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

B. Outcome Reporting
1. The teacher 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.

Assessment Method(s)

Experiential Learning Plan – This is an assignment designed explicitly to meet this SLO. Students
must meet 10 criteria to demonstrate their knowledge and skill related to experiential learning,
specifically FFA and SAE.
1. Discuss Kolb’s Experiential learning model, the purpose, use, and stages of the cycle.
2. Demonstrate how a specific SAE experience flows through the Concrete Experience stage in the cycle.
3. Demonstrate how a specific SAE experience flows through the Reflective Observation stage in the cycle.
4. Demonstrate how a specific SAE experience flows through the Abstract Conceptualization stage in the cycle.
5. Demonstrate how a specific SAE experience flows through the Active Experimentation stage in the cycle.
6. Demonstrate how a specific FFA experience flows through the Concrete Experience stage in the cycle.
7. Demonstrate how a specific FFA experience flows through the Reflective Observation stage in the cycle.
8. Demonstrate how a specific FFA experience flows through the Abstract Conceptualization stage in the cycle.
9. Demonstrate how a specific FFA experience flows through the Concrete Experience stage in the cycle.
10. As a future teacher, how will you ensure students complete all stages of the Experiential Learning Cycle to
ensure effective learning.

Students complete this item the fall before they student teach and are scored on a rubric
ranging from Distinguished to Unacceptable.

Results

Nineteen students completed this assessment in Fall 2018. Of those students, one did not
complete all of the sections and received a failing grade (12/40). There were 14 who
scored a perfect 40 (scored “distinguished” on each of the 10 items). The remaining four
students scored between 32 -39 points overall. The average score on each of the 10
items was above 3.60 for each item (the one student who chose not to complete all of
the items skewed the results a little).

Overall, we were pleased with the scores on this assessment. Students were able to
demonstrate they gained satisfactory skills and knowledge on each of the components.
(With the exception of the one student who did not complete each section).
2. The teacher 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 600 in Fall 2018. To pass this assessment, candidates must score a “Developing (2)” or higher in each review category and have a minimum total of 17 points out of a possible 28 (60%).

Results

There were 18 students who completed the Ag Content Portfolio in the Fall 2018 semester. All of the students scored with an average in the “proficient” category or above. There were 8 (44%) who achieved scores between 25 and 28 to average the “distinguished” category, the other 10 (66%) scored between 19 and 23 to average the “proficient category.

The content portfolio has seven categories each with a maximum of four points. According to the scoring rubric, those scoring 17 to 24 are “proficient” while those scoring 25 to 28 are “distinguished.” All students scored in these two categories with 8 of the students falling in the distinguished 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.
3. Knowledgeable teachers of agriculture are able to integrate reading, writing, mathematics, and science content into instruction in agriculture.

**Assessment Method(s) & Results**

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 2019 Student Teaching Portfolio document from the College of Education). Students complete this assessment during their student teaching experience, which was Spring 2019 for all 17 students. We expect students to score “Meets Standard” or “Distinguished” on each measure.

**Student Teaching Portfolio 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.

**Student Teaching Portfolio 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**

Seventeen students completed each entry during the Spring 2019 semester (due in mid-April). For Entry 4, seven students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining 10 students scoring at the “meets standard” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level. For Entry 5, ten students scored at the “distinguished” level and seven students at the “meets standard” level.

Results of both entries is expected, but we would have liked to see more students in the “distinguished” level, but were pleased that no students scored in the “developing” area (we had one last year score at that level). 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.
4. Knowledgeable 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)

Assessment tools for this learning objective were the same as SLO #4. They are from the Student Teaching Portfolio, Entries 4 and 5. Each entry is described below (as stated in the Spring 2019 Student Teaching Portfolio document from the College of Education). Students complete this assessment during their student teaching experience, which was Spring 2019 for all 17 students. We expect students to score “meets standard” or “distinguished” on each measure.

Student Teaching Portfolio 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.

Student Teaching Portfolio 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

Seventeen students completed each entry during the Spring 2019 semester (due in mid-April). For Entry 4, seven students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining ten students scoring at the “meets standard” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level. For Entry 5, ten students scored at the “distinguished” level and seven students at the “meets standard” level.

Results of both entries is expected, we would have liked to see more students in the “distinguished” level, but were pleased that no students scored in the “developing” area (we had one last year score at that level). 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.
5. Effective instructional practice requires that teachers of agriculture 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 17 Spring 2019 student teachers. We also used the Praxis scores and final student teaching evaluation. All 17 student teachers completed the Student Teaching Portfolio Entries. The final student teaching evaluation is completed by each student’s cooperating teacher. Praxis scores are reported for all individuals who took the assessment which limits us from knowing how many were students from our program and how many were others who just wanted to take the assessment.

Below is a short explanation of each instrument used to assess this learning objective.

**Student Teaching Portfolio 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.

**Student Teaching Portfolio 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 Teaching 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. The instrument contains 30 different competencies. The competencies are included in the following categories:

1. The Learner and Learning
2. Content Knowledge
3. Instructional Practice
4. Professional Responsibility
5. Dispositions

Praxis scores - All students in the program are required to take the Principles of Learning and Teaching (PLT) and the Ag Content tests. They are Praxis exams and administered at certified testing centers. The passing score for the PLT is 160 and 147 for the Ag Content Test. Our data is provided to us by K-State College of Education.

**Results**

For Entry 6, eleven students scored at the “distinguished” level with the remaining 6 in the “meets standard” level. No students scored at the “developing” or “unacceptable” level. We
were pleased that we had a majority score at the distinguished level, but will continue to work with students in order that more are able to achieve that score.

Results of Entry 7 yielded sixteen students in the “distinguished” level with the remaining 1 student scoring at the “meets standard” level. No students scored at the developing or unacceptable level. We were very happy that all but one student scored at the distinguished level on this item.

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 in an effort to reduce the number who score in the “developing” area.

Scores from the final Student Teaching Evaluation were provided by the College of Education. The 17 students were evaluated by their cooperating teacher on 30 different competencies. Student scores ranged from 3.07 – 3.90 with an average score of 3.29. Because each student had to receive at least a 3 on each item in order to pass student teaching, this score is what we expected. We know there are still areas of growth for the students and they will continue to develop as they enter their own classrooms after graduation.

The Praxis PLT Grades 7 -12 was administered to 169 K-State affiliated students. The Median score was 177 (one point above the national average) with 150 (96%) passing the exam. The Ag Content Test was administered to 25 K-State affiliated students. The median score was 173 (four points above the national average). The report stated that 21 of those taking the exam were majoring in Agricultural Education and 100% of them passed the test.

A secondary report was provided after a request was put in to the College of Education for more details on the 21 students. Unfortunately, the report was not just for majors only, but included all who took the Ag Praxis between March 2019 and August 2019. Of the fifteen scores listed on the chart, 13 passed the exam. The mean score for all 15 was 168.2 (KSDE requires a score of 147 to pass).
6. 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 17 student teachers completed the entries. In addition, Category 4: Professional Responsibility on the Final Student Teaching Evaluation was also used to assess this SLO.

Student Teaching Portfolio 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.

Student Teaching Portfolio 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.

The Final Student Teaching Evaluation contains the category “Professional Responsibility.” The cooperating teachers assess each student on their “professional learning and ethical practice” and “leadership and collaboration.” Each of the two sub-categories contains two items.

Results

For Entry 9, nine students scored in the “distinguished” category with the remaining eight in “meets standard”. Assessment of Entry 10 resulted in only six students in the “distinguished” category, with the remaining eleven in “meets standard”.

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.

For Category 4 of the Final Student Teaching Evaluation, cooperating teachers assessed the students on four separate items. Eleven students yielded “distinguished” on two of the items (9a and 10a), twelve students were “distinguished” on 10b, while fifteen students were “distinguished” on 9b. The remaining students were “meets standard” on each of the four competencies. The competency with the highest number in distinguished related to students’ ability to reflect and change their teaching practices based on evidence. The two items scoring the lowest related to seeking out professional development and leadership roles.
While we would have liked to see more of our students score at the “distinguished” level on these items, we also understand that they are balancing the roles of student and teacher during their final semester. They will step into the leadership roles after the graduate and enter the profession.
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, graded by Dr. Ulmer, included changes made to reflect the new Ag Standards and changes to the curriculum. The Experiential Learning Plan was developed and assessed by Mrs. Brandie Disberger. The faculty approved the rubric and deemed it appropriate to capture the data needed for the corresponding student learning objective.

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 student's 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 future students to perform 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 Teacher Education Program Retention Assessment (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 three years (2016-2017; 2017-2018; 2018-2019) 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). Each year we reflect on the total degree program and make any necessary changes to benefit the students. Through all our work, we refer 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 in Fall 2018 to review our assessments and align the rubrics to existing criteria. We also met with Dr. Goodson in Summer 2019 to make sure our assessments are ready to begin the first year of data collection.

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. We continue to look for opportunities to meet these standards through degree program modifications, course revisions, and experiential learning opportunities.

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. This last year was the first in which the College of Education did not make radical changes to the portfolio. We all now feel much more prepared to assist our students in meeting the expectations outlined in the student teaching portfolio.

Finally, to demonstrate the success of our program, we were named the NAAE Region II Outstanding Postsecondary Agriculture Program in 2019. This award program recognizes six exemplary postsecondary programs from across the nation each year. We are honored to be included in this elite group of programs.
**Future Plans**

Our outcomes are based on the KSDE program review standards. We will continue to seek out opportunities to meet the learning needs of our students while meeting the standards for accreditation.

We are still working to connect our learning outcomes to the assignments on Canvas in order to ease the assessment report process. We continue to work with COE in order to more easily access our students’ assessment scores on the student teaching portfolio entries.

The agricultural education faculty continually seek out grant funding to provide an innovative and highly impactful educational experience for the undergraduate students. We will continue to identify program needs and funding agencies that we can solicit to support program growth.

Finally, we are working on a multi-year effort to obtain/create/build facilities that will meet the learning needs of our students, with a high priority in the agricultural mechanics area.

**Summary of this Report**

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.