



# Applied Leadership for Teaching and Learning | 2016-2017 Assessment Report

1. Please give a brief overview of the assessment data you collected this year.

We annually implement a variety of formative and summative assessment techniques in assessing candidates and graduates' learning outcomes. The successful completion of the culminating thesis or project serves as the main targeted assessment related to all program outcomes. Program faculty evaluate the degree to which outcomes have been met using performance rubrics, and monitoring growth over time. In addition, we monitor graduate perception across the completion of the core courses in the MSAL program. The following chart provides a map for ongoing programmatic assessment.

**MSAL Program Outcome Assessment Map**

MSAL Learning Assessment	Formative Measures	Summative Measures
TCH LRNG 701	Tests, Quizzes, Journals, In-class Group Work	Formal Presentation, Reflective Project
TCH LRNG 702	Tests, Quizzes, Journals, In-class Group Work	Formal Proposal, Literature Review
TCH LRNG 703	Tests, Quizzes, Journals, In-class Group Work	Formal Presentation, Term Paper
TCH LRNG 704	Tests, Quizzes, Journals, In-class Group Work	Leadership Project, Formal Presentation
A of E (9 crs.)	Various Formative and Summative Measures	Various Formative and Summative Measures
Project or Thesis TCH LRNG 799	Progress Checks, Revisions	Formal Defense, Presentation, GR-4 form

We used feedback from the mandated evaluation tool used for all PK-12 teachers *Educator Effectiveness* (EE). This utilizes a 1-4 rubric based on the Danielson model used in all area schools. Multiple observations are conducted on all cohort participants throughout the school year. We focused on gathering data from Domain I, II, and III. All cohort participants demonstrated competency by scoring at levels 3 or 4 in these areas cross the semesters. The following chart provides a map of EE assessment indicators.

The Framework for Teaching (Danielson)			
I. Planning and Preparation	II. Classroom Environment	III. Instruction	IV. Professional Responsibilities
1a. Knowledge of Content and Pedagogy	2a. Creating an Environment of Respect and Rapport	3a. Communicating with Students	4a. Reflecting on Teaching
1b. Demonstrating Knowledge of Students	2b. Establish a Culture for Learning	3b. Questioning and Discussion Techniques	4b. Maintaining Accurate Records
1c. Setting Instructional Outcomes	2c. Managing Classroom Procedures	3c. Engaging Students in Learning	4c. Communicating with Families
1d. Demonstrating Knowledge of Resources	2d. Managing Student Behavior	3d. Using Assessment in Instruction	4d. Participating in a Professional Community
1e. Designing Coherent Instruction	2e. Organizing Physical Space	3e. Demonstrating Flexibility and Responsiveness	4e. Growing and Developing Professionally
1f. Designing Student Assessments			4f. Showing Professionalism

**Target Assessment area 2016-2017 (Practicing ESL teachers, and high poverty schools)**

We looked at increasing the number of admissions and graduates from area schools that serve these at-risk populations. We will look at the fall and spring semesters in regards to admission and graduation data. This outcome dovetails with efforts to increase and serve in the area of Diversity. We originally targeted May graduates (June 1, 2017), but moved that target date to August, 15th, 2017 for a more accurate measure of our target. Our program target goal was to have the majority of our graduates in this timeframe be actively serving 2<sup>nd</sup> language learners and/or teach in high poverty schools in our community.

2. How will you use what you've learned from the data that was collected?

**Candidate Enrollment Analysis**

Using existing enrollment data, we conducted an analysis of MSAL graduates since the enactment of Wisconsin's ACT 10 and the elimination of most structured pay incentives for practicing PK-12 teachers. Traditional graduates were defined as not transferring in credits for completion of their program. Transfer students are defined as those entering our program with credits (Bilingual educators, UW-O, ILP/Green Bay PDP/PDC participants, FNS Students with IS, Plymouth Cohort, etc). The following data supports the critical importance of

partnerships as they relate to enrollment. Further, the flexibility related to accepting transfer credit is critical to both enrollment and our 2016-2017 target assessment goal of serving those teachers that serve high-risk populations (bilingual learners in high poverty settings).

Grad. Year	Total	Transfer	Traditional
Aug. 2011	19	11	8
2012	14	7	7
2013	5	2	3
2014	15	11	4
2015	15	14	1
Plymouth	19	19	0
2016	18	14	4
2017 (proj.)	15	10	5
Plymouth	19	19	0

**2016-2017 MSAL Graduates (Dec., May, and Aug.)**

We were pleased with the collected program data that supported our efforts to increase admission and graduation of practicing PK-12 educators working with second-language learners in high poverty schools. Moreover, this dovetails with ongoing University efforts to better serve our region in regards to diversity and a changing school aged demographic. Upon analysis, nineteen of our twenty-six graduates (MSAL on campus) during this period were serving PK-6 students in high poverty schools (>88% poverty), and/or were serving second language learners. In addition to addressing our program’s target assessment goal for 2016-2017, these data support our College’s (CHESW) mission of “transforming our community” through service, as well as serving these practicing educators meets the University’s Select Mission by directly enriching the quality of life for the community by embracing the educational value of diversity and impacting intellectual, cultural and economic resource. If we are to continue to target and serve this need in our community, program flexibility and aggressive marketing strategies will be of integral importance.