

Undergraduate Assessment of Student Learning Report
Report for Academic Year:

A. Program Information

Department: Communications and Agricultural Education
Program: Agricultural Education
Contact Name: Gaea Hock
Contact Email: ghock@ksu.edu

B. Outcome Reporting

1. *Teachers of agriculture will possess knowledge of agriculture in the areas of animal systems, plant systems, power, structural and technical systems, agribusiness systems, environmental service and natural resource systems, biotechnology systems, and food products and processing systems.*

Assessment Method(s)

Ag Content Portfolio – The intent of this assignment is to provide students an opportunity to ‘showcase’ their content knowledge/background in preparation for entry into the middle-secondary classroom. It also represents for the Department of Secondary Education a source of data from which to make decisions that are:

- Consistent with a continuous improvement model;
- Consistent with our conceptual framework [Perspectives and Preparation, sub-category “Content and Pedagogy” (i.e., Content Area Knowledge)] and Professionalism, sub-category “Reflects on Practice.”]; and
- Reported to the Kansas State Department of Education (KSDE) as the number of teacher licensure candidates meeting a standard of proficiency.

Successful completion of this assignment required students to submit evidence for each content standard in the subject area(s) they plan to seek KSDE licensure. Evidence to be considered includes:

- A reflective essay written by the teacher candidate for each individual content standard;
- Evidence (or artifacts) from the course(s) identified as contributing to the teacher candidates’ understanding of the content represented by the individual content standard; and
- Grades obtained in the course(s) matched to each individual content standard.

Students complete this assessment during the fall of their senior year, but it is a summary of all their content learning since beginning of their college career. Students completed this assessment in AGED 400 in Fall 2017, but will complete it in AGED 600 in future years. Students are expected to achieve at a proficient or higher level on this assessment.

Results

There were 19 students who completed the Ag Content Portfolio in the Fall 2017 semester. All of the students scored at least 90/100 (A). There were 7 who achieved 100%, 6 who scored in the 95-98% range and 6 who received a 90% on this assessment item.

According to the scoring rubric, those scoring 80-90% are “proficient” while those scoring 91-100% are “exemplary.” All students scored in these two categories with 13 of the students falling in the exemplary category.

Results of this assessment support the finding that students are receiving adequate preparation in terms of their content courses and their ability to apply that learning to the teaching field.

2. Teachers of agriculture are able to integrate reading, writing, mathematics, and science content into instruction in agriculture.

Assessment Method(s)

Assessment tools for this learning objective were from the Student Teaching Portfolio, Entries 4 and 5. Each entry is described below (as stated in the Spring 2018 Student Teaching Portfolio document from the College of Education). Students complete this assessment during their student teaching experience, which was Spring 2018 for all 19 students. We expect students to score “proficient” or “Exemplary” on each measure.

Entry 4 Content Knowledge

The candidate understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates content-specific learning and literacy experiences that make the discipline accessible and relevant to assure mastery of the content.

Entry 5 Application of Content

The candidate understands how to engage learners through interdisciplinary lessons that utilize concept based teaching and authentic learning experiences to engage students in effective communication, collaboration, outside resources, reading, technology, and in critical and creative thinking.

For each entry students had to complete a reflective essay highlighting their learning in the specific area. They also had to include artifacts to demonstrate their learning. Example of artifacts included: unit plans, lesson plans, course plans, class syllabi, teacher observations, and teacher evaluations, student feedback, student evaluations, assignments, and student work.

Results

Nineteen students completed each entry during the Spring 2018 semester (due in mid-April). For Entry 4, three students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining 16 students scoring at the “proficient” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level. For Entry 5 – three students scored at the “distinguished” level, 15 students at “proficient”, and 1 student was in the “developing” area.

Results of both entries is expected, but we would have liked to see more students in the “distinguished” level. We were also disappointed to see one in the “developing” area for Entry 5. We met as a faculty to discuss specific tasks we could do in future fall semesters to get students more prepared to achieve a higher score. We require them to do a ‘practice’ portfolio and will work to make it more rigorous to help prepare them for the spring portfolio.

3. *Teachers of agriculture are able to apply knowledge in real world agricultural settings and address life and career skills, critical thinking and communication skills, and information, media and technology skills to assure learner mastery of the content.*

Assessment Method(s) & Results

This learning objective was assessed using the same two entries in the Student Teaching Portfolio (Entry 4 & 5) as the previous learning objective (#2). Please refer to the methods and assessment results above as they are the same for this LO.

4. *Teachers of agriculture demonstrate effective instructional practice and are able to: plan for classroom and laboratory learning, create valid and reliable assessments of learning, and practice instructional strategies in classroom and laboratory settings within the areas of animal systems, plant systems, power and technical and structural systems, agribusiness systems, natural resources and environmental service systems, biotechnology systems, and food products and processing systems.*

Assessment Method(s)

This is a large learning objective and therefore requires multiple assessments. The majority of assessment tools are from the student teaching portfolio for the 19 Spring 2018 student teachers. We also used the Praxis scores and final student teaching evaluation. All 19 student teachers completed the Student Teaching Portfolio Entries. The final student teaching evaluation is completed by each student's cooperating teacher.

Below is a short explanation of each Student Teaching Portfolio Entry used to assess this learning objective.

Entry 3 Learning Environment

The candidate works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, includes teacher and student use of technology, and encourages positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Entry 4 Content Knowledge (Same Student Teaching Portfolio Entry number as LO's 2 &3)

Entry 6 Assessment

The candidate understands how to use multiple measures to monitor and assess individual student learning, engage learners in self-assessment, and use data to make decisions.

Entry 7 Planning for Instruction

The candidate plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, technology, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Students had to write a reflective essay detailing for they met the required items for each entry and provide artifacts. Artifacts included student assignments, student feedback, lesson plans, teacher observations and evaluations, teacher reflections, unit plans, lesson plans, course plans, class syllabi, and assessments.

Final Student Evaluation- This evaluation is distributed to the cooperating teachers each spring. They report their assessment on the students. *In order to "pass" student teaching and qualify for a license, a score of 3 or 4 must be achieved on each measure.

Results

Results of Entry 3 included seven students scoring in the “distinguished” level, 11 in “proficient” and one in the “developing” level. No students scored in the unacceptable level.

Entry 4 results were already discussed for LO #2 & #3 (above), three students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining 16 students scoring at the “proficient” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level.

For Entry 6, five students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining 15 in the “proficient” level. No students scored at the “developing” or “unacceptable” level.

Results of Entry 7 yielded fifteen students in the “distinguished” level with the remaining 4 students scoring at the “proficient” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level.

Unfortunately, scores from the final Student Teaching Evaluation were not available due to turnover in the College of Education office that disseminates and collects data from the evaluation. We have communicated to COE about the importance of knowing our students results and they assure use we will have that information in the future.

Overall, we were pleased with how our students scored on the portfolio entries. We intend to move a higher percentage of them to the “distinguished” level and none in the “developing” area.

5. *Teachers of agriculture engage in meaningful and intensive professional learning by participating in professional organizations, study, self-reflection and collaboration.*

Assessment Method(s)

This learning objective was assessed with Student Teaching Portfolio Entries 9 and 10. All 19 student teachers completed the entries.

Entry 9 Professional Learning and Ethical Practices

The candidate engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Entry 10 Leadership, Participation, and Collaboration

The candidate seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, support staff, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

For each entry, students were required to write a reflective essay demonstrating how they met the requirements for that particular item. They also had to provide artifacts to support their essay.

Results

For Entry 9, seven students scored in the “distinguished” category with the remaining 12 in “proficient”. Assessment of Entry 10 resulted in only 2 students in the “distinguished” category, with the remaining 17 in “proficient”.

This learning objective is hard to evaluate due to the more internal nature of the items being assessed, but the two student teaching portfolio entries are satisfactory to encourage students to reflect on how they grew as a professional during the student teaching semester.

We were disappointed more students did not score in the distinguished category. We will work harder to help students recognize ways they can improve in the key areas of this learning objective. We also discussed that they may not know how to provide artifacts to demonstrate their level of achievement in this area. We will make examples of those artifacts clear to students early in the semester so they will be able to collect them throughout their time in the classroom.

C. Program Self Review

Faculty Review of Annual Assessment Data and Process

Describe how program faculty reviewed the assessment results and process to decide on actions/revisions.

The faculty met both formally and informally throughout the year to discuss how the students were performing on the assessments. The Ag Content Portfolio was graded by Dr. Ulmer and changes were made to the rubric for future years to reflect the new Ag Standards and changes to the curriculum.

Faculty also reviewed the student teaching portfolio entries prior to their final submission for students who wanted us to provide them with feedback. After they were submitted, we were allowed to assess the students final student teaching portfolio and worked with students who were given the opportunity to correct any errors and resubmit for a re-grade. It was through this work that we identified key areas to emphasize and assist our students in performing at a higher level.

In addition to the items included in the official assessment report, we continually assess our program with qualitative feedback, advisory committee meetings, and feedback from recent graduates currently teaching at the high school level. We also received the results of the TERPA which allowed our current students to complete a survey as to their K-State Ag Ed experience. We were pleased to see the results of the survey as K-State scored higher than the average in all but one category.

Program Improvements

In the last two years (2016-2017 and 2017-2018) the faculty have worked hard to review and revise the existing degree program. Due to our efforts, we successfully reduced the degree program from 130 to 120 credit hours, added more flexibility to the required agriculture courses, and added content-specific courses to needed areas (i.e. agricultural mechanics). Through all our work, we referred back to student assessments and ways we can work to improve them.

In preparation for the CAEP review, we met with Dr. Burden in College of Education to review our assessments and align the rubrics to existing criteria.

New KSDE State Standards for Agricultural Education were written in 2014 and went into effect in 2016. We worked hard to review our curriculum and assessments to guarantee we are meeting and assessing those standards.

Due to accreditation, most of our assessment tools are tied to the Student Teaching Portfolio. Brandie Disberger serves on the Portfolio Committee in the College of Education. Her work on the committee helps to bridge the expectations put on us from the state department with those that we believe are needed for our particular group of students to be successful.

Future Plans

Our outcomes are based on the KSDE program review standards. The outcome below is a new standard that we will assess starting in the 2018-2019 school year.

Outcome #1 Teachers of agriculture provides opportunities for learners who bring unique individual differences to the learning process and provides learners with supportive individual experiential learning opportunities through the National FFA Organization (FFA) and supervised agricultural experience (SAE), to ensure that each student learns new knowledge and skills.

In order to assess this standard, a new “Experiential Learning Plan” assignment and rubric will be created for administration in AGED 621 starting in Fall 2018.

Additionally, the Ag Content Portfolio assignment and scoring rubric was updated to more accurately measure items included in the new standards.

We are working to connect our learning outcomes to the assignments on KSOL in order to ease the assessment report process.

We are working with COE in order to more easily access our students assessment scores on the student teaching portfolio entries.

Summary of this Report

We are still learning how to conduct the assessment process due to two new faculty members and needing to meet accreditation standards. We are able to start to recognize key areas of concerns in relation to our student learning outcomes. Our students are performing at an adequate level on each measure, but there are areas of improvement and enhancement. The assessment process has allowed us to modify our lessons, assignments, and feedback in an effort to help them achieve at a higher level on the assessments used for this report. The Agricultural Education faculty meet on a regular basis to discuss students, coursework, and areas for refinement and change.