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Expanded Statement of Institutional Purpose Linkage:

Institutional Mission Reference:
Texas A&M International University, a Member of The Texas A&M University System, is committed to the preparation of students for leadership roles in their chosen profession and in increasingly complex, culturally diverse state, national, and global society ... Through instruction, faculty and student research, and public service, Texas A&M International University is a strategic point of delivery for well-defined programs and services that improve the quality of life for citizens of the border region, the State of Texas, and national and international communities.

College/University Goal(s) Supported:
Enter Text Here

Intended Educational (Student) Outcomes:

1. Students completing the educator preparation program will compare favorably with students in other educator preparation programs on their knowledge of instructional design and assessment to promote student learning.

2. Students completing the educator preparation program will demonstrate the skills related to implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment.

3. Students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles.
Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

1. Students completing the educator preparation program will compare favorably with students in other educator preparation programs on their knowledge of instructional design and assessment to promote student learning.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

1a. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:
The average score of students completing the educator preparation program will be at or near 70% or a minimum of 240 on the Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) on the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities, Domain 1 entitled Designing Instruction and Assessment to Promote Student Learning.

1a. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:
Out of a population of 100 students, only 50 took the Pedagogy and Professional Responsibilities (PPR) Test of the new Texas Examination on Educator Standards (TExES) during 2002-2003. The remaining 50 students either took the Examination for Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) or had not tested at the time this report was prepared. On average, the students who took the PPR Examination obtained 77.4% of the items correct on Domain I. An analysis of the students’ performance on the four competencies comprising Domain I indicated that their two strongest areas were Competency #3 (Understands how to design effective instruction and assessment procedures) with 83.5% accuracy and Competency #2 (Understands and applies concepts related to student diversity) with 77.5% accuracy. On Competency #1 (Understands and applies human developmental processes), students demonstrated 76.7% accuracy and 71.8% accuracy on Competency #4: (Understands and applies learning processes and factors to plan effective instruction and assessment). Despite these differences, students’ performance on Domain I and the respective competencies indicates that they exceeded the 70% criterion.

1a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:
Students’ performance data will be shared with and examined by appropriate faculty to determine how best to incorporate these components into the teaching – learning
experiences provided by the educator preparation program. TExES data will also be disaggregated by levels of certification sought (i.e., Early Childhood - 4th grade, 4th - 8th grade, and 8th – 12th grade) and by specializations within each of these certification levels to help faculty identify program strengths and areas that need modification.

**Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:**

**1b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:**
At the Portfolio Defense, students completing the educator preparation program will provide evidence of knowledge of instructional design and assessment with a score of 80% or better, as determined by a team of field supervisors using a common rubric.

**1b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:**
Spring 2002 and Fall 2002 Block II Data collected from 104 students through the use of the Internship Interview Rubric indicated that 103 (99%) of the students successfully participated in the interview process and were subsequently admitted into the internship experience. During this interview, students demonstrated appropriate knowledge of instructional design and assessment. Of the 104 students interviewed, six were identified as needing to strengthen their understanding of how to successfully work with students having special needs. With appropriate guidance and support from TAMIU faculty, these students successfully addressed this issue.

**1b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:**
The data mentioned above will be shared with program faculty to determine how best to incorporate it into the educator preparation program. Program faculty will also examine and revise, as needed; the means of assessment utilized at this point in the educator preparation program to better identify program strengths and areas needing modification.
Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

NOTE: There should be one form for each intended outcome listed. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

2. Students completing the educator preparation program will demonstrate the skills related to implementing effective, responsive instruction and assessment.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:
2a. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:
The average score of 90% of students completing the educator preparation on the Field Performance Evaluations will be at or near 85%, with no score lower than 65%.

2a. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:
Data collected from 69 students during the Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 semesters through the use of the Field Performance Evaluations revealed that their scores ranged from 72 to 98 and that the mean for the group was 88.8. Students were particularly capable of communicating information in an accurate, clear, and logical manner to their students. A trend observed among some students is that they need to make sure that children are attentive before beginning the lesson. Overall, the desired performance standard was exceeded.

2a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:
The data mentioned above will be shared with program faculty to determine how to best incorporate these insights into the educator preparation program. Program faculty will also re-examine and possibly revise the assessment instrument used at this point in the educator preparation program to help them identify program strengths and areas of need.

Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:
2b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:
At the Portfolio Defense, students completing the educator preparation program will provide evidence of performance of instructional design and assessment with a score of 80% or better, as determined by a team of Field Supervisors using a common rubric.
2b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected: 
During the Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 terms, 113 Block III students prepared and presented their portfolios for evaluation. Ninety-eight percent (111) of the 113 students earned a score of 80% or higher on their portfolios. The other two students obtained scores of 75% and 78%. The average score obtained by the 113 students was 93.7%. As part of the portfolio presentation, students demonstrated an appropriate understanding of instructional design and assessment.

2b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program: 
A team of educators working with the educator preparation program will re-examine the rubric used to assess students’ performance while defending their portfolios to determine if any modifications to the rubric and / or program are needed. The rubric will then be used to help educators monitor program strengths and areas of need.
Intended Educational (Student) Outcome:

NOTE: There should be one form for each intended outcome listed. Intended outcome should be restated in the box immediately below and the intended outcome number entered in the blank spaces.

3. Students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles.

First Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

3a. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:
The average score of students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a specialization in Reading on the Generalist EC-4th grade, TExES 101 exam, Domain I will be at or near the passing standard.

3a. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:
Only two students with majors in Early Childhood Reading completed their program this year. One took the Elementary Comprehensive Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET), and the other had not taken the Early Childhood Reading Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES) at the time this report was prepared.

3a. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:
This section is not applicable at this time.

Second Means of Assessment for Outcome Identified Above:

3b. Means of Program Assessment & Criteria for Success:
On the Questionnaire for Early Childhood Students, students completing the Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education with a Reading specialization will demonstrate knowledge of effective Language Arts/Reading principles with an average score of 3 on a Likert scale of 1 – 4 on their knowledge of TExES exam 101, Domain I competencies.

3b. Summary of Assessment Data Collected:
All Early Childhood (EC) Education students in Block III completed a survey indicating their self-assessment of their knowledge with respect to the competencies on Domain I of the EC-4 standards. Those with a specialization in Reading were not singled out.
However, it was assumed that their scores would be at or near the average for the EC students as a whole. Averages for the competencies ranged from 3.15 to 3.40 on a Likert scale of 1-4. A score of “3” indicates “adequate knowledge.” Since our objective was that students would have an average of “3” on these competencies, we did achieve this objective for students at the end of Block III in the Spring of 2003.

3b. Use of Results to Improve Instructional Program:
Although no competency score fell below “3”, results from the survey allow us to pinpoint potential areas of strength and weakness. Those competencies rated the highest were those having to do with “writing conventions” and “assessment” (3.40). Those rated the lowest were word analysis and decoding, oral language, and phonological/phonemic awareness (3.14-3.16). Program faculty will examine this issue to determine how to place greater emphasis on these three areas, all of which are highly related to children’s early development in reading. Future versions of the survey will allow students to specify their major area of study so that those with a Reading specialization can be identified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>LOCATION/Special Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas Examination of Educator Standards (TExES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio Defense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Performance Evaluations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rubric (need proper name)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire for Early Childhood Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>