



**Undergraduate Program-Specific Student Learning Outcome Assessment
Annual Report – 2020-21
GUIDELINES
for the
2020-21 ACADEMIC YEAR**

Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Planning, and Assessment

Updated July 20, 2020

For more information, please contact:
Robert E. Smith, Ed.D. Email: rsmith91@esu.edu | Phone: #3080

**Undergraduate Program-Specific Student Learning Outcome Assessment
Annual Report – 2020-21**

I. Program Information

Program/Department: Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE)

Department Chair: Christine E. W. Brett E-mail: cbrett@esu.edu Phone: x3582

Department Assessment Coordinator: Christine E. W. Brett E-mail: cbrett@esu.edu Phone: x3582

II. Program-Specific Student Learning Outcomes (Educational Objectives) Assessed During Last Academic Year

List ALL Program-Specific SLOs first, their direct alignment to University SLOs, and the assessment timeline (annual or bi-annual) for assessing each program SLO.

* Numbers are derived from September 2019 counts.

Program SLO:	UNIVERSITY SLO	TIMELINE for ASSESSMENT (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)
The PETE unit plan requires teacher candidates to write developmentally appropriate unit and lesson plans, using research in content specific areas, and to assess learner knowledge, using diagnostic, formative, and summative assessments.	ESU SLO IV	Twice a semester

III. Direct Measures Used

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the direct methods used to collect information assessing (if applicable).

Dept. SLO #	Direct Assessment Measure(s) Used	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with a rubric, etc.)	Assessment completed by (student, supervisor, faculty, etc.)	When the assessment was administered in the student (internship, 4th year, 1st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)
	Design a standards-based unit of instruction	Unit Plan with scoring rubric	Faculty	Year 4, last semester. 1 during week 7 and 1 during week 14	all

IV. Indirect Measures Used

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the indirect methods used to collect information assessing (If applicable).

Dept. SLO #	Indirect Assessment Measure(s) Used	Assessment description (Exit and other interviews, focus groups, written surveys, and questionnaires, etc.)	Assessment completed by (student, supervisor, faculty, etc.)	When the assessment was administered in the student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)
N/A	N/A				

V. Student Performance Outcomes

How did the student perform on each assessment, compared to the department/program goal?

What is the target/goal/score for each assessment? Then briefly summarize the results.

Assessment number/name	Target/Acceptable score	Number assessed in 2018-2019 (N) 2019-2020 (N)	Number & % meeting target/ Number and % not meeting target
Unit Plan	Exceeds Expectations (EE): 100-87 pts Met Expectations (ME): 86-75 pts Did Not Meet Expectations (DNM): below 75 pts.		We measure each indicator on the rubric. Please see attached data below

PETE 440: Physical Education Clinical Experience Unit Plan Rubric

Exceeds Expectations: 100-87 points

Met expectations: 86-75 points

Did not meet expectations: Below 75 points (Must re-do unit plan prior to implementation; grade assigned on first attempt will be used as grade)

Grade: _____

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectations 1	Did Not Complete 0
1. Title	*Title reflects <u>connection</u> between the standards, content and sport, individual, dance and/or fitness activities.	*Title reflects the standards and content.	*Title reflects the content only.	No title.
2. Mission	*Unit plan mission is linked to PA standard statement and the mission of the school district and PE/Wellness program. *Mission is stated as a promise of the knowledge, skills & dispositions that will be delivered through the unit.	*Unit plan mission is linked to PA standard and the mission of the school district or PE program. *Mission is stated as a promise of the knowledge, skills & dispositions that will be delivered through the unit.	*Unit plan mission is linked to standard. *Mission is stated as what will be delivered through the unit.	*No unit mission.
<u>STAGE 1 UbD</u> 3. Essential Questions and Content	*Provides comprehensive essential questions and content from Standard Align System (SAS) that reflects the PA standards. *Provides higher order questions that reflect the “Understanding By Design” model.	*Provides essential questions and content that reflects the PA standards. *Provides higher order questions that reflect the “Understanding By Design” model.	*Provides essential questions but no content that reflects the PA standards.	*Does not provide essential questions or content.
<u>STAGE 1 UbD</u> 4. Essential Questions and Content	*Provides comprehensive (in-depth) essential questions and content that reflect the unit of instruction (learning activities).	*Provides essential questions and content that reflects the unit of instruction (learning activity).	*Provides essential questions but no content that reflects the learning activities in the unit of instruction.	*Does not provide essential questions or content related to the specific learning activities.

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectation 1	Did Not Complete 0
STAGE 2 UbD 5. Acceptable Evidence (Summative Assessments) Element 5.1	*All verbs from the designed or chosen summative assessments match the grade-level standard and essential content *Authentic assessments engage students in demonstrating all the content practiced during learning experiences.	*Some verbs from the designed or chosen summative assessments match the grade-level standard and essential content *Authentic assessments engage students in demonstrating some of the content practiced during learning experiences.	*Some verbs from the designed or chosen summative assessments match the grade-level standard and essential content *Assessments that engage students in demonstrating some of the content practiced during learning experiences but are traditional rather than authentic in nature.	No assessments engage students in the content practiced during learning experiences.
Stage 3 UbD 6. Learning Activities Element 3.7	*Learning experiences are developmentally appropriate, clearly described, incorporate student use of technology and show a clear alignment with PA Standard and Standards Align System (SAS) Department of Education Portal.	*Learning experiences are developmentally appropriate, clearly described, and show a clear alignment with PA Standard.	*Learning experiences are described and show an alignment with PA Standard Statement. *Descriptions of developmental levels are inconsistently used.	*Learning Experiences do not match PA standard.

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectation 1	Did Not Complete 0
7. Summative Scoring Tools (Rubrics) Element 5.1	<p>*Scoring tools match assessment and contain all (100%) criteria of essential content and grade-level standard.</p> <p>*Criteria are richly described and include both qualitative and quantitative descriptors to discriminate levels of student performance.</p>	<p>*Scoring tools match assessment and contain most (75%) of the criteria of the essential content and grade-level standard.</p> <p>*Criteria are richly described and include either qualitative or quantitative descriptors to discriminate levels of student performance.</p>	<p>*Scoring tools match assessment and contain some (less the 75%) of the essential content and grade level standard.</p> <p>*Limited discriminate criteria for levels of student performance.</p>	<p>*No scoring tools OR scoring tools do not match assessment.</p>
8. Summative Assessment Answer Keys	Provides detailed answer keys with 100% desired answers clearly written out for all summative assessments.	Provides answer keys with 80% of desired answers written for all summative assessments.	Provides answer key(s) for only one summative assessment.	Does not provide answer key(s) for any assessment(s).

<p>9. Grading System: Weighted Point-based</p>	<p>*A point-based grading system demonstrates how summative assessments will be used to calculate a final grade for each student.</p> <p>*Weighted points are an accurate representation of actual time spent administering the summative assessments.</p> <p>*Summative assessments are aligned with PA standard.</p>	<p>*A point-based grading system demonstrates how summative assessments will be used to calculate a final grade for each student.</p> <p>*Most weighted points represent the actual time spent and emphasis given during learning experiences.</p> <p>*Summative assessments are aligned with PA standard.</p>	<p>*A grading system demonstrates how assessments will be used for the final grades however, may contain additional categories not related to a standard based system.</p>	<p>*Unclear how the weighted points are assigned. Grading system does not contain categories aligned to a standard-based system (uses participation, dress and effort as main assessment).</p>
<p>10. Formative Assessment Element 5.2</p>	<p>*Designs/Chooses formative assessments that match teaching styles and content practiced during learning experiences.</p> <p>*All (90-100%) verbs from the assessment match the objective and grade-level PA standard.</p>	<p>*Designs/Chooses formative assessments that most (89-80%) often match teaching styles and content practiced during the learning experiences.</p> <p>*Most (89-80%) verbs from the assessment match the objective.</p>	<p>*Designs/Chooses formative assessments that did not match teaching styles or content.</p>	<p>*No formative assessment.</p>

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectation 1	Did Not Complete 0
11. Diagnostic Assessment Element 5.2	<p>*Diagnostic assessment engages students in demonstrating all the essential content to be practiced during learning experiences.</p> <p>*All (90-100%) verbs from the assessment match the objective; grade-level standard and are aligned with the summative assessment.</p>	<p>Diagnostic assessment engages students in demonstrating most of the essential content that will be practiced during the learning experiences.</p> <p>*Most (80-89%) verbs from the assessment match the objective and are aligned with the summative assessment.</p>	<p>Diagnostic assessment engages students in demonstrating some (below 80%) of the essential content that will be practiced during the learning experiences.</p>	<p>No diagnostic assessments provided.</p>
12. Block Plan Stage I of UbD Essential Questions & Content	<p>*Essential Questions and content are aligned to PA standard.</p> <p>*Provided two or more essential questions with correct content in daily block plan.</p>	<p>*Essential Questions and content are aligned to PA standard.</p> <p>*Provided one to two essential questions with correct content in daily block plan.</p>	<p>*Provided only one essential question with content in daily block plan.</p>	<p>Did not provide any essential questions/content in daily block plan.</p>
13. Block Plan Assessments Element 5.2	<p>*Stage II (Assessments) of UbD is aligned to PA standard.</p> <p>*There is an assessment that measures each verb in the PA standard statement and is aligned with the correct domain 100% of the time.</p>	<p>*Stage II (Assessments) of UbD is aligned to PA standard.</p> <p>*There is an assessment that measures each verb in the PA standard statement and is aligned with the correct domain 75% of the time.</p>	<p>*There is an assessment that measures each verb in the PA standard statement but lacks a clear alignment with verb and domain.</p>	<p>No assessments in block plan or assessments not aligned to PA standard.</p>

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectation 1	Did Not Complete 0
14. Block Plan Learning Activity Element 3.6	*100% of the block plan shows best practice and a developmentally appropriate sequence of learning experiences.	80% of the block plan shows best practice and a developmentally appropriate sequence of learning experiences.	Less than 80% or less of the block plan shows best practice and a developmentally appropriate sequence of learning experiences.	Learning activities represent poor practice and a developmentally appropriate sequence of learning experiences.
15. Objectives are performance based and measurable Element 3.2	*Lesson objectives are performance –based and measurable. All objectives contain the required components (condition, behavior and evaluative criteria). *Evaluative criteria have both qualitative and quantitative criteria throughout the block plan	*Lesson objectives are performance –based and measurable. All objectives contain the required components (condition, behavior and evaluative criteria). *Evaluative criteria are either qualitative or quantitative criteria.	*Lesson objective are performance-based but are not measurable or are missing one of the following: condition, behavior, and/or evaluative criteria.	*Objectives do not contain all the required components: condition, behavior and evaluative criteria or are missing two of the following: condition, behavior, and/or evaluative criteria.
16. Objectives are aligned with standards Element 3.3	*Lesson objectives are aligned with state standard(s) and address the essential content of the identified state standard. *90-100% of specific learning objectives and standards match.	*Lesson objectives are aligned with state standard(s) and address the essential content of the identified state standard. *Most (89%-80%) specific learning objectives and standards match.	*Less than 80% of specific learning objectives and standards match.	*Specific learning objectives and standard(s) do not match.

Planning	Exceeds Expectation 5	Met Expectations 3	Does Not Meet Expectation 1	Did Not Complete 0
17. Objectives are written in all domains	*Block plans have specific objectives in all domains (cognitive, psychomotor, affective, and fitness) when appropriate.	*Block plans have specific objectives in three of the four domains.	*Block plans have specific objectives in two of the three domains.	*None or only one specific learning objective in block plans.
Block Plan 18. Accommodations/Modifications Element 3.5	*For one identified student, the entire block plan clearly identifies a variety (3 or more) of instructional and curricular strategies designed to meet the unique needs of the learner with the identified learning activity.	* For one identified student, the block plan identifies at least 2 instructional and curricular strategies designed to meet the unique needs of the learner with the identified learning activity.	* For one identified student, the block plan identifies at least 1 instructional and/or curricular strategy designed to meet the unique needs of the learner with the identified learning activity.	*Accommodations and Modifications were missing in block plan.
19. First Lesson Plan	*The first lesson plan contains 11-12 of the following criteria: Stage I, II, and III of UbD model; equipment, specific objectives; anticipatory set; warm-up; instructional input; organizational procedures with diagrams; adaptations and accommodations; guided practice questions and feedback statements; and closure.	*The first lesson plan contains at least 10 of 12 criteria: Stage I, II, and III of UbD model; equipment, specific objectives; anticipatory set; warm-up; instructional input; organizational procedures with diagrams; adaptations and accommodations; guided practice questions and feedback statements; and closure.	*The first lesson plan is missing more than 10 of the following criteria: Stage I, II, and III of UbD model; equipment, specific objectives; anticipatory set; warm-up; instructional input; organizational procedures with diagrams; adaptations and accommodations; guided practice questions and feedback statements; and closure.	*No first lesson plan.

Planning	Exceeds Expectation	Met Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectation	Did Not Complete
	5	3	1	0
20. References	*At least 3 resources support content and pedagogy. Appropriate APA style (6 th edition)	*At least 2 resources support content and pedagogy. Minor errors (6 th edition) APA style.	*Only one resource.	*No resources.

VI. Key Findings: *Briefly summarize the results of the assessments and how do these compare to the goals you have set?*

The data (**Attachment 3C**) represent an overall score for teacher candidates (TCs) based on the Unit Plan Rubric and depicts candidates' achievement in each of the ten components of the Unit Plan Rubric that directly related to SHAPE America Standards and Elements for Spring 2020 (N=17).

Attachment 3C: Data Tables for Assessment #3 East Stroudsburg University Unit Plan Report

Table 3.1: Physical Education Unit Plan Assessment Overall Scores

	Exceeds Expectations 100-87 points	Met Expectation 86-75 points	Does Not Meet Expectation Below 75 points
Spring 2020 1st placement N=17	70.59%	29.41%	0%
Spring 2020 2nd placement N=17	52.94%	17.65%	29.41%

Table 3.2: Disaggregated and Aggregated Mean scores for each SHAPE America Element for Teacher Candidates from University Supervisors.
(Total candidates = 17)

Standard 3											
	Standard & Element	Exceeds Expectations		Met Expectations		Did Not Meet Expectations		Did Not Complete		Mean (out of 5)	
		1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
15. Block Plan: Objectives are performance based and measurable.	3.2										
Spring 2020 (n=17)		76.47%	82.35%	23.53%	0%	0%	17.65%	0%	0%	4.53	4.56
NASPE 3.2 Aggregated Mean		76.47%	82.35%	23.53%	0%	0%	17.65%	0%	0%	4.53	4.56
16. Block Plan: Objectives are aligned with standards.	3.3										
Spring 2020 (n=17)		88.24%	64.71%	14.29%	35.29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.76	4.56
NASPE 3.3 Aggregated Mean		88.24%	64.71%	9.53%	35.29%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.76	4.56
18. Block Plan: Accommodations /Modifications	3.5										
Spring 2020 (n=17)		70.59%	94.12%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	0%	0%	0%	4.29	4.89
NASPE 3.5 Aggregated Mean		70.59%	94.12%	23.53%	5.88%	5.88%	0%	0%	0%	4.29	4.89
14. Block Plan Stage III: Learning Activities that are sequences and progressive	3.6										
Spring 2020 (n=17)		94.12%	35.29%	5.88%	58.82%	0%	5.88%	0%	0%	4.88	3.81
NASPE 3.6 Aggregated Mean		94.12%	35.29%	5.88%	58.82%	0%	5.88%	0%	0%	4.88	3.81

	Standard & Element	Exceeds Expectations		Met Expectations		Did Not Meet Expectations		Did Not Complete		Mean (out of 5)	
		1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
6. Stage III of UbD: Learning Activities that match PA Standard	3.7	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		76.47%	35.29%	23.53%	41.18%	0%	5.88%	0%	17.65%	4.53	3.25
NASPE 3.7 Aggregated Mean		76.47%	35.29%	23.53%	41.18%	0%	5.88%	0%	17.65%	4.53	3.25
Standard 5											
5. Stage II of UbD: Acceptable Evidence (Summative Assessments)	5.1	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		88.24%	76.47%	11.76%	23.53%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.76	3.69
7. Summative Scoring Tools (Rubrics)	5.1	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		41.18%	64.71%	58.82%	5.88%	0%	23.53%	0%	5.88%	3.82	3.88
NASPE 5.1 Aggregated Mean		64.71%	70.59%	35.29%	14.71%	0%	11.77%	0%	2.94%	4.29	3.79
10. Formative Assessments	5.2	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		82.35%	52.94%	17.65%	35.29%	0%	11.76%	0%	0%	4.65	4.06
11. Diagnostic Assessments	5.2	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		85.71%	70.59%	14.29%	11.76%	0%	17.65%	0%	0%	4.71	4.31
13. Block Plan Stage II of UbD: Assessments	5.2	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
Spring 2020 (n=17)		52.94%	70.59%	47.06%	29.41%	0%	0%	0%	0%	4.06	4.69
NASPE 5.2 Aggregated Mean		73.67%	61.77%	17.26%	32.35%	0%	5.88%	0%	0%	4.65	3.97

Table 3.1 presents the percentage of candidates scoring at each level from the first and second field experience placements. TCs in the first placement (1st) that scored as “Exceed Expectations” (“EE”) level with a scoring range of 100-87 possible points were 70.59%. Findings at the “Met Expectations” (“ME”) level with a scoring range of 86-75 possible points were 29.41% and 0% of the TCs scored at the “Did Not Meet Expectations” (“DNME”) level, scoring below 75 points out of a possible 100 points. At the second placement (2nd) 52.94% were at “EE”; 17.65% at the “ME” level and 29.41% of the TCs scored at the “DNME” level.

Table 3.2 represents the Unit Plan results itemized and aligned with SHAPE America Standards and Elements. For **Element 3.2** indicates that 76.47% (1st) and 82.35% (2nd) of TC submissions were scored “EE” level, 23.53% (1st) and 0% (2nd) at the “ME” level, and 0% (1st) and 17.65% (2nd) at the “DNME” level. At the “Did Not Complete” (“DNC”) level 0% was found. For **Element 3.3** 88.24% (1st) and 64.71% (2nd) of TCs scored at “EE” level; 9.53% (1st) 35.29% (2nd) at the “ME” level; 0% (2nd) at “DNME”; and “DNC” levels. For **Element 3.5** 70.59% (1st) and 94.12% (2nd) of TC submissions were scored at “EE” level, 23.53% (1st) and 5.88% (2nd) at the “ME” level, 5.88% (2nd) at the “DNME” level and 0% scored at “DNC” level. For **Element 3.6**, 94.12% (1st) and 35.29% (2nd) of TC submissions were scored at “EE” level, 5.88% (1st) and 58.82% (2nd) at the “ME” level, 5.88% (2nd) at the “DNME” level and 0% at the “DNC” level. For **Element 3.7**, 76.47% (1st) and 35.29% (2nd) of TCs scored at “EE” level, 23.53% (1st) and 41.18% (2nd) at the “ME” level, 5.88% (2nd) at the “DNME”, and 17.65% (2nd) at the “DNC” level.

Elements 5.1 and 5.2 align with more than one item; therefore, the “aggregated mean of percentage” for each element is displayed. For **Element 5.1**, TC submissions indicate that 85.71% (1st) and 70.59% (2nd) of TCs scored at “EE” level, 11.91% (1st) and 14.71% (2nd) at the “ME” level, 2.39% (1st) and 11.77% (2nd) at the “DNME” level and 5.88% (2nd) scored at “DNC” level. For **Element 5.2**, TC submissions indicate that 73.67% (1st) and 61.77% (2nd) of TCs scored at the “EE” level, 17.26% (1st) and 32.35% (2nd) at the “ME” level, 5.88% (2nd) at the “DNME” level and 0% at the “DNC” level.

D. Interpretation of the Data as Evidence for Meeting Identified Standards and Elements

In general, Assessment #3 results demonstrate candidates are quality beginning educators who can plan and implement standards-based and developmentally appropriate units of instruction addressing the needs of all P-12 students. They are also capable of assessing and reflecting on that implementation to change instruction to further impact the learning of their P-12 student. Differences are seen between scores in the first and second placements with the second placement scores being lower. The declines in scores can be explained due to the fact that the unit plans submitted for the first placement were written, graded, and returned for revision during the PDS semester. The second unit plans were developed by the TCs without any formative assessment or feedback from PETE faculty; therefore, the second unit plan scores more accurately represent TCs competency levels in planning. Overall, we are pleased that second placement scores did not dip too much. Many areas where the dips occurred were because the TC failed to complete. For the TCs who scored at the “DNME” or “DNC” levels,

remediation occurred with the University Supervisors with revisions required prior to implementation. (Note: the grade issued upon unit plan submission was not altered after feedback to revise the unit plan was required).

In addition, scores from items on the Unit Plan Assessment indicate that TC submissions met or exceeded expectation levels for Elements 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 5.1 and 5.2. This indicates that our TCs have strong skills in the following: writing objectives that are performance-based and measurable and align with state standards; choosing appropriate learning activities that match state standard(s); planning and implementing sequential instruction that addresses the diverse need of all students; and designing and implementing diagnostic and formative assessments in their standard-based unit of instruction.

Specific areas that appear to be weaker are Adaptation and Modifications for P-12 learners (Item #18) aligning with **Element 3.5** and Assessment Items (Item #5, #7, #10, #11, #13) aligning with **Elements 5.1 and 5.2**. Overall, these scores were higher than our previous report, therefore we will continue our focus in these areas. Addressing them in the following courses: PETE 345: Adapted Physical Education; PETE 310 Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Elementary Physical Education; PETE 442: Movement Experiences for Secondary Grades; PETE 400: PE Teaching and Assessing Strategies; the PDS experience; and PETE 440 Student Teaching.

VII. Describe Process Used by Program Faculty to Discuss and Interpret Key Findings

Through what modes were assessment results shared with program faculty? What process was used by program faculty to discuss and interpret the key findings? What hypotheses do program faculty have for why these are the results?

We have annual PETE retreats to discuss data: where our candidates are thriving and where they are struggling. We then discuss in what courses the content is covered and how we cover this content. Is it lecture, is it hands on learning—how we can strengthen our candidate’s experiences by interweaving in classes and helping our students to connect the dots.

VIII. Changes Made as a Result of the Key Findings / Actions Taken

What changes or actions were taken or are planned for 2020-2021 and in the future in response to your key findings?

At the current time we are adjusting to the COVID-19 pandemic and really focusing upon how to teach Physical Education in a hybrid mode or completely remote. In addition how to teach to our professional standards without using equipment that is shared with students. Trying to adjust to integrating more technology for our students to collect data on their p-12 students.

IX. Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department Assessment Plan

Describe any disparity from the submitted assessment plan and why it occurred.

N/A