least five other courses as well. 2) ARED 2999 requires a 2.75 GPA to pass. Many of our students struggle to earn and maintain the required 2.75 grade point average. 3) ARED 2999 requires our students to pass the GACE Program Admission Assessment. Several of our students struggle to pass this assessment.

Method(s) to be Used to Address Area in Need of Improvement for Upcoming Academic Year:

During the 2018-2019 school year, the program is working to help students pass ARED 2999; when students pass ARED 2999, we have students in methods courses and can collect data needed for this report. We are using multiple methods to help students pass ARED 2999. First, we (faculty and advisors) are helping art education majors prepare for this expense before they take this course. In each advising session students are reminded of the expenses of ARED 2999 and ARED 4070/4090. Second, we (faculty and advisors) are educating our students about the option of earning a BFA in Art and then completing an add-on P-12 Certification for Art Education. This provides students with an opportunity to raise their GPAs while earning a college degree. Then, they can earn a certificate in Art Education by adding a few classes. Finally, we work with students for three weeks to prepare for the GACE Program Admission Assessment. We practice reading, writing, and math and pinpoint areas to review.

Targeted Level(s) of Proficiency/Success for Upcoming Academic Year:

We hope to have 75% or more of students pass ARED 2999 by the next academic school year.

Area in Need of Improvement 2:

To be prepared for the students who passed ARED 2999 and taking methods courses, we need to develop assessments for the Art Education Program. While the program will use the Intern Keys Assessment, the PBDA Assessment, the GACE Content Assessment, and EdTPA, we must also develop the program specific assessments for instructional planning and for content knowledge. Further, the program needs to develop the Continuous Improvement Matrix for art education as well. By developing these assessments we will be able to collect data and engage in data analysis for program improvement.

Method(s) to be Used to Address Area in Need of Improvement for Upcoming Academic Year:

This year we will work to design the Continuous Improvement Matrix for Art Education. By designing this matrix, we will be able to better understand the ideal courses in which to implement the Intern Keys Early Assessment, Intern Keys Final Assessment, The Professional Behaviors and Dispositions Assessment, the GACE Content Assessment, and edTPA. Further, we need to find and design the program specific assessments for Art Education in the areas of content knowledge and instructional planning.

Targeted Level(s) of Proficiency/Success for Upcoming Academic Year:

By next year we will build the Continuous Improvement Matrix for Art Education. We will also research content assessments and talk to other art education program coordinators in the state of Georgia to understand what they do for content assessments. We will find and design the two missing program assessments.

Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators (GACE) Content Assessment Pass Rates (Georgia Content Test)

Assessment Description:

The Georgia Professional Standards Commission (PSC) has contracted with Educational Testing Services (ETS®) to assist in the development and administration of the Georgia Assessments for the Certification of Educators® (GACE®). The purpose of the GACE is to assess the knowledge and skills of prospective Georgia public school educators. The GACE program helps the PSC meet its goal of ensuring that candidates have the knowledge and skills needed to perform the job of an educator in Georgia public schools. The GACE are aligned with state and national standards for educator preparation and with state standards for the P–12 student curriculum (Georgia Performance Standards).

The GACE are criterion-referenced, objective-based assessments designed to measure a candidate’s knowledge and skills in relation to an established standard rather than in relation to the performance of other candidates. The tests were developed in consultation with committees of Georgia educators, educator preparation faculty, and other content and assessment specialists. Test questions were reviewed and approved by committees of Georgia educators. The passing score for each test is established by the PSC and is based on the professional judgments and recommendations of Georgia educators.

Assessment Data:

Test Name	Test Year	Program									Statewide						
		# of Examinees	Average Scale Score	# Overall Passing	# Induction Passing	# Professional Passing	% Overall Passing	% Induction Passing	% Professional Passing	# of Examinees	Average Scale Score	# Overall Passing	# Induction Passing	# Professional Passing	% Overall Passing	% Induction Passing	% Professional Passing
109 Test I	SEP-2016 TO AUG-2017	1	212.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	211	229.57	150	81	69	71	38	33
	SEP-2015 TO AUG-2016	5	244.80	5	4	1	100	80	20	235	227.83	154	84	70	66	36	30
	SEP-2014 TO AUG-2015	8	245.88	7	3	4	88	38	50	193	227.33	125	62	63	65	32	33
110 Test II	SEP-2016 TO AUG-2017	3	196.00	1	1	0	33	33	0	213	222.80	139	73	66	65	34	31
	SEP-2015 TO AUG-2016	5	216.40	3	2	1	60	40	20	221	220.45	131	74	57	59	33	26
	SEP-2014 TO AUG-2015	9	232.89	8	7	1	89	78	11	191	226.28	126	65	61	66	34	32

Note: Data reported are one year behind and only include assessment attempts from program completers.

Subarea Assessment Data:

Art Education Test I (ETS)

Variables	Average Scaled Score		Number of Examinees		Average Percentage Correct	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
TOTAL	224.73	264	192	1		
SUBAREA I. ELEMENTS AND PRINCIPLES OF ART					68.92	89.29
1. UNDERSTANDS ART ELEMENTS AND PRINCIPLES IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2-D) AND THREE-DIMENSIONAL (3-D) MEDIA AND HOW THEY COMMUNICATE MEANING					67.49	78.57
2. UNDERSTANDS VARIOUS METHODS OF CREATING MEANINGFUL COMPOSITIONS					70.35	100
SUBAREA II. MEDIA, TECHNIQUES, AND PROCESSES					63.92	75
1. UNDERSTANDS SAFETY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND STORAGE ISSUES RELATED TO THE USE OF ART MATERIALS AND PROCESSES					67.4	40
2. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE A VARIETY OF DRAWING, PAINTING, PHOTOGRAPHY, AND PRINTMAKING MATERIALS AND PROCESSES					64.3	72.73
3. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE DIGITAL IMAGE PROCESSES					65.33	85.71
4. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE THREE-DIMENSIONAL MATERIALS AND PROCESSES					60.42	88.89

Art Education Test II (ETS)

Variables	Average Scaled Score		Number of Examinees		Average Percentage Correct	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
TOTAL	218.48	238	195	1		
SUBAREA I. ART IN CONTEXT					61.93	72.41
1. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF WESTERN ART FROM ANTIQUITY THROUGH THE 19TH CENTURY					57.65	50
2. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF NON-WESTERN ART					71.11	66.67
3. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY ART					61.59	100
SUBAREA II. CONNECTIONS					66.15	53.85
1. UNDERSTANDS HOW OTHER DISCIPLINES RELATE TO THE STUDY AND PRODUCTION OF THE VISUAL ARTS					66.15	53.85
SUBAREA III. CRITICISM AND REFLECTION					68.66	83.33
1. UNDERSTANDS THE MAJOR PHILOSOPHIES OF ART AND AESTHETICS AND THEIR ROLE IN ART CRITICISM					73.43	100
2. UNDERSTANDS THE INDIVIDUAL AND COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES OF ART CRITICISM AND CRITIQUE					61.17	57.14

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

It is important to note that the analysis below comes from one student and is not be generalizable to the entire program. When reviewing this data with stakeholders we examined multiple years of data to better understand trends. Overall, the scores and number of examinees have been inconsistent across the last three school years. With a low sample size we needed to look at data in each subarea to try to draw conclusions for program improvement.

ART EDUCATION TEST I (ETS)						
	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
EXAMINEES	193	8	181	1	192	1
TOTAL SCORE	227.33	245.88	230.65	212.00	224.73	264

ART EDUCATION TEST I (ETS)						
	Average % Correct 2015-16		Average % Correct 2016-17		Average % Correct 2017-18	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
SUBAREA I. ELEMENTS AND PRINCIPLES OF ART	64.62	66.52	70.84	53.57	68.92	89.29
1. UNDERSTANDS ART ELEMENTS AND PRINCIPLES IN TWO-DIMENSIONAL (2-D) AND THREE-DIMENSIONAL (3-D) MEDIA AND HOW THEY COMMUNICATE MEANING	65.39	65.00	69.46	50.00	67.49	78.57
2. UNDERSTANDS VARIOUS METHODS OF CREATING MEANINGFUL COMPOSITIONS	63.73	68.27	72.22	57.14	70.35	100
SUBAREA II. MEDIA, TECHNIQUES, AND PROCESSES	66.35	76.56	66.64	68.75	63.92	75
1. UNDERSTANDS SAFETY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND STORAGE ISSUES RELATED TO THE USE OF ART MATERIALS AND PROCESSES	68.39	72.50	66.41	40.00	67.4	40
2. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE A VARIETY OF DRAWING, PAINTING, PHOTOGRAPHY, AND PRINTMAKING MATERIALS AND PROCESSES	67.57	75.00	66.10	54.55	64.3	72.73
3. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE DIGITAL IMAGE PROCESSES	64.47	89.29	69.93	85.71	65.33	85.71
4. UNDERSTANDS HOW TO USE THREE-DIMENSIONAL MATERIALS AND PROCESSES	64.9	70.31	64.89	88.89	60.42	88.89

Art Education Test I, Subarea I shows that for the 2015-2016 school year and the 2017-2018 school year our students scored higher than the state average. However, the student who took the test in 2016-2017 scored 17.27 points below the state average. For Subarea II, our students scored above the state average. We also examined specific places where our students scored below state average. The student who took the GACE Test I in the 2016-2017 school year scored below average in four of the six categories. However, we noted that our students scored below average two years in a row when tested about safety, environmental, and storage issues related to the use of art materials and processes.

ART EDUCATION TEST II (ETS)						
	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
EXAMINEES	191	9	181	3	195	1
TOTAL SCORE	226.28	232.89	223.88	196.00	218.48	238

Variables	2015-2016		2016-2017		2017-2018	
	Average Percentage Correct		Average Percentage Correct		Average Percentage Correct	
	State	Program	State	Program	State	Program
TOTAL	191	9	181	3	195	1
SUBAREA I. ART IN CONTEXT	63.8	64.68	63.00	57.47	61.93	72.41
1. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF WESTERN ART FROM ANTIQUITY THROUGH THE 19TH CENTURY	63.53	64.81	57.97	36.11	57.65	50
2. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF NON-WESTERN ART	66.75	62.96	66.57	50.00	71.11	66.67

3. DEMONSTRATES A BASIC UNDERSTANDING OF THE HISTORY OF MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY ART	62.36	65.56	66.55	84.85	61.59	100
SUBAREA II. CONNECTIONS	64.22	59.26	69.06	56.41	66.15	53.85
1. UNDERSTANDS HOW OTHER DISCIPLINES RELATE TO THE STUDY AND PRODUCTION OF THE VISUAL ARTS	64.22	59.26	69.06	56.41	66.15	53.85
SUBAREA III. CRITICISM AND REFLECTION	69.5	77.22	71.70	53.70	68.66	83.33
1. UNDERSTANDS THE MAJOR PHILOSOPHIES OF ART AND AESTHETICS AND THEIR ROLE IN ART CRITICISM	70.6	79.49	75.94	57.58	73.43	100
2. UNDERSTANDS THE INDIVIDUAL AND COLLABORATIVE PROCESSES OF ART CRITICISM AND CRITIQUE	67.46	73.02	65.04	47.62	61.17	57.14

Art Education Test II data reveals that our students scored above the state average in the 2015-2016 school year and the 2017-2018 school year. However, our students scored 27.88 below the state average during the 2016-2017 school year. Recognizing that our 2016-2017 students scored below average in every category, except their understanding of modern and contemporary art, we looked for trends across the past three years to better understand our program. We saw that students consistently score below state average in Subarea II on questions concerning connections (understanding how other disciplines relate to the study and production of visual arts).

In the next year we will share this data with foundations faculty to serve as an impetus for collaboration between art education faculty and foundations faculty. Further, we plan to share our low scores about safety with the entire faculty to see how studio professors can explicate their safety practices for their students. Further, recognizing that students have scored lower than the state when tested on western art history and about non-western art history, students in ARED 2999 will be encouraged to keep notes from their Art History classes and use texts like *Prebels' Artforms* to explore non-western art and use *The Annotated Mona Lisa: A Crash Course in Art History from Prehistoric to Post Modern* to refresh their knowledge of western art history before they take the test.

edTPA (Planning)

Assessment Description:

The edTPA is a performance-based, subject-specific summative assessment administered to teacher candidates during clinical practice. The edTPA is aligned to state and national standards (CAEP Standards, Common Core State Standards, InTASC Standards) and provides evidence of the overall quality of teacher candidates and their ability to effectively teach all students. Each candidate prepares and submits for evaluation examples of authentic teaching materials, commentaries of their own teaching, and an unedited videotape from a three to five-day teaching segment that demonstrate how the candidate planned instruction, adapted instruction to meet the needs of diverse learners, and assessed the progress of the students.

Candidates are scored on 15 rubrics (except foreign language candidates who are scored on 13 rubrics and early childhood education and early childhood special education candidates who are scored on 18 rubrics) that reflect the expected competencies teachers are expected to display during the course of professional practice. Each of the rubrics is scored on a scale of one to five. The overall score represents the sum of the scores from all rubrics on a scale between 15 and 75 (a scale of 13 - 65 for 13-rubric handbooks and 18 - 90 for 18-rubric handbooks). Candidates receive both the total score and the scores from the individual rubrics.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

No candidates submitted edTPA during academic year 2017-18.

Academic Year Rubric Assessment Data:

No candidates submitted edTPA during academic year 2017-18.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Though no candidate submitted a portfolio for edTPA, the program is working to include assignments that scaffold the skills needed to pass edTPA.

Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (Field and Clinical Practice)

Assessment Description:

The Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) is an observation instrument and summative assessment for pre-service teachers adapted by the EPP from the Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards (TAPS), which is the observation component of the Georgia Teacher Keys Effectiveness System (TKES) currently being used to evaluate in-service teachers in Georgia P-12 schools. The Georgia Professional Standards Commission Educator Preparation Rule 505-3-.01 states, "GaPSC-approved education program providers shall ensure that candidates are prepared to implement the appropriate sections of any Georgia mandated curriculum in each relevant content area and any Georgia mandated educator evaluation systems". This assessment is based on the following ten performance standards used to assess in-service teachers in Georgia: 1) Professional Knowledge; 2) Instructional Planning; 3) Instructional Strategies; 4) Differentiated Instruction; 5) Assessment Strategies; 6) Assessment Uses; 7) Positive Learning Environment; 8) Academically Challenging Environment; 9) Professionalism; and 10) Communication. Raters are also given the "Teacher Assessment on Performance Standards Reference Sheet" that provides sample performance indicators for each standard.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

Early Field Experience CAPS Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Final Field Experience CAPS Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Clinical Practice CAPS Summative Evaluation Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

The enrollment in ARED 3000, 3010, 3012, and 4070/4090 was low last year. Thus, we do not have data from this assessment. Next year students from ARED 3000 will have data from the Intern Keys assessment. Students in ARED 4070/4090 will also have data from Clinical Practice Intern Keys Summative Assessment.

Impact on P-12 Student Learning (Effects on Student Learning)

Assessment Description:

Best professional practices indicate that initial candidates must demonstrate that they possess the necessary content and pedagogical proficiencies required to positively impact P-12 student learning. Specifically, initial candidates must demonstrate competency across teaching domains, including content mastery and the capacity to make data-driven decisions involving classroom and community contextual factors, the planning and implementation of standards-aligned instruction, the effective use of instructional strategies, the effective utilization of educational resources, including technology, the use of assessment to make necessary modifications in instruction, the ability to engage in meaningful reflection to improve teaching and learning, and the ability to empirically document the impact of instruction on student learning in an accurate, meaningful, and professional manner. Administered during clinical practice, the Initial Teacher Impact on Student Learning Assessment, performed by program faculty, is designed to verify candidates' ability to positively impact student learning by evaluating candidate knowledge, skills, dispositions, and capacities as indicated in CAEP Standard 1, the InTASC Standards, and other relevant Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs).

Academic Year Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Last year we had no students take ARED 4070/4090, thus there is no data to report. We should have one student in the spring of 2019.

Evaluation of Teacher Candidate Dispositions (Dispositions)

Educator Disposition Survey

Assessment Description:

The EPP has a strong commitment to ensuring that candidates develop and demonstrate behaviors indicative of critical dispositions. The shared values and beliefs of the EPP faculty are structured through the eight guiding principles: dispositions, equity, process, ownership, support, impact, technology, and standards. The EPP focuses on actions that reflect fairness and a belief that ALL students can learn. Teacher candidates who develop this disposition consider P-12 students with diverse backgrounds, skills, cultures, and experiences as viable learners. The EPP's first guiding principle is dispositions. The Dispositions Principle states, "productive dispositions affect learners, professional growth, and the learning environment". The Educator Disposition Survey contains 13 statements with which teacher candidates identify their level of agreement. Candidates are asked to identify, using a Likert scale, if they strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree, with statements addressing the dispositions the EPP faculty have identified as the most important for educators. Four of survey questions address the EPP-adopted belief that all students can learn. The survey is completed at entry to and exit from the initial teacher preparation program.

The EPP established the criteria of success by identifying desirable responses for each disposition statement on the survey. Strongly agree or agree is the desirable response for the following statements: 3) I believe that it is important to adapt instruction to students' different learning styles, and help students achieve in ways they find easy to learn; 4) I appreciate students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performances; 6) I believe that communication is essential in the classroom and school and that students' many different modes of communication should be encouraged and valued; 9) I believe it is important to ask for feedback, advice, and assistance to improve my practice as an educator; 10) As an educator, it is my responsibility to intervene when I see a student evidencing signs of difficulty academically, emotionally, socially, or physically; 12) I believe ALL students can learn; and 13) I believe that a teacher's skill in teaching has a greater impact on student achievement than the impact of a student's family background. The desirable response is strongly disagree or disagree for the following statements: 1) Students' personal motivation and family background have more to do with student achievement than what I do as a teacher; 2): I believe that schools today need to get back to basics teachers should present lessons for everyone in the same structure way for students to learn the content; 5) I believe that it is primarily the responsibility of administrators to establish a positive climate in the classroom and school; 7) I believe that lesson plans should be implemented as written; rarely should there be a need to deviate from those plans; 8) Assessment should be used primarily to determine students' grades and/or mastery of the goals on their IEPs; and 11) The most important variables that influence the impact of my performance as an educator are the students' family backgrounds and the students' personal motivation.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

Survey Question	Number of Candidate Responses		Percentage of Candidates Who Selected the Desirable Response	
	Entry	Exit	Entry	Exit
Students' personal motivation and family background have more to do with student achievement than what I do as a teacher.	8	0	75.0	-
I believe that schools today need to get back to basics -- teachers should present lessons for everyone in the same structured way for students to learn the content.	8	0	100.0	-
I believe that it is important to adapt instruction to students' different learning styles, and help students achieve in ways they find easy to learn.	8	0	100.0	-
I appreciate students' critical thinking, independent problem solving, and performances.	8	0	100.0	-
I believe that it is primarily the responsibility of administrators to establish a positive climate in the classroom and school. Teachers have limited impact on maintaining such a climate in a school.	8	0	87.5	-
I believe that communication is essential in the classroom and school and that students' many different modes of communication should be encouraged and valued.	8	0	87.5	-

I believe that lesson plans should be implemented as written; rarely should there be a need to deviate from those plans.	8	0	37.5	-
Assessment should be used primarily to determine students' grades and/or mastery of the goals on their IEPs.	8	0	37.5	-
I believe that it is important to ask for feedback, advice, and assistance to improve my practice as an educator.	8	0	100.0	-
As an educator, it is my responsibility to intervene when I see a student evidencing signs of difficulty academically, emotionally, socially, or physically.	8	0	100.0	-
The most important variables that influence the impact of my performance as an educator are the students' family backgrounds and the students' personal motivation.	8	0	75.0	-
I believe that ALL students can learn.	8	0	100.0	-
I believe that a teacher's skill in teaching has a greater impact on student achievement than the impact of a student's family background.	8	0	75.0	-

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

The data reveals that we have several students entering our program and zero students exiting. Students overall did well on the ethics assessment, but there were two sections where our students could improve. First, preservice teachers need to better understand the role of lesson plans in the classroom. Second, they need to understand the role of assessment and the term IEP before exiting the program. This content is covered in each art education methods course.

Candidate Assessment on Performance Standards (CAPS) Dispositions

Assessment Description: CAPS dispositions are a set of key dispositional elements designed to evaluate teacher candidates by their university supervisor during their final field experiences observation and their summative clinical experiences observation. CAPS dispositions offer an observational assessment of these key teacher dispositions, which are intended to contribute to the totality of evidence needed to fully assess a teacher candidate's abilities.

Academic Year Summative Evaluation Assessment Data:

Final Field Experience CAPS Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Clinical Practice CAPS Summative Evaluation Assessment Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

The enrollment in ARED 3000, 3010, 3012, and 4070/4090 was low last year. Thus, we do not have data from this assessment. Next year students from ARED 3000 will have data from the Intern Keys assessment. Students in ARED 4070/4090 will also have data from Clinical Practice Intern Keys Summative Assessment.

Continuous Improvement Assessment Matrix

Assessment Description:

The COEHS Continuous Improvement (CI) System is a multi-dimensional, web-based platform composed of two complementary functional components. The first component, the Proficiency Matrix, allows for easy organization and elaboration of the standards and proficiencies that are to be addressed within each academic program. The web-based presentation of the CI Proficiency Matrix affords access to individual programs of study, to associated course syllabi and to strategically arranged program proficiencies and assessment descriptions. The matrix organizes the program proficiencies progressively based on complexity and depth within six themes (assessment, content pedagogy, diversity, ethics/dispositions, technology, and field experience). A candidate's progression within a theme from the exploration phase, to application, and finally to integration is assessed via designated key course assessments developed by program faculty and strategically placed in the program to measure candidate growth. Collectively there are 40 EPP programs of study and nearly 450 individual course syllabi contained in the matrix. Each academic program includes up to 300 proficiencies along with the key course assessments which are imbedded at the application and integration proficiency levels. The proficiencies and the key course assessments are cross referenced in the program syllabi, all of which are available online. The results of the key course assessments are recorded in the CI Assessment Matrix which is the second component of the CI System. The aggregated scores on the assessments are arranged by theme and progression level allowing program faculty to make informed decisions within themes and at each progression level as to the effectiveness of the pedagogy used and the appropriateness of the content.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

There is no data from this assessment/ matrix because there is no matrix. This year we will design the matrix.

Teacher Candidate's Sense of Efficacy Scale

Assessment Description:

The Sense of Self-Efficacy Survey is based on the instrument developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001). This instrument comes in two versions: Short Form and Long Form. The Long Form version is administered twice to candidates in the program, once at the start of the program and again at the end of the program. Self-efficacy is a construct that implies the connection between confidence in one's ability and one's actual ability or effectiveness. Scholars have conducted research for decades on the link between self-efficacy and success in a variety of areas including academic achievement. Self-efficacy has also been applied to the effectiveness of teachers and the connection has been established between a teacher's sense of self-efficacy and their actual teaching effectiveness. This scale ranges from 1-9 with scores at the low end of the scale implying low self-efficacy and scores at the high end of the scale implying high self-efficacy.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing and elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17, 783-805.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

No candidates completed this assessment during academic year 2017-18.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

We did not have a candidate complete the program during the academic year of 2017-2018. For 2018-2019 we should have one person complete our program.

GaPSC Educator Ethics Assessment - Entry and Exit

Assessment Description:

The Georgia Ethics assessments are training and assessment programs composed of a series of modules that combine instruction and testing.

- The Georgia Educator Ethics assessment is designed for beginning and currently practicing teachers.
- The Georgia Ethics for Educational Leadership assessment is designed for educational leaders (principals/assistant principals and superintendents/assistant superintendents).

The goal is to help teachers and educational leaders become familiar with, understand, and apply the Georgia Code of Ethics for Educators, as well as comprehend and embrace the principles of ethical decision making in an educational context.

These assessments focus is on professionalism in education — in relationships with students, schools, colleagues, and communities — as well as on ethical understanding to guide decision making, and the specific regulations and expectations that teachers and educational leaders face in Georgia.

The Georgia Ethics assessments are offered at two levels: Program Entry and Program Exit. Each consists of seven interactive modules that combine instruction and testing. The modules instruct through video, gaming, and self-guided learning. Five of the modules include an end-of-module test with immediate feedback. The Program Exit level also includes an end-of-course, or summative, test.

Academic Year Assessment Data:

Educator Ethics Modules	Program Entry		Program Exit	
	Number Assessed	Mean Score	Number Assessed	Mean Score
Module 3: The Professional Educator and the Student	7	95.2	0	-
Module 4: The Professional Educator and the School	7	86.9	0	-
Module 5: The Professional Educator and the Community	7	91.7	0	-
Module 6: Ethical Decision Making for the Professional Educator	7	95.2	0	-
Module 7: The Professional Educator in Georgia	7	91.7	0	-
Module 8: Program Exit End-of-Course/Summative Test			0	-

Note: Data reported for the GaPSC Educator Ethics - Program Entry assessment are the highest score for candidates admitted into Teacher Education during the 2017-18 academic year and data reported for the GaPSC Educator Ethics - Program Exit assessment are the highest score for candidates who completed their program during the 2017-18 academic year.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Of the seven students who completed the entry ethics assessment, all seven received high scores. This may be the result of examining the code of ethics with students before they are expected to take this assessment.

Surveys for Program Improvement

Candidate Survey for Program Improvement

Survey Description:

As part of the overall College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) assessment process for initial teacher preparation programs, all candidates are asked to complete a Candidate Survey for Program Improvement (CSPI) upon completion of clinical practice. The candidates are asked to give their respective programs an overall grade, identify strengths, and make suggestions for improvements. In addition, various questions are asked about the integration of technology into instruction, preparation to meet the needs of diverse learners, quality of advising, and other areas. Results from this survey are shared with department heads and faculty members and utilized in planning program improvements.

Academic Year Survey Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Survey Comments: None

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

While we had no students finish clinical practice last year, so we have no data to analyze.

Graduate Survey for Program Improvement

Survey Description:

The Graduate Survey for Program Improvement (GSPI) was developed by members of the COE Assessment Committee in an effort to establish a procedure to follow up with graduates and employers. The GSPI is sent to graduates of initial teacher preparation and other school professional preparation programs the spring or summer of the year following their graduation. *In 2017, the GaPSC began administering an annual inductee survey to initial teacher program completers from the prior year who were employed in a Georgia public school. Due to survey fatigue, VSU does not survey these program completers using our internal survey (GSPI). Therefore, only responses from graduates not employed in a Georgia public school during the 2017-18 academic year and in the certification area for which the EPP prepared them are reported. Data from the GaPSC survey has not yet been made available to EPPs.*

Academic Year Survey Data:

No data available for academic year 2017-18.

Note: In 2017, the GaPSC began administering an annual inductee survey to initial teacher program completers from the prior year who were employed in a Georgia public school. Due to survey fatigue, VSU does not survey these program completers using our internal survey (GSPI). Therefore, only responses from graduates not employed in a Georgia public school during the 2017-18 academic year and in the certification area for which the EPP prepared them are reported. Data from the GaPSC survey has not yet been made available to EPPs.

Survey Comments: None

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

We have no data to analyze. However, one of the stakeholders is a former VSU student. She and I met to discuss program improvement.

Employer Survey for Program Improvement

Survey Description:

The Employer Survey for Program Improvement (ESPI) is sent to employers of graduates of initial teacher preparation and other school professional preparation programs in the spring or summer of the year following graduation. Each graduate from the past two years is listed, his/her preparation field is listed, and employers are asked to respond to items related to individual graduates. In 2017, the GaPSC began administering an annual employer survey to employers of initial teacher program completers from the prior year who were employed in a Georgia public school. Due to concerns over survey fatigue, employers of initial teacher program completers from non-Georgia public schools are surveyed using VSU's internal survey (ESPI). **Therefore, only responses from employers of graduates not employed in a Georgia public school during the prior academic year and in the certification area for which the EPP prepared them are reported. Data from the GaPSC survey has not yet been made available to EPPs.**

Academic Year Survey Data:

Note: In 2017, the GaPSC began administering an annual employer survey to employers of initial teacher program completers from the prior year who were employed in a Georgia public school. Due to concerns over survey fatigue, employers of initial teacher program completers from non-Georgia public schools are surveyed using VSU's internal survey (ESPI). Therefore, only responses from employers of graduates not employed in a Georgia public school during the prior academic year and in the certification area for which the EPP prepared them are reported. Data from the GaPSC survey has not yet been made available to EPPs.

Survey Comments:**Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:**

We have no data to analyze.

Mentor Teacher Evaluation of VSU Supervisor and Clinical Practice**Evaluation Description:**

At the end of clinical practice, mentor teachers who mentored teacher candidates during the current semester are asked to complete a survey on their assigned teacher candidate's university supervisor as well as provide comments on the clinical practice experience. In the survey, mentor teachers are asked to rate the university supervisor's communication, frequency of teacher candidate supervisor observations and meetings, and collaboration with the mentor teacher.

Academic Year Summative Evaluation Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Because we had no students complete the program, we have no data to analyze.

Teacher Candidate Evaluation of University Supervisor**Evaluation Description:**

Teacher candidates enrolled in a clinical practice course during the current semester are asked at the end of the semester to complete a survey on their assigned university supervisor as well as provide comments on the clinical practice experience. In the survey, teacher candidates are asked to rate the university supervisor's communication, feedback, frequency of observations and meetings, and collaboration.

Academic Year Summative Evaluation Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Because we had no students complete the program, we have no data to analyze.

**Teacher Candidate Evaluation of Mentor Teacher
Evaluation Description:**

Teacher candidates enrolled in a clinical practice course during the current semester are asked at the end of the semester to complete a survey on their assigned mentor teacher as well as provide comments on the types of activities completed during clinical practice. In the survey, teacher candidates are asked to rate the mentor teacher's communication, feedback, and collaboration with the teacher candidate.

Academic Year Summative Evaluation Data:

No 2017-18 academic year data available.

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

Because we did not have a student complete the program, we have no data to analyze.

Additional Evidence Data Information

This page of the Data Use for Strategic Program Improvement document is where program surveys, trainings offered, curriculum changes, program evaluations, or other additional program evidence from the academic year can be evidenced.

Evidence Description:

Evidence Data:

Analysis of EPP/Program Data/Evidence:

(to be completed by program faculty)