

Department of Secondary Education
Annual Report
For Fiscal Year 1 May 2010- 1 June 2010
Dr. Linda Hutchison, Head

Section 1: Introduction

This year was another transition year in which new hires, budgeting, and SPA (Specialized Professional Associations) accreditation were all external factors affecting the functioning of the department. The department faculty served as chairs in four hires—three within the department and one college-wide hire for an Endowed Chair in Literacy Education. These hires were the result of a variety of factors. We had one faculty member retire, and two resignations for different reasons. Fortunately we were approved to hire for the areas of science education, agricultural education and modern languages education. We successfully hired Andrea Burrows in Science Education, Chris Haynes in Agricultural Education and we will be continuing the modern language education search to find a candidate that will fulfill the job requirements. All of these hires were at the Assistant Professor level which was prudent given the construction of the various levels in the department. We saw it as imperative to hire faculty who would be successful in the tenure process and we have already begun departmental discussions around the provision of appropriate and targeted mentoring and support for our new faculty. We want our new faculty to be successful and realize what is important in achieving tenure.

Our budget is still at the belt-tightened level although it felt looser because of support for programs at the College level. We appreciate that support from the Dean to pay for the many programs within the department that have very real needs to maintain a quality education for our undergraduate students. Within the department we are focusing on integrating our undergraduate and graduate concerns so that all faculty can adequately participate in the decisions facing both. We still continue to trouble-shoot in some graduate situations but we no longer have to investigate every question posed by faculty and students. Concerns still remain for tracking students as many of the forms and students cross departments and faculty for assistantships but this past year saw us functioning better than the previous year. We continue to be diligent to make sure all forms are filed in the correct manner.

Secondary Education Faculty have been actively working during these transitions to continue the work of the preservice Teacher Education programs including continuing work on moving programs toward National Recognition for NCATE SPA Accreditation as well as strengthening the Curriculum and Instruction Graduate program areas. Two additional content areas received National Recognition so; in addition to Mathematics Education (NCTM) and English Education (NCTE); Social Studies Education (NCSS), and Science Education (NSTA) are now Nationally Recognized by their respective National Organizations (as noted) and NCATE. A final application for Modern Languages Education (ACTFL) was also completed this year by the department head and a graduate assistant and we anticipate hearing the outcome in early fall. This work will be discussed further in this report. Other areas of continued work are the concurrent majors and post-baccalaureate credential program, which will also be explained in more depth later in this report. One additional area of undergraduate work was the designation of endorsement areas for science education teachers, which became finalized within the

college during this year and we have earned final PTSB approval for these science education endorsements.

It is the partnership of the concurrent majors that is helping to increase our enrollment numbers and we believe that the departments of both majors benefit. Our post-baccalaureate program is growing because many students who previously earned a content degree have enrolled in our single-year program to earn a teaching credential. This past year the department passed the Agricultural Education concurrent major, solidifying many concurrent majors into a single programs concurrent majors and simplifying the load so that a single faculty member could be responsible for the new resulting program. This was done to reflect national standards in agricultural education and the trend toward a more science oriented degree. Our agricultural education students will take enough life science coursework to also choose to earn an endorsement in biological sciences which will help their potential for employment after graduation. The work with the College of Agriculture and the department is important for improving our enrollment numbers in this major.

Section 2: Academic Planning Implementation

The section that follows delineates our Action items with appropriate corresponding College and University Action items noted. Each action item is addressed with our accomplishments this year or the year it was completed.

Action Item #1:

Continue our work with Partner Schools to:

- Provide quality Residency experiences for both our students and their mentors as well as K-12 students, and
- Support content professional development with our district partners. (CoEd Action Items #5 and #8, UW Action Item #18)
- Identify opportunities for field experiences with culturally diverse K-12 students. (CoEd Action Item #5)

95% of our majors are placed in partner school placements in Albany County SD #1, Natrona County SD #1, and Laramie County SD #1. This placement percentage has steadily increased each year, even with larger numbers of students, from 60% for the 2005 placement year. These placements and work with partner districts help make for quality placements for our students who are ready to experience teaching. We realize that further work needs to be done with our partner schools in content area teaching and learning and when the staff development plan is initiated, we can begin to support more content professional development for our partner districts. We will continue to rotate placements to prevent teacher burnout.

Action Item #2:

Explore the feasibility and use of technology for unique instructional purposes, such as one-to-one computing.

We believe that students learn how to use technology best by using it prior to their Residency experience. To wait until Residency in schools means they are trying to cope with too many variables as they learn to teach. We also notice that many mentor teachers would benefit from learning how to use what they have available in their classrooms as

many districts are avoiding professional development in technologies. The hardware exists in schools but many teachers have not been trained to use it yet. So the department is working on how to best include content-specific technologies in the methods courses. It is an important factor for our undergraduates and graduate students. We see the need to continually keep updated in educational technologies as they become available. Some of our partner secondary schools have gone to one-to-one computing in the past few years. We do not see these similar goals in either the college or university plans so this year we will continue to define the parameters of our exploration and evaluate the necessity of doing one-to-one computing at the university to have our students be technologically competent in classrooms.

Action Item #3

Explore opportunities to expand our international work in secondary schools addressing learning and teaching in our content fields; and identify sources of (internal or external) funding. (CoEd Action Item #1)

Our faculty has been collaborating internationally and we continue to work with the College and University on providing study abroad opportunities for our students. This past year our department took active steps in working with our colleagues from Bolivia as several students, faculty and dignitaries visited UW this past year. This past year Dr. Carol Bryant was awarded a grant to fund Project Citizen work with Bolivia. This work funded Drs. Bryant, Taylor, and Medina-Jerez's as well as other non-departmental College of Education faculty and State Department of Education staff's trip to Bolivia in May 2010 as well as a delegation from Bolivia to visit UW. We have established a relationship with the **Normal Superior Simón Bolívar** teacher preparation institute in La Paz, Bolivia. The Bolivian visitors met with all of our methods students as we worked to learn about schools in Bolivia and further establish ties. A Memorandum of Understanding establishing a non-funded expression of interest in working together was established. The funding obtained was for the 2009-2010 and the 2010-2011 school year and Dr. Bryant anticipates the possibility of being funded again this coming year. For our continuing involvement this source of funding is critical. At this point our Bolivian counterparts are suffering funding/political glitches so Dr. Bryant is unsure of the progress that can be made this next year. More of the department faculty needs to be involved in this project to attain an understanding of the scope.

Action Item #4

Develop a professional development plan for content-specific in-service teachers. Our focus will center on content area learning and teaching. Using the development of a college-wide plan as a focus, our department will work together to identify a department plan that will supplement and support the college and SMTC efforts. The department plan will be responsive yet create a manageable set of contributions for each faculty member. (CoEd Action Item #8, UW #96)

We look forward to the discussion of developing a College Professional Development Plan. A department plan discussion will begin when the college and SMTC begin a discussion. We anticipate that these discussions will involve appropriate Secondary

Education faculty. It is important that faculty participate in workload changes as they occur.

Action Item #5

Continue to align assessment systems for future NCATE and SPA accreditation through collaborations with our partner departments in Colleges of Arts and Sciences and Agriculture. (CoEd #1, UW #21)

We continue to work with partner departments in aligning proposed changes to the SPA accreditation standards as the changes are requested. We are awaiting word for our last SPA-application area that is “Nationally Recognized with Conditions.” In receiving this designation, the SPA required different or additional data for moving these programs to being “Nationally Recognized.” This area is Modern Languages (rewritten by Dr. Linda Hutchison and Marium Aburgasea-Heidt) and was submitted for final review Spring 2011 after more corrections were required on Dr. Taylor’s submission in Spring 2010.

Action Item #6

Continue departmental collaborative faculty research efforts focusing on professions critical to the region. Explore possibilities of collaborative research with HBCU’s from the UW list. (CoEd Action Item #4, UW #32)

The research efforts will be addressed in Section 4.

We will take our lead from the University on developing specific HBCU relationships when the establishment of parameters for involvement is discussed. We would actively participate in cementing HBCU relationships if it becomes possible to work further on our diversity goals.

Section 3. Teaching Activities:

The department recognizes quality teaching and rewards this past year have been through words of praise for those scoring at a high level. It continues to be an important part of post-tenure review as well as our pre-tenure cases. Discussions about how pre-tenure cases could be supported have been a regular part of tenure case discussions in the department. New pre-tenure faculty will be encouraged to follow through on offers of assistance for this to be effectively implemented.

Section 4. Research and/or Creative Activities:

This past year we have been continuing our work on the goal of strengthening our research productivity but it should be noted most faculty are meeting or exceeding college expectations for this area. Our submissions continue to increase as a department. Portions of department faculty meetings are spent discussing research of faculty, but we should probably make it more consistent. We will continue to support this for the next few years as we realize that this is just a start. Supporting increasing research productivity as a department is critical for our long-term success. The input of the Endowed Chairs has provided additional technical support and mentoring of our Associate and Assistant Professors in the area of research have positively contributed to different departmental faculty research projects. They have also supported many faculty

throughout the College of Education. Again, it is incumbent upon tenure-track faculty to follow through on offers of assistance from other faculty for successful implementation.

Section 5. Service, Extension and Outreach Activities:

Service is a very large and real part of the work we do. We continue to be active in service roles. We work with the Community Colleges for recruitment, transitioning and articulation. We continue to work with Outreach in many ways including our Residency supervision/PLC components in our undergraduate programs. While we might want to decrease our statewide service, this is excellent public relations work for the university as well as increasing our opportunities to work with potential mentor teachers for our students. In addition to serving the state and region, many faculty have taken on national commitments as well. We look forward to the discussion of developing a College Professional Development Plan as the needs assessment done this past year is evaluated.

Section 6. Student Recruitment and Retention Activities and Enrollment Trends:

Recruitment and Retention of students is critical for many of our low-enrollment areas (Agriculture, Art, Modern Languages, and Technical Education as well as some specific Science majors—physics, chemistry, and earth sciences). Some faculty has been more active than others in recruiting majors from Community Colleges and freshmen. OIA data demonstrates the numbers of Secondary Education undergraduates are increasing. It also reflects an increase of post-baccalaureate students (second bachelors). The majority of these second bachelor students are earning a credential—most in an area of secondary education. The increase in the number of juniors could reflect our attempts to recruit transfer students.

Section 7. Development activities and public relations:

We continue to write letters of appreciation when monies are donated. However, we do not have any faculty member identified with the responsibility of development. We used the College of Education development officer before the budget cuts, and we continue to hope the UW foundation will work on our needs.

Many of the department service activities could fit well within the description of public relations in Wyoming and Wyoming schools. We continue to work with Debbie Beck and continue to encourage faculty to let her know what work they are pursuing and provide her with ways of advertising our work. We have also worked hard on our webpage to make improvements. This work continues as the marketing department makes formatting changes.

Section 8. Classified and Professional Staffing:

Mrs. Debbie Dobbyn continued to perform well in her role as our departmental secretary. She left the University to join her husband at his new job in Iowa. In February we hired Mrs. Judy Yates to serve in this capacity. Her work with the Wyoming Department of Education has made the transition to the department more seamless. Mrs. Marilyn MacDonald continues to handle the paperwork of Residency semester as well as scanning our documents to save copy costs and the environment.

Section 9. Diversity:

We have actively recruited candidates of diversity by employing the methods we have discussed in Leadership council meetings such as advertising in specific journals and working to ensure we have an adequate pool of diverse candidates for new hires. Our department had 3 searches this past year resulting in two hires (one female science educator and one male in agriculture education) and one failed search (modern language education). Our attempts to recruit diverse faculty were in very difficult areas (science and agriculture education) and we will continue to work on getting a more diverse pool as we hire next year in modern language education. The department has also approached diversity in our discussions about our departmental work in Bolivia. These discussions center around the service learning components that we could put in place to help those we are working with to improve public education in Bolivia. I believe those impacts would be greater on our faculty and students so we should probably work to include a variety of faculty and students on any future trips to Bolivia.

Section 10. Assessment of Student Learning:

Undergraduate Programs

TIER 1 REPORTING FOR 2010-2012 –

College of Education, Teacher Education (undergraduate) Program: The Teacher Education Program is the undergraduate program for the college so applies to the following depts.-- Secondary Education, Elementary Education, Educational Studies

Tier 1 programs are required to submit an assessment report each year for the next two years. The project report described in Question 3 can be submitted in either July 2011 or July 2012.

1. Please check which of the following types of assessment(s) your department/program has engaged in over the last five years. A description of these activities is available at the end of this document.

Direct Assessments

- ? Standardized tests
- The Teacher Education Program does not require a standardized exit test to graduate, but the Professional Teaching Standards Board does require a PRAXIS II test for elementary education and social studies graduates to be licensed in Wyoming. These 2 areas are required to take the test because of the scope of content they teach. Other secondary content areas are not required because they receive a concurrent major in

Indirect Assessments

- X Dispositional surveys
- While Dispositional Surveys were marked – we really have disposition ratings (what we consider crucial professional skills and behaviors) that are recorded in key classes throughout the Teacher Education Program and entered into the CEID (college database). The intent is to track these student dispositions to identify students who need contracts to

the content they will be teaching.

continue and/or further support.

Embedded question analyses

X Student satisfaction surveys

1) Every other year the undergraduate program contracts with the WYSAC for a student teacher/mentor teacher survey on specified categories of the Teacher Education Program. This is given during the residency semester. These data are tracked over years to determine change

2) Every year students and mentors receive a reflection survey during residency to consider: 1) what mentors think they have provided in different areas of curriculum, assessment, management, etc. and, 2) what student teachers think they have gained in those areas. These data are tracked from year to year.

3) Many faculty teaching classes throughout the Teacher Education program give informal surveys on how the class is going at different points in the semester. This data is informal but used to consider changes during the semester.

4) Students have the opportunity to fill out online course evaluations for each class they take each semester. This data (aggregated, but with individual comments) is then provided to the dept. heads and the appropriate faculty member.

Student learning portfolios

Exit interviews

X Examination of student work examples

Alumni surveys

Key courses within the Teacher Education Program define common assessments (e.g.,

project, paper, study, etc.) which all students do in that course no matter the instructor. These are then grades and entered into the CEID system.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Jury panels | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus groups |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Employer panels | <input type="checkbox"/> Retention analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internship/externship reviews | <input type="checkbox"/> FTE analysis |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Senior-level final examinations | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade distribution reports |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oral examinations | <input type="checkbox"/> Job placement data |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Simulation exercises | <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty surveys |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Capstone projects | <input type="checkbox"/> Transfer student surveys |
| X <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) – | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |

1) Teacher Performance Assessment (Outside scoring with rubrics). This might also be considered a capstone though it is not titled that. This is a national development effort, headed by Stanford and involving 21 states, to create a comprehensive teacher assessment measuring context, planning, instruction, and assessment. We piloted this instrument (only residency without any previous experience with the tool) in one elementary and one secondary section this spring. TPA will be further piloted with a greater number of content areas next year as a “no fault” pilot. Thereafter, scores will not be recorded and shared. When the pilot phase is over, the scores will be reported through a data system (to be selected) and will be available to college personnel and for university and national reports. These assessments will be introduced throughout the program in defined Educational Studies courses, Elementary Education courses, and Secondary Education Courses. The final product will be developed and scored during the residency semester as an exit assessment.

2) Student teaching evaluation – during residency, the mentor teacher fills out a defined evaluation covering content knowledge and dispositions of teaching (rated on a 4 point scale -unsatisfactory, basic, proficient, and distinguished - for each category.). This is done at midterm for the student to have time to work on areas defined as U or B and then again at the end of residency. No student can pass residency with more than three basic ratings out of 14-19 categories depending on the content area.

2. If your program(s) is/are under the auspices of outside accreditation, provide a short summary of where you are in the accreditation process and what are/were the outcomes.

We are program accredited through NCATE and our last visit was in the spring 2008. The programs were accredited without conditions through spring 2016. We are also evaluated by the Professional Teaching Standards Board (Wyoming) at that same time and have been program approved through that process as well, so PTSB licenses are granted based on program completion rather than course by course. Additionally, each content area is either “nationally recognized” through their Specialized Professional Association (SPA) -- e.g., National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), National Council for Social Studies (NCSS), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), National Science Teacher Association (NSTA), Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), etc. -- or approved through the PTSB for state-level approval where content areas do not have a specific SPA or the program has different goals/directions in Wyoming. Since the NCATE visit the following undergraduate program content areas have received national recognition which is good for the same length of time as the NCATE approval: elementary education, mathematics, English, physical education (not in our college but works through the college for these approvals), social studies, and science. The modern languages content area was SPA approved with “recognition with conditions” and a report has been submitted addressing the feedback, with the final review results in August, 2011. If approved, the modern languages will also have “national recognition”. The other content areas have been state approved for their content area programs: art, agricultural education, and technical education.

3. Provide an example of one assessment project start to finish, including what you did, who was involved, what the results were, how your department used the

information, and what changes were made as a result of the assessment. The example you provide should be written in a format that can be understood easily by others outside of your discipline. This example will be published on the UW assessment of student learning website and may be distributed to the university community via various assessment related workshops and meetings. A template for this report is available at the end of this document.

My department/program will submit its report in:

July 2011

X July 2012 – Project: We will report on the TPA pilot process which will be further along at that point and we will be able to describe specific examples.

Graduate Programs

The graduate program all faculty in Secondary Education are affiliated with can be found in the Curriculum and Instruction annual report. However, we have faculty responsible for three other College of Education Ph.D. programs and their information was collected for the explanations below. We are commenting specifically on the Science Education Ph.D.

1. Identify a **graduate program** within your department and select the tier that best describes the current state of assessment for the program. After selecting the tier, provide an explanation of how you arrived at this particular conclusion and/or evidence to support your conclusion.

Science Education PhD

TIER 3 REPORTING FOR 2010-2012

Tier 3 programs are required to submit an assessment report each year for the next two years. The reports should be submitted in July 2011 and July 2012. The following questions should be answered as part of the 2010-2011 annual report. Questions for the 2011-2012 report will be available next year, but expect to provide a detailed report regarding your department/program's progress. Tier 3 programs will also be required to attend a workshop or meeting in fall 2011 tailored to assist Tier 3 programs with their assessment progress.

1. Please check which of the following types of assessment(s) your department/program will engage in over the next two years. A description of these activities is available at the end of this document.

Direct Assessments

- Standardized tests
- Embedded question analyses
- Student learning portfolios
- Examination of student work examples
- Jury panels
- Employer panels
- Internship/externship reviews
- Senior-level final examinations
- Oral examinations
- Simulation exercises
- Capstone projects
- Other (please specify)

Indirect Assessments

- Dispositional surveys
- Student satisfaction surveys
- Exit interviews
- Alumni surveys
- Focus groups
- Retention analysis
- FTE analysis
- Grade distribution reports
- Job placement data
- Faculty surveys
- Transfer student surveys
- Other (please specify)

2. Provide a detailed two-year assessment plan for moving your department or program from Tier 3 to Tier 2. Include specific dates and deadlines, include who will be involved and fully describe what activities you will engage in.

The Science Education PhD degree option is new, so all plans, policies and procedures are either freshly implemented or under development. The faculty directly responsible for developing the plan currently includes Alan Buss, Kate Welsh, Timothy Slater, Diana Wiig, Jason Katzmann, and Jennifer Forrester. Preliminary assessment criteria were established in May 2010 to set admissions requirements and standards. A rubric was developed and has been in use since that time. This group also met May 11, 2011 to discuss an initial assessment plan. They will meet in early fall semester, by September 15, 2011, to determine expectations and policies for three basic assessment requirements for all PhD students: preliminary examinations, annual research projects, and dissertation defenses.

By Oct. 31, 2011, guidelines, policies and procedures, including collection, storage, and analysis of data, for these initial assessments will be formalized and adopted by the Science Education PhD faculty. Once these assessments are in

place, attention will turn to additional assessments, including student satisfaction surveys and focus groups.

Faculty discussions about informal discussions will take place during the Spring 2012 semester, with formal adoption of plans by May 1, 2012.

Less formal data collection began in Spring 2011 when two candidates completed their preliminary exams. Their data will be added to the assessment database as soon as it is established in Fall 2011. Data will be collected in Summer 2011 from these same two PhD candidates as they complete their dissertation defenses and exit the program in Fall 2011. The committee chair person and Alan Buss will be responsible for gathering the data on student performance and understanding as prescribed by the committees and program faculty. Data collection for the annual research projects will begin in May 2012, when all PhD candidates will be required to present scholarly research products at a mini-conference to be held on the UW campus. This mini-conference will be held each year during finals week of the spring semester. Initial faculty discussions point to gathering copies of the research products, videos of presentations, and peer/faculty evaluations of the presentations and products.

Data collection for the three basic assessment requirements will continue through Spring 2013. Additional assessments will be refined during the 2012-2013 AY, for implementation at the end of Spring 2013. Additionally, standard data from student evaluations will be collected by the College of Education. These results will be paired with data from the basic assessments to adjust course and program requirements and expectations on a bi-annual basis.

3. Why is your department/program a Tier 3 program? What are your challenges and how will you plan to overcome them? What assistance do you need?

As previously stated, this is a new program, with relatively recent enrollment. Two candidates have passed their preliminary examinations to date, in Spring 2011. A formal assessment plan is under development, but collected data are limited. Plans are under development to formalize data collection, storage and analysis.

The planning faculty comes together with a broad range of ideas and experience in evaluation and assessment, but has limited experience working with PhD candidates on a regular basis. Support would best come in the form professional development for establishing criteria for rigorous, meaningful preliminary exam tasks/questions, for evaluating PhD level research projects, and evaluating high-level dissertation projects.

Mathematics Education Ph.D.

As an embryonic program, the Mathematics Education PhD is at a Tier 3 level of evaluation. We have implicit "plans" for this in various forms: variety of assessments in each EMAT course, an annual review of student progress toward satisfying degree

requirements conducted by the mathematics education faculty, informal assessments of, and with, students through ongoing interactions, etc. We anticipate written and oral examinations that will be a strong indicator of student learning.

Literacy Education Ph.D.

The Literacy Education Ph.D. is a new program so an assessment program has not yet been developed. The College of Education Literacy Ph.D. committee will begin working on that plan this coming year as they continue to define/develop the courses that are critical to the program. Given this, the program falls into a Tier 3 level.

Evidence that has been collected to date on student learning include: 1) written work and 2) informal evaluation discussions of all students. We have not collected “direct evidence.”

We have, however, engaged in continuous conversations about assessment and an assessment protocol. We are moving from assessment by individual instructors only toward building a culture of assessment.

As student data becomes available the refinement of what we have as a “plan” will be polished and honed. Currently we have gone through two iterations of an annual review of students, and we have had to modify our requested elements because our explanations of our expectations were obviously not clear enough for all students.