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| **Unit/Program Name** | Physical Education |
| **Office of Primary Responsibility** | Physical Education Program Director, Kym Kirby |
| **Assessment Coordinator** | Gina Barton |
| **Submission Date of this Report** | May 2, 2016 |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: The professional physical educator integrates content knowledge and skills of scholarly inquiry to teach all students.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY 2011-2012 | AY 2012-2013 | AY 2013-2014 | AY 2014-2015 | AY 2015-2016 |
|  | **1.** | Percent of physical education students who are "first time test takers" and achieved a score of 70% or higher on the discipline-specific scientific and theoretical concepts sub-test of the Physical Education Professional Knowledge Inventory (PE-PKI). | 44%(4 of 9 | 60%(3 of 5) | 40%(2 of 5) | 57%(4 of 7) | 17%(1 of 6) |
|  | **2.** | Percent of physical education students who are "first time test takers" and achieved a score of 70% or higher on the pedagogical knowledge and skills sub-test of the Physical Education Professional Knowledge Inventory (PE-PKI). | 78%(7 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 80%(4 of 5) | 86%(6 of 7) | 83%(5 of 6) |
|  | **3.** | Percent of physical education students who are "first time test takers" and achieved a score of 4 or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test of the Physical Education Professional Knowledge Inventory (PE-PKI; 2012-present).  | N/A | 100%(5 of 5) | 100%(5 of 5 ) | 100%(7 of 7) | 100%(6 of 6) |
|  | **4.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 146 or higher on the PRAXIS II - Test #0091 (2008-2012); or score a 169 or higher on the PRAXIS II - Test# 5095 (2012-present) demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification by the South Carolina Department of Education. | 100%(9 of 9) | 100%(5 of 5) | 100%(5 of 5) | 100%(7 of 7) | 100%(6 of 6) |
|  | **5.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 169 or higher on the PRAXIS II - Test #0093 (2008-2012) demonstrating content specific knowledge and video analysis of skill performance required for physical education certification by the South Carolina Department of Education. | 100%(9 of 9) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
|  | **6.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 3 or higher (4 point scale) on the Skill Competency and Game Play Evaluation (2011 - present). | 89%(8 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 100%(5 of 5) | 100%(7 of 7) | 86%(6 of 7) |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
|  | **1.** | PE-PKI sub-test (anatomical, physiological, biomechanical conceptual knowledge) | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES 499 to graduating seniors |
|  | **2.** | PE-PKI sub-test (motor development, motor learning, methods of instruction, measurement and assessment and adapted physical education) | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES 499 to graduating seniors |
|  | **3.** | PE-PKI sub-test (video analysis of motor skill competency - 2012- present) | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES 499 to graduating seniors |
|  | **4.** | PRAXIS II - Test # 0091 (2008-2012)PRAXIS II - Test #0095 (2012-present) | Every Fall semester in PEES 422 (Secondary Methods of Physical Education Clinical) |
|  | **5.** | PRAXIS II - Test #0093-Video Analysis (2008-2012) | Every Fall semester in PEES 422 (Secondary Methods of Physical Education Clinical) |
|  | **6.** | Skill Competency and Game Play Evaluation Rubric (2011 - present) | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES Content Skills classes (PEES 204, 206, 222, 223, and 224) |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
|  | **1.** | At least 80% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the anatomical, physiological, biomechanical conceptual knowledge sub-test | 70 - 79% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the anatomical, physiological, biomechanical conceptual knowledge sub-test | <70% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics of the human organism subtest. |
|  | **2.** | At least 80% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the motor development, motor learning, methods of instruction, measurement and assessment and adapted physical education sub-test | 70-79% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the motor development, motor learning, methods of instruction, measurement and assessment and adapted physical education sub-test | <70% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the emotor development, motor learning, methods of instruction, measurement and assessment and adapted physical education sub-test |
|  | **3.** |  At least 80% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test | 70-79% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test | <70% of "first time test takers" achieve a score of 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test |
|  | **4.** | 90% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II required exams. | 80% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II required exams. | <80% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II required exams. |
|  | **5.** | 90% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II (video analysis) required exam. | 80% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II (video analysis) required exam. | <80% of program completers will pass PRAXIS II (video analysis) required exam. |
|  | **6.** | At least 90% of students score 3 or higher on the Skill Competency and Game Play Evaluation | At least 80% of students score 3 or higher on the Skill Competency and Game Play Evaluation | <80% of students score 3 or higher on the Skill Competency and Game Play Evaluation |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Seventeen percent (n=1) of the six students scored 70% or higher on the conceptual knowledge subtest in anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics. The data were alarming to us. In an attempt to find an explanation for this low performance we investigated two areas: the groups' GPA and any other unique characteristics about this particular cohort. We found the GPA for these core courses to be 2.34, which is low compared to previous cohorts (2.85). Fifty percent (n=3) of six students in the 2015-2016 cohort are students who have had to repeat one or more of the core classes. In addition, one of the six students did an year long internship (Disney) which removed her from the content. Lastly, for 5 of the 6 students, PEES 310 (Biomechanics) was taught by an adjunct who was not retained after his first semester of teaching due to poor teaching evaluations and inconsistent course delivery. Biomechanics represents 30% of the core content area (sub-test 1). We feel each of these reasons contributed to the low performance in this particular sub-test. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Fifty-seven percent (n=4) of the seven students scored 70% or higher on the conceptual knowledge subtest in anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics. The data indicated the average score was 69.5%, an increase of 1.5% from AY 2013-2014. The number of "first-time" test takers who passed actually doubled in number during this academic year from the previous year. As expected, we have seen an increase in student performance due to what we believe to be the continuity of the Exercise Science faculty teaching these core courses. We will be reviewing the core course questions to ensure that the content is aligned with course objecitves. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Forty percent (n=2) of the five students scored 70% or higher on the conceptual knowledge subtest in anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics. The data indicated the average score was 68%, consistent with AY 2012-2013. The entire Exercise Science faculty (those responsible for teaching the content in this sub-test) is now in its third year of continuity with no turnover. We expect to see that continuity translate into significant student performance enhancements for this subtest, we anticipate that we will observe steady, albeit modest, progress towards meeting this outcome in the near future. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Sixty percent (n=3) of the five students scored 70% or higher on the conceptual knowledge subtest in anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics. The data indicated the average score was 68%, an increase of 1% point from AY 2011-2012. The entire Exercise Science faculty (those responsible for teaching the content in this sub-test) is now in its second year of continuity with no turnover. While it may take more than one year to see that continuity translate into significant student performance enhancements for this subtest, we anticipate that we will observe steady, albeit modest, progress towards meeting this outcome in the near future. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken. AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Forty-four percent (n=4) of the nine students scored 70% or higher on the conceptual knowledge subtest in anatomy, physiology, and biomechanics. However, the data indicated the average score was 67.%, a decrease of 1% point from AY 2010-2011. The turnover in faculty continues to impact the progress in this subtest. A new faculty member taught both PEES 210 and PEES 310 this year, and the content for both of these classes are a large part of this subtest. Based on item analysis of previous exams, we revised some of the questions in this subtest to better reflect the material being covered in the associated classes. However, a lack of consistency in faculty development due to constant turnover does not allow for the revised PKI to reflect improvements in student learning yet at this point. To be more specific, the Exercise Science faculty had one faculty member retire and another leave for another position at the end of the 2010-2011 academic year. Two faculty members were hired as replacements for the following year (2011-2012), but one was not retained due to poor teaching evaluations and inconsistent course delivery. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.  |
|  | **2.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for this subtest. Eighty-three percent (n=5) of the six students scored 70% or higher on the pedagocial knowledge and skills sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 73% which was the same as the AY 2013-2014 and AY 2014-2015. See Summary Section for further description actions taken. AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for this subtest. Eighty-six percent (n=6) of the seven students scored 70% or higher on the pedagocial knowledge and skills sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 73% which was the same as the AY 2013-2014.No substantive changes were made.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for this subtest. Eighty percent (n=4) of the five students scored 70% or higher on the pedagocial knowledge and skills sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 73%, a decrease of 3% points from AY 2012-2013. This decrease was minimal and we will continue to monitor future cohorts' performances.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for this subtest. Eighty percent (n=4) of the five students scored 70% or higher on the pedagocial knowledge and skills sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 76%, an increase of 6.9% points from AY 2011-2012. We believe that this increase is due to a combination of curricular changes and continuity between the two PETE faculty members' instructional methods/procedures and student expectations.AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was not met for this subtest. Seventy-eight percent (n=7) of the nine students scored 70% or higher on the pedagocial knowledge and skills sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 69.1%, an increase of 1.1% points from AY 2010-2011. Based on item analysis of previous exams, we revised some of the questions in this sub-test to better reflect the material being covered in the associated classes. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.  |
|  | **3.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for this subtest. One hundred percent of the six students scored 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 83%. This 11% decrease is due to an outlier which represents the individual who participated in the year long internship (Disney) and was removed from the content. No substantive changes were made.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for this subtest. One hundred percent of the seven students scored 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 94%. No substantive changes were made. AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for this subtest. One hundred percent of the five students scored 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 92%.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for this subtest. One hundred percent of the five students scored 70% or higher on the video analysis of motor skill competency sub-test. The data indicated the average score was 85%. This sub-test was added to the PE-PKI as a result of State Department of Educations elimination of the video analysis component for physical education teacher certification (PRAXIS II #0093). See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.AY 2011-2012N/A  |
|  | **4.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for PRAXIS II - Test #0095, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent (n=6) of the six students passed PRAXIS II. The average score was 178 (passing score = ≥169). No substantive changes were made.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for PRAXIS II - Test #0095, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent (n=5) of the five students passed PRAXIS II. The average score was 175 (passing score = ≥169). No substantive changes were made.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for PRAXIS II - Test #5095, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent (n=5) of the five students passed PRAXIS II. The average score was 185 (passing score = ≥169). No substantive changes were made.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for PRAXIS II - Test #0095, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent of the five students passed PRAXIS II. The average score was 173.8 (passing score = ≥169). No substantive changes were made.AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was met for PRAXIS II - Test #0091 or Test #0095, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent of the nine students passed PRAXIS II. The average score for PRAXIS - Test # 0091 was 152 (passing score = ≥146; N=4). The average score for PRAXIS - Test #0095 was 176 (passing score = ≥169; N=5). State requirements for PRAXIS II changed within the academic year from Test #0091 to all students being required to takeTest #0095. No substantive changes were made.  |
|  | **5.** | AY 2013 - 2014, AY 2014 - 2015, and AY 2015-2016This test is no longer administered; therefore, there is no data to report.AY 2012 - 2013Due to changes in PRAXIS II the South Carolina Department of Education, no longer requires students to take PRAXIS - Test #0093 to meet Physical EducationTeacher Certification requirement. See summary section for further descriptions of actions taken.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met PRAXIS II - Test #0093, demonstrating content specific knowledge and skills required for physical education certification. One hundred percent of the four students passed PRAXIS II. The average score was 170 (passing score = ≥160). No substantive changes were made.  |
|  | **6.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for Skills Competency and Game Play Evaluation. Eighty-three percent (N=6) of the six students scored 3 or higher on the Skills Competency and Game Play scoring rubric. The average score was 3.4. PETE faculty will continue to use technology (i.e., Coach's Eye) as a requirement for students to analyze their performance on a consistent basis. This self-assessment, combined with other formative assessments, are instrumental in holding students accountable to learning/performance as date indicate. No substantive changes were made.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for Skills Competency and Game Play Evaluation. Eighty-six percent (N=6) of the seven students scored 3 or higher on the Skills Competency and Game Play scoring rubric. The average score was 3.8. PETE faculty will continue to use technology (i.e., Coach's Eye) to require students to analyze their performance on a consistent basis. No substantive changes were made.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for Skills Competency and Game Play Evaluation. One hundred percent (N=5) of the five students scored 3 or higher on the Skills Competency and Game Play scoring rubric. The average score was 3.5. PETE faculty will continue to use technology (i.e., Coach's Eye) to require students to analyze their performance on a consistent basis. No substantive changes were made.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for Skills Competency and Game Play Evaluation. Eighty percent (N=4) of the five students scored 3 or higher on the Skills Competency and Game Play scoring rubric. The average score was 3.25. PETE faculty are instituting a more innovative use of technology (i.e., Coach's Eye) to require students to analyze their performance on a consistent basis. See Summary Section for further description of actions taken.AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was met for Skills Competency and Game Play Evaluation. percent (N=8) of the nine students scored 3 or higher on the Skills Competency and Game Play scoring rubric. The average score was 3.32. No substantive changes were made. |
|  | **Sum** | Each year we perform an item analysis for the PKI. The PKI data base shows an decrease in the percentage of students scoring 70% or higher for sub-test 1. There has been a consistent decline in student performance for this sub-test over the past 3 years. One contributing factor to this decline, we believe, is attributed to faculty turnover, as there has been an inconsistency in the delivery of Biomechnics content which represents 30% of sub-test 1. A second contributing factor is students’ lack of knowledge in the following questions (as determined by an item analysis): Questions 7, 8, 13, 14, 18, 20, 21, 26, 28, 41, 47 and 49. These questions have been targeted as questions to re-format and/or revise during a faculty workshop that will be conducted during the summer of 2016 in an effort to continue to align content with PKI standards and program goals. We believe a third contributing factor to this decline is that PETE students are consumed with field experiences and clinical practice during the semester PKI is administered. Faculty have discussed the implementation of required study sessions for PETE students in an effort to help students “reconnect” them to core content that is not revisited as often in physical education pedagogy classes. Again, "first time test takers" were analyzed for Goal 1 and the faculty want to continue with this procedure as we view that criterion as a true test of end-program knowledge. No plan of action is deemed necessary for sub-sections 2 and 3 of the PKI exam since student performance in these content areas have remained relatively consistent with a modest increase over the last 3 years. However, question alignment to course objectives for these content areas will also be reviewed during the 2016 Faculty Workshop as mentioned above. Learning outcomes 4 and 6 show consistent results that we believe is due to consistency in PETE courses and their alignment with our national accrediting agencies (SHAPE/CAEP) standards. We want to collect another year of data before making revisions or modifications to the assessments in this area.      |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
|  | **1.** |  |  |
|  | **2.** |  |  |
|  | **3.** |  |  |
|  | **4.** |  |  |
|  | **5.** |  |  |
|  | **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: The professional physical educator plans, provides and assesses learning experiences that are supported by research, knowledge of best practice and professional standards

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY 2011-2012 | AY 2012-2013 | AY 2013-2014 | AY 2014-2015 | AY 2015-2016 |
| **1.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 32 or higher on the PETE Lesson Plan Evalutation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment.  | 89%(8 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 100%(5 of 5) | 86%(6 of 7) | 83%(5 of 6) |
| **2.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 36 or higher on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. | 89%(8 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 80%(4 of 5) | 86%(6 of 7) | 83%(5 of 6) |
| **3.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 45 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. | 89%(8 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 100%(5 of 5) | 100%(7 of 7) | 100%(6 of 6) |
| **4.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | PETE Lesson Plan Evalutation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. | 4 times during a clincal practice semester |
| **2.** | PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment | 4 times during a clincal practice semester |
| **3.** | PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. | Every Fall and Spring semester in EDUC 461 (clinical practice) |
| **4.** |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | At least 80% of students achieve a score of 32 or higher on the PETE Lesson Plan Evalutation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment.  | 70-79% of students achieve a score of 32 or higher on the PETE Lesson Plan Evalutation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment.  | <70% of students achieve a score of 32 or higher on the PETE Lesson Plan Evalutation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment.  |
| **2.** | At least 80% of students achieve a score of 36 or higher on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment | 70-79% of students achieve a score of 36 or higher on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment | <70% of students achieve a score of 36 or higher on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment |
| **3.** | At least 80% of students achieve a score of 45 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning | 70-79% of students achieve a score of 45 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning | <70% of students achieve a score of 45 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning |
| **4.** |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | AY 2015 – 2016The expected outcome was met on the Lesson Plan Evaluation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. Eighty-three percent (n = 5) of the six students scored above 32 on the lesson plan evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 33.5 on a 40 point rubric scale. See Summary Section for further description of action taken.AY 2014 – 2015The expected outcome was met on the Lesson Plan Evaluation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. Eighty-six percent (n = 6) of the seven students scored above 32 on the lesson plan evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 36.6 on a 40 point rubric scale.AY 2013 – 2014The expected outcome was met on the Lesson Plan Evaluation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. One hundred percent (n = 5) of the five students scored above 32 on the lesson plan evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 32.5 on a 40 point rubric scale.AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the Lesson Plan Evaluation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. Eighty percent (n = 4) of the five students scored above 32 on the lesson plan evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 36.3 on a 40 point rubric scale.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met on the Lesson Plan Evaluation Rubric for instructional planning and assessment. Eighty-nine percent (n = 8) of the nine students scored above 32 on the lesson plan evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 35.2 on a 40 point rubric scale. |
| **2.** | AY 2015 – 2016The expected outcome was met on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. Eighty-three percent (N=5) of the six students scored above 36 on the instruction/teaching evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 38.1 on a 45 point rubric scale. See Summary Section for further description of action taken.AY 2014 – 2015AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. Eighty-six percent (N=6) of the seven students scored above 36 on the instruction/teaching evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 40.1 on a 45 point rubric scale.AY 2013 – 2014The expected outcome was met on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. Eighty percent (N=4) of the five students scored above 36 on the instruction/teaching evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 40.9 on a 45 point rubric scale.AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. Eighty percent (N=4) of the five students scored above 36 on the instruction/teaching evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 40.75 on a 45 point rubric scale.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met on the PETE Instruction/Teaching Evaluation Rubric for instructional implementation and assessment. Eighty-nine percent (N=8) of the nine students scored above 36 on the instruction/teaching evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 41.25 on a 45 point rubric scale |
| **3.** | AY 2015 – 2016The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. One hundred percent (n = 6) of the six students scored above 45 on the TWS evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 48.7 on a 60 point rubric scale. See Summary Section for further description of action taken.AY 2014 – 2015The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. One hundred percent (n = 7) of the seven students scored above 45 on the TWS evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 53.2 on a 60 point rubric scale.AY 2013 – 2014The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. One hundred percent (n = 5) of the five students scored above 45 on the TWS evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 51.5 on a 60 point rubric scale.AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. Eighty percent (n = 4) of the five students scored above 45 on the TWS evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 49.7 on a 60 point rubric scale.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for planning, instruction, assessment and impact on student learning. Eighty-nine percent (n = 8) of the nine students scored above 45 on the TWS evaluation rubric. The data indicated the average score was 48.9 on a 60 point rubric scale. |
| **4.** |       |
| **5.** |       |
| **6.** |       |
| **Sum** | This particular program goal (Indicators 1 and 2) continues to be a strength of our program as it measures overall teacher effectiveness. However, we use a limited number (n=4) of lesson plans and teaching evaluations to determine student performance. While this meets the Lander University Department of Teacher Education requirement, we are implementing a new evaluation system (letter grade as opposed to P/F) for the PETE student teachers beginning in AY2016-2017. We believe this will provide a more valid and reliable measure of student performance during clininical practice. For Indicator 3, beginning in AY2013-2014, student mastery was required for the Teacher Work Sample (TWS). This means students’ final submission of their TWS is reflective of several revisions based upon faculty feedback. The TWS continues to be used as a program assessment tool in all methods courses (PEES 320/329, Elementary Methods and PEES 422/429, Secondary Methods) prior to clincal practice experience. We believe this systematic progression of the TWS introduces the student well in advance to the expectations of the TWS during clinical practice resulting in improved performance.The PETE faculty continually work in conjuction with the Teacher Education faculty in developing and implementing revised assessments to meet unit, state and SPA accreditation requirements. These revisions are aligned with current trends in education. Overall, the impact of the changes have significantly improved student performance. The PETE faculty have established a long and strong relationship with p-12 educators within the community who in return contribute to the growth and success of our students.  |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: The professional physical educator communicates and collaborates with diverse populations (students, educators, families, and community members) exhibiting professional behaviors and dispositions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY 2011-2012 | AY 2012-2013 | AY 2013-2014 | AY 2014-2015 | AY 2015-2016 |
| **1.** | The average of all student scores on the Appropriate Professional Dispositions subsection of the PEES 499 Professional Disposition Scoring Rubric. | 2.76(n=9) | 2.53(n=5) | 2.78(n=5) | 2.43(n=7) | 2.83(n=6) |
| **2.** | The average of all student scores on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation (5-point scale for AY 2011-2015; 4-point scale for AY 2015-2016). | 4.09(n=9) | 4.07(n=5) | 4.1(n=5) | 4.25(n=7) | 3.54(n=6) |
| **3.** | The average of all student scores on the Job-Interview Skills subsection of the PEES 499 Professional Disposition Scoring Rubric. | 2.81(n=9 | 2.84(n=5) | 2.77(n=5) | 2.67(n=7) | 2.53(n=6) |
| **4.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | Professional Skills and Disposition Scoring Rubric - Professional Disposition Subsection | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES 499 |
| **2.** | Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation | Every Fall and Spring semester in EDUC 461 |
| **3.** | Job-Interview Skills subsection of the PEES 499 Professional Disposition Scoring Rubric. | Every Fall and Spring semester in PEES 499 |
| **4.** |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Professional Dispostion sub-section (evident through certifications, memberships, and volunteerism) will be at least 2.4 out of 3.0. | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Professional Dispostion sub-section (evident through certifications, memberships, and volunteerism) will be between 2.0 and 2.39 out of 3.0.  | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Professional Dispostion sub-section (evident through certifications, memberships, and volunteerism) will be less than 2.0 out of 3.0.  |
| **2.** | The average score of all student scores on theTeacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation will be at least 3.2 out of a 4.0 scale. | The average score of all student scores on theTeacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation will be between 2.8 and 3.1 out of a 4.0 scale.  | The average score of all student scores on theTeacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation will be less than 2.8 out of a 4.0 scale.  |
| **3.** | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Job Interview skills sub-section (evident through preparation, content of responses, grammar, and people skills) will be at least 2.4 out of 3.0  | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Job Interview skills sub-section (evident through preparation, content of responses, grammar, and people skills) will be between 2.0 and 2.39 out of 3.0  | The average score of all student scores on the three categories of the Job Interview skills sub-section (evident through preparation, content of responses, grammar, and people skills) will be less than 2.0 out of 3.0 |
| **4.** |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Professional Disposition sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. The average score of all students on category (a) memberships, was 3.0; on category (b) volunteerism, was 3.0; and on category (c) certifications, was 2.5.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Professional Disposition sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. The average score of all students on category (a) memberships, was 2.35; on category (b) volunteerism, was 2.45; and on category (c) certifications, was 2.5.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Professional Disposition sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. The average score of all students on category (a) memberships, was 2.85; on category (b) volunteerism, was 3.0; and on category (c) certifications, was 2.5.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Professional Disposition sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. The average score of all students on category (a) memberships, was 2.60; on category (b) volunteerism, was 2.43; and on category (c) certifications, was 2.5.AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Professional Disposition sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. The average score of all students on category (a) memberships, was 2.89; on category (b) volunteerism, was 2.94; and on category (c) certifications, was 2.47.  |
| **2.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. One hundred percent of the six students scored above a 3.2 on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. The data indicated the average score was 3.54 on a 4 point rubric scale. See Summary Results for further description.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. One hundred percent of the seven students scored above a 4 on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. The data indicated the average score was 4.25 on a 5 point rubric scale.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. One hundred percent of the five students scored above a 4 on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. The data indicated the average score was 4.1 on a 5 point rubric scale. AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. Eighty-nine percent (n = 8) of the nine students scored above a 4 on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. The data indicated the average score was 4.36 on a 5 point rubric scaleAY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. Eighty percent (n = 4) of the five students scored above a 4 on the Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation. The data indicated the average score was 4.47 on a 5 point rubric scale. |
| **3.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Job Interview Skills sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. By category, the average score of all students on category (a) preparation/profession appearance was 3.0; on category (b) quality of content when responding to interview questions was 2.4; and on category (c) people skills/grammar was 2.2.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Job Interview Skills sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. By category, the average score of all students on category (a) preparation/profession appearance was 3.0; on category (b) quality of content when responding to interview questions was 2.6; and on category (c) people skills/grammar was 2.4.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Job Interview Skills sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. By category, the average score of all students on category (a) preparation/profession appearance was 3.0; on category (b) quality of content when responding to interview questions was 2.8; and on category (c) people skills/grammar was 2.5.AY 2012-2013The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Job Interview Skills sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. By category, the average score of all students on category (a) preparation/profession appearance was 3.0; on category (b) quality of content when responding to interview questions was 2.82; and on category (c) people skills/grammar was 2.71. AY 2011-2012The expected outcome was met for the average of all three categories on the Job Interview Skills sub-section of the Disposition Scoring Rubric. By category, the average score of all students on category (a) preparation/profession appearance was 2.87; on category (b) quality of content when responding to interview questions was 2.75; and on category (c) people skills/grammar was 2.81. |
| **4.** |       |
| **5.** |       |
| **6.** |       |
| **Sum** | All three sub-sections of the Professional Disposition Scoring Rubric continue to be a program strength. Despite meeting each of these indicators of success, our program implemented a few changes that enhanced the professional disposition of our students. The professionalism/volunteerism component added to an introductory level course for PETE majors which requires a certain number of credits awarded through a variety of measures (i.e., memberships, certifications, volunteerism, PEES Club involvement, etc.) has proven to be an effective strategy for establising professional dispositional behavior. Data support that the establishment of this professional behavior has continued throughout their senior year. The Teacher Education Dispositions and Summative Evaluation Rubric was revised in AY 2015-2016. Teacher education faculty revised the instrument based upon clinical teacher feedback and university supervisor input. The instrument is an on-line evaluation in which the clinical teacher, the university supervisor and the student evaluate the student's professional dispostions. The instrument is now based upon a 4.0 scale as opposed to the previous 5.0 scale used for AY years prior to AY 2015-2016. We only report the university supervisor's total average score for this program report. The additional data are used by the university supervisor for reliability/triangulation purposes. Since 2008, we have used district personnel to assist with conducting mock interviews at the district office to replicate a professional setting for the interview experiences of graduating seniors. This process of interviewing, while time intensive, continues to significantly impacte student interviewing skills |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: The professional physical educator engages in reflection and professional development to foster student learning and inform instructional decisions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY 2011-2012 | AY 2012-2013 | AY 2013-2014 | AY 2014-2015 | AY 2015-2016 |
| **1.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 16 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric. | 89%(8 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 100% (5 of 5) | 100%(7 of 7) | 100%(6 of 6) |
| **2.** | Percent of physical education students who score a 24 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric | 78%(7 of 9) | 80%(4 of 5) | 100% (5 of 5) | 100% (7 of 7) | 100%(6 of 6) |
| **3.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for sub-section 5 - Unit Assessment Plan.  | Every Fall and Spring semester in EDUC 461 (clinical practice) |
| **2.** | PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Rubric for sub-section 7 - Analysis of Student Learning. | Every Fall and Spring semester in EDUC 461 (clinical practice) |
| **3.** |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | At least 80% of students achieve a score of 16 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric. | 70-79% of students achieve a score of 16 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric. | <70% of students achieve a score of 16 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric. |
| **2.** | At least 80% of students achieve a score of 24 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric | 70-79% of students achieve a score of 24 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric | <70% of students achieve a score of 24 or higher on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning) on the PEES TWS Scoring Rubric |
| **3.** |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | AY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan). One hundred percent of the six students scored 16 or above on the TWS subsection 5. The data indicated the average score was 16 on a 20 point rubric scale.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan). One hundred percent of the seven students scored 16 or above on the TWS subsection 5. The data indicated the average score was 16 on a 20 point rubric scale.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan). One hundred percent of the five students scored 16 or above on the TWS subsection 5. The data indicated the average score was 16 on a 20 point rubric scale.AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan). Sixty percent (n = 4) of the five students scored 16 or above on the TWS subsection 5. The data indicated the average score was 16.8 on a 20 point rubric scale.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 5 (Unit Assessment Plan). Eighty-nine percent (n = 8) of the nine students scored 16 or above on the TWS subsection 5. The data indicated the average score was 17.0 on a 20 point rubric scale. |
| **2.** | AAY 2015-2016The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning). One hundred percent of the six students scored 24 or above on the TWS subsection 7. The data indicated the average score was 24 on a 30 point rubric scale.AY 2014-2015The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning). One hundred percent of the seven students scored 24 or above on the TWS subsection 7. The data indicated the average score was 24 on a 30 point rubric scale.AY 2013-2014The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning). One hundred percent of the five students scored 24 or above on the TWS subsection 7. The data indicated the average score was 25.8 on a 30 point rubric scale.AY 2012 - 2013The expected outcome was met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning). Eighty percent (n = 4) of the five students scored 24 or above on the TWS subsection 7. The data indicated the average score was 25.8 on a 30 point rubric scale.AY 2011 - 2012The expected outcome was not met on the PETE Teacher Work Sample (TWS) subsection 7 (Analysis of Student Learning). Seventy-eight percent (n = 7) of the nine students scored 24 or above on the TWS subsection 7. The data indicated the average score was 25.4 on a 30 point rubric scale. |
| **3.** |       |
| **4.** |       |
| **5.** |       |
| **6.** |       |
| **Sum** | The Teacher Work Sample (TWS) is a program assessment tool that is used in all methods courses (PEES 320/329, Elementary Methods and PEES 422/429, Secondary Methods) prior to clincal practice experience. This systematic progression of the TWS, we believe, introduces the student well in advance to the expectations of the TWS during clinical practice resulting in improved performance. Since 2011-2012 we have required students in PEES 320/329 and PEES 422/429 clinicals to reflect daily on instructional decision making and their impact on student learning through a reported self evaluation. We believe this additional analysis correlates to improved performance in both subsections 5 and 7 of the TWS. However, the Department of Teacher Education (the unit) requires student mastery before the students' final submission. As a result, the data will naturally indicate 100% passing/meeting this indicator. The PETE faculty are discussing the implementation of a more valid measure of student learning which would be the evaluation of “first-time” TWS submissions for sections 5 and 7. This discussion/review of this particular evaluation system will take place during the PEES faculty workshop (summer 2016). We view this criterion as a true test of end-program knowledge.  |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**: The Department of Teacher Education will maintain national accreditation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome | AY 2008-2009 | AY 2009-2010 | AY 2010-2011 | AY 2011-2012 | AY 2012-2013 |
| **1.** | National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **2.** | National Association for Sport and Physical Education | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **3.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** | National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education Unit report | Every seven years. Most recently submitted in 2012 |
| **2.** | National Association for Sport and Physical Education SPA report | Every seven years. Most recently submitted in 2010 |
| **3.** |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** | Yes - Accredited | N/A | No - Not Accredited |
| **2.** | Yes - Accredited | N/A | No - Not Accredited |
| **3.** |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** | The unit continues its accreditated status. The unit faculty continue to attend and/or conduct workshops related to educational best practices that are aligned with accrediting agencies.  |
| **2.** | The PETE program continues its accreditated status. The PETE faculty continue to attend and/or conduct workshops related to best practices in physical education teacher education that are aligned with accrediting agencies.  |
| **3.** |       |
| **4.** |       |
| **5.** |       |
| **6.** |       |
| **Sum** |       |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Goal**:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strategic Goal Supported** |  |
| **Indicator of Success/ Student Learning Outcome****AND****Summary of Data** | Indicator/Learning Outcome |       |       |       |       |       |
| **1.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **2.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **3.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |       |       |       |
| **Assessment Instrument(s) and Frequency of Assessment** | Instrument | Frequency |
| **1.** |       |       |
| **2.** |       |       |
| **3.** |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |
| **Expected Outcome** | Met(3) | Partially Met(2) | Not Met(1) |
| **1.** |       |       |       |
| **2.** |       |       |       |
| **3.** |       |       |       |
| **4.** |       |       |       |
| **5.** |       |       |       |
| **6.** |       |       |       |
| **Review of Results and Actions Taken** | **1.** |       |
| **2.** |       |
| **3.** |       |
| **4.** |       |
| **5.** |       |
| **6.** |       |
| **Sum** |       |
| **Outcomes** | Indicator of Success Evaluation | Indicator of Success Score |
| **1.** |  |  |
| **2.** |  |  |
| **3.** |  |  |
| **4.** |  |  |
| **5.** |  |  |
| **6.** |  |  |
| **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** | $0.00Explanation |

1. **Unit/Program Summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Unit/Program Goal** | **Strategic Goal Supported** | **Unit/Program Goal Outcome** | **Additional Resources Required to Achieve or Sustain Results** |
|  |  | **Score** | **Evaluation****Met: 3.00 – 2.01****Partially Met: 2.00 – 1.01****Not Met: 1.00 – 0.01****Not Evaluated: 0.00** |  |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| 1.
 |  | 0.00 |  | $0.00 |
| **UNIT/PROGRAM TOTALS** | **0.00** |  | **$0.00** |
| **Unit/Program Summary (including evidence of improvements made to the program curriculum based on assessment):**       |