Mission / Purpose
The mission of Birth Through Five (B-5) is to provide an exemplary, interdisciplinary teacher preparation program for early care and education professionals, in order to positively impact the quality of programs for very young children in the urban metropolitan Atlanta region. The program prepares new teachers, current teachers or career changers for employment in varied settings with very young children (birth through Kindergarten) both typically developing and those with special education needs. Graduates of the program are well prepared for jobs as certified teachers, administrators, or early education specialists in the Birth Through Five and Preschool Special Education fields. Our program is committed to principles and practices that are respectful of the unique characteristics of the children, families, and teacher candidates with whom we work.

The B-5 program provides a unique collaboration with the Georgia System of Technical Colleges. A system-wide articulation agreement allows a pathway to the B-5 bachelor’s degree completion for students with an Associates Degree in Early Care and Education from an accredited technical college program. As of September, 2012 sixty-six (69) students have declared the B-5 major, with 24 graduates during the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 academic years.

Goals
G 1: Content Knowledge
The teacher candidate will possess the content knowledge necessary to understand the content in the curriculum they teach.

G 2: Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills
The teacher candidate will possess the pedagogical content knowledge and skills to plan and teach effectively.

G 3: Student Learning
The teacher candidate will use varied instructional strategies, assessment techniques and critical reflection to document children's development and learning.

G 4: Professional Dispositions
The teacher candidate will work collaboratively with diverse professionals and display professional and ethical behaviors.

Student Learning Outcomes/Objectives
SLO 1: Demonstrates content knowledge (G: 1) (M: 1)
The teacher candidate understands child development and learning and the central concepts of the subject areas she/he teaches and creates learning experiences that are developmentally
appropriate.

**SLO 2: Plans effectively for development and learning (G: 2) (M: 2)**
The teacher candidate plans for the educational progress of children based upon knowledge of the individual student, curriculum and behavioral goals, family goals and community.

**SLO 3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning (G: 3) (M: 3)**
The teacher candidate understands the goals and benefits of assessment and uses formal and informal strategies to evaluate the development and learning of the child.

**SLO 4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions (G: 4) (M: 4)**
The teacher candidate knows and uses the ethical guidelines of the profession. She/he uses reflection to improve practice and displays interpersonal and communication skills with diverse learners, families and colleagues.

**Measures, Targets, and Findings**

**M 1: Evaluation of Field Performance (Clinical Practice) (O: 1)**
This measure rates the candidate's overall professional performance in the early childhood classroom. The measure/rubric is based on the 15 professional standards of the early care and education profession (NAEYC and CEC). At the completion of student teaching (clinical practice), teacher candidates must receive a rating from the university supervisor of "meets" or "exceeds" on each standard/element of the rubric. If a candidate does not receive a minimum rating of "meets," s/he will be required to extend or repeat student teaching with additional coaching and action plans until mastery of standards is demonstrated.

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

**Target for O1: Demonstrates content knowledge**
85% of candidates will receive ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all standards demonstrating content knowledge in the field.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**
94% of teacher candidates (15/16) received ratings of "meets standard" or "exceeds standard" for all indicators demonstrating knowledge of content and pedagogy in the field. The highest mean ratings for candidates (2.8/ 3.0) were in the areas of "promoting child development and learning," and "becoming a professional." Candidates also received strong ratings for standards focused on working with families and communities ( 2.75 - 2.81/ 3.0), which is an improvement from prior assessment cycles. Lower mean ratings were noted for "uses a broad repertoire of developmentally appropriate approaches" (2.56) and "engaging in advocacy for children in the profession." (2.62). One teacher candidate received ratings of "does not meet standard" on three (3) performance standards. This student was required to extend her student teaching internship by two weeks with a focused professional development plan on these standards. The candidate did re mediate areas of weakness and passed student teaching with a grade of "C".

[Please note: the LiveText data table linked to this finding shows only 11 candidates in the overall summary, instead of the 16 actual candidates. This error is due to one of the raters completing all ratings except "overall rating."]
M 2: IEP/IFSP Project (O: 2)

This measure rates the teacher candidate's ability to plan for a young child with special needs by completing a sample IEP or an ISFP. An IEP is the formal plan that teachers, parents, and specialists develop to meet the educational needs of a student age 3-21 who is eligible for special education services. An IFSP is the formal plan that describes a child's and family's needs and the services to be provided for children with disabilities from birth through age three. Candidates develop the formal plan in a methods course for exceptional children EXC 4530. A 32 point rubric aligned with professional standards (NAEYC and CEC) is used to rate the candidate's project on eight (8) indicators. Ratings include: mastery (4), accomplished (3), developing (2), and beginning (1). Candidates are expected to receive a rating of at least "developing" on each indicator at mid-point in the program since it may be their first exposure to the IEP/IFSP process and the project proceeds their full-time student teaching experience. Birth-Five candidates will receive the Preschool Special Education Endorsement upon program completion.

Source of Evidence: Project, either individual or group

**Target for O2: Plans effectively for development and learning**

85% of candidates will obtain a rating of at least "developing" for all eight indicators demonstrating their ability to plan effectively for children's development and learning.

**Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met**

90% (9/10) candidates received a rating of at least "developing" on all eight indicators of the IEP/IFSP project. In fact, seven (7) students received the highest rating of "mastery," and two received ratings of "accomplished." Only 1 candidate received a rating of "beginning" which is below the target. Candidates with a rating below target are able to re-mediate their skills in the second methods course for working with children with disabilities. Therefore, candidates have three chances to demonstrate mastery of all indicators, in EXC 4520, EXC 4530 or BRFV 4661 (final internship).

M 3: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) (O: 3)

This measure rates the teacher candidate's performance against national standards through a professional portfolio. The portfolio includes artifacts and reflective narratives. Examples of artifacts are lesson plans, child case studies, research reviews, and photo documentation of children's learning. Candidates organize the portfolio based on the standards of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) and the Council for Exceptional Children (Division of Early Childhood DEC/CEC). Candidates submit assigned artifacts and rationales each semester for progress monitoring. The final portfolio evaluation is completed at the end of student teaching. One key component of the portfolio is the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project that measures the candidate's impact on student learning. This project requires the candidate to document children's learning during a 10 day thematic unit implemented during student teaching. The portfolio rubric element that rates the candidate's performance on the DOL project is titled "impact on student learning." Rubric ratings are "exceeds expectations," "satisfactory," and "unsatisfactory."

Source of Evidence: Portfolio, showing skill development or best work

**Target for O3: Uses assessment methods to document student learning**

85% of teaching candidates will obtain "satisfactory" or "exceeds expectations" on the portfolio rubric rating for "impact on student learning." This rating includes scores on the Documentation of Learning (DOL) Project from 73 - 92 (satisfactory) or 93 - 100 (exceeds).
Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

100% of candidates (16/16) received ratings of “satisfactory” or “exceeds expectations” on the Documentation of Learning Project. This project is embedded in the B-5 professional portfolio and is rated under the indicator, "Impact on Student Learning." Eight (8) candidates received ratings of "exceeds expectations" with scores between 93-100 points. Seven (7) candidates received ratings of "satisfactory" with scores ranging between 73 - 92. The overall project average was 82/100. Several candidates received ratings of "partially met" or "not met" on individual components of the project. These lower ratings were not due to lack of knowledge or skill, but typically omissions of the component or technology problems encountered by candidates with uploads into LiveText.

M 4: Dispositions Survey (O: 4)

The College of Education administers an online survey to assess all teacher candidate's professional dispositions. The measure is called "Five Dispositions of Effective Educational Professionals." Candidates receive a rating from program faculty mid program and end of program. Ratings are as follows: Exceptional (4 pts), Acceptable (3 pts), Marginal (2 pts), Unacceptable (1pt).

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target for O4: Values and exhibits professional and ethical dispositions

The achievement target is a mean rating of 3.0 on a 4.0 scale. This rating would indicate that B-5 teacher candidates demonstrated professional dispositions at the "acceptable" level at the end of program.

Findings 2012-2013 - Target: Met

The overall mean rating of candidates professional dispositions exceeded the target of 3.0 with a range of 3.69 - 3.81. 15/16 candidates displayed "exceptional" or "acceptable" levels of professional dispositions. One candidate was rated as "marginal" in terms of observed professional dispositions. Not surprisingly, this candidate also received lower ratings on other performance assessments (i.e., Evaluation of Field Performance). These professional dispositions were discussed with the candidate; however, changes in dispositions may require more intensive and longer term reflection and support.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards

This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating professional and ethical practices in this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: Medium

Implementation Description: Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2010

Responsible Person/Group: B-5 Program Coordinator

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards
This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in family and community relations this assessment cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) | Outcome/Objective: Plans effectively for development and learning

Implementation Description: Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2011

Responsible Person/Group: B-5 Program Coordinator

Additional Resources: None

Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Report data for "completers" only or revise schedule of assigned standards
This is a new program with no current "completers." The data for this outcome is for 12 candidates who are "in progress," rather than "completers." These candidates were not assigned standards for demonstrating their competence in family and community relations this reporting cycle. This is an unintended design flaw in this assessment; our attempts to provide "formative" data in Weave are incomplete. In the future, the program will report measures for "completers" only. Completers will have addressed all standards by the end of student teaching. Another possible solution would be to modify the schedule of assigned standards so that all outcomes have some data from the e-portfolio in the assessment cycle.

Established in Cycle: 2009-2010

Implementation Status: Planned

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Portfolio (Documentation of Learning) | Outcome/Objective: Uses assessment methods to document student learning

Implementation Description: Data for the e-portfolio measure will be presented for program completers when all standards have been assigned to meet learning outcomes.

Projected Completion Date: 06/2011
**Course assignment will be redesigned**

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** Redesign assignment materials and extend opportunities to work on the assessment over two courses.
**Projected Completion Date:** 06/2011
**Responsible Person/Group:** EXC 4530, EXC 4520 Course Instructor
**Additional Resources:** None
**Budget Amount Requested:** $0.00 (no request)

---

**Revise assessment and extend assessment over two courses**

There are three indicators on the IEP/IFSP project rubric where more than 85% of candidates received ratings of "beginning," which is below the achievement target. These indicators are: "provides statement of environments other than natural or general education classroom," "identifies the person responsible for implementation," and "provides for transition planning." Among these three indicators, over half of the candidates (61%) scored below expectation in "provides for transition planning." An analysis of the student work and rubric ratings revealed that students did not follow the specific guidelines in the assignment or use the rubric to insure that all indicators/elements were included in the project. It was determined that the lower ratings did not result from students lack of knowledge of these indicators. The course instructor has determined that a suitable action plan will be to give students a specific template with all indicators/elements to be filled in. This template, along with the assignment instructions and rubric, should assist the candidates in providing all required project components. Additionally, the students will have two courses to work on the IEP/IFSP (EXC 4530/EXC 4520). It is expected that their scores will improve in the second course, although assessment data will only be reported from one course EXC 4530 (these courses are not required to be taken sequentially).

**Established in Cycle:** 2010-2011
**Implementation Status:** Planned
**Priority:** High
**Implementation Description:** The instructor will revise the assessment template and students will
have the opportunity to document their performance in developing an individualized educational plan for a young child with special learning needs over two semesters, rather than just one.

Projected Completion Date: 12/2011
Responsible Person/Group: EXC 4530 instructor
Additional Resources: None
Budget Amount Requested: $0.00 (no request)

Rubric revised to clarify minimum level of performance

Going forward from fall, 2012, the IEP/IFSP rubric will be revised to reflect clearer levels of proficiency and passing scores: Mastery (29-32 points); Accomplished (25-28 points); Developing (24 points); Beginning (23 points or fewer). If a student receives 23 points or fewer, they will need to redo and resubmit the assignment until a passing score is obtained.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: In-Progress
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
  Measure: IEP/IFSP Project | Outcome/Objective: Plans effectively for development and learning

Implementation Description: EXC 4530 and EXC 4520 will revise syllabi according to the new assessment standard and scores.
Projected Completion Date: 09/2013
Responsible Person/Group: Course instructors revise syllabi; Program coordinator revises LiveText Rubric and Weave Measure
Additional Resources: None

Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 1:**
What changes in the assessment process has your degree program made since last year’s assessment report? (e.g. revised learning outcomes, measures, targets, etc.) Why were these changes made? What changes and improvements in the assessment process will you make in the coming academic year?

We observed and reported that one of our measures, the IEP/IFSP project, was using a rubric that was ineffective in reporting expectations and unclear to students. The rubric was revised and recent data reveal fewer candidates receiving ratings below target. We will continue to use this revised rubric and monitor student performance.

**ACADEMIC PROGRAM QUESTION 2:** What is the impact of the data obtained from assessment findings on your educational degree program? What changes and improvements to your educational program will be made based on this year’s assessment data? (e.g., revised curriculum, courses, sequence, etc.) If changes to curriculum or courses are made for other reasons, please explain.

Prior assessment data from one of our measures, the End Program Evaluation of Field Performance, revealed that candidates in their final student teaching internship received relatively lower ratings from cooperating teachers and university supervisors on standards related to working with families and communities. At our program advisory meetings, we discussed this finding and possible additions/assignments to one course, BRFV Family and Community Relations in Birth Through Five. Candidate’s 2012-2013 ratings on these standards is improved
over the 2011-2012 assessment. In fact, some of the highest mean ratings are in this cluster of three standards, ranging from 2.75 - 2.81/3.0. This outcome could be influenced by the course changes or a function of the candidates or school contexts for the reporting year. We will continue to monitor candidate performance on this cluster of professional standards focused on family/community relations during the final field evaluation.