

Education Department 2025-2026 Annual Assessment Report (Traditional Undergrad)

2025-2026 Summary Data: percent meeting our benchmark

	2023-2024	2024-2025	2025-2026
SLO #1	99.4	100	N/A
SLO #2	98.5	90.7	92.3
SLO #3	99.3	97.8	N/A
SLO #4 (overall)	99.3	93.5	93.2
(4A: Elem. Lang Arts)		96.0	N/A
(4B: Elem. Math)		80.0	76.9
(4C: Elem. Social Studies)		100	N/A
(4D: Elem. Science)		95.5	100
(4E: Secondary)		100	100
SLO #5	100	95.5	93.9
SLO #6	99.3	95.7	84.9
SLO #7	100	96.1	87.0
SLO #8	100		80.0
SLO #9	100	97.3	100
SLO #10	100	97.3	100
SLO #11	100	97.3	100

Benchmark for all SLOs: 100% of students pass by scoring 3 or 4 on 4-point rubric

Our results for this past year surprised us a bit, primarily in SLOs #6 and #7

- #6: The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.)
- #7: The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Some of the low scores are a result of our recent changes to how we teach literacy. The board of educational examiners now requires an assessment on the science of reading for all elementary education and special education majors across the state. This resulted in some changes in where we house certain elements in literacy pedagogy. While we haven't changed where we are assessing these two standards for our elementary education majors (EDU243: Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Problems and EDU326: Methods of Teaching English Language Arts), we will be reviewing those changes this year in order to best recognize when students should take the outside assessment and how we can best prepare them for it.

SLO#8 is also low. Part of the reason for this is a much smaller cohort in the secondary education major taking content-specific methods courses last semester. We also changed the location of this assessment for elementary majors two years ago from social studies methods to math methods, a course that our students struggle in (comparatively). We'll keep an eye on SLO#8 data this coming year.

Traditional Undergraduate Assessment Matrix

Assessment Schedule: <u>Elementary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
EDU328: Teaching Science in Elementary				A	A						
EDU243: Diagnosis/Correction of Reading Probs		A				A					
EDU315: Behavior Management	A		A								
EDU329: Teaching Social Studies in Elementary				A							
EDU323: Teaching Mathematics				A				A			
EDU326: Teaching Reading & Language Arts				A			A				
EDU409: Philosophy of Education									A	A	A

Assessment Schedule: <u>Secondary</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
EDU307: General Methods		A				A	A				
EDU315: Behavior Management	A		A								
---308: Special Methods					A			A			
EDU409: Philosophy of Education									A	A	A
Department Chair Letter of Recommendation				A							

Actions taken in response to last year's APAC annual report letter:

- 1. Committee members observed that the benchmark is 100% of students will score a 3 or better on the relevant rubric. We also noted that in the past year the department did not meet the benchmark for several SLOs. Some commentary on this issue is likely warranted – even if this is to note such things as: the results are skewed by a student or students who have since been assisted through remediation to meet the benchmark; or the student(s) who could not meet the benchmark has been transitioned to the educational studies major, or some similar explanation.**

Two years ago, we implemented an InTASC alert system, similar to our department's disposition alerts, and the college's academic alerts. The instructor of the course in which a student received a 1 or 2 out of our 4-point rubric would speak to the student and fill out appropriate paperwork (see page 5). Either the assessment coordinator or the department chair would then meet with the student to determine the best place to remediate and re-score the student. Ideally this would happen in another course that reinforces that particular standard. On some occasions, we need to reinforce during student teaching, as long as the discrepancy doesn't prevent students from student teaching. That is determined by the education faculty for gate 2 in our program—application to the student teaching semester.

Of course, there are times when students leave our program, either because they recognize that they no longer want to be on this path, or because we disallow them to continue. If you'd like some examples (without names, of course), we would be happy to provide them.

- 2. The committee would encourage your department to continue to make progress in setting up departmental assessment in EAC. We understand that the goals have been set up in EAC, and this includes four child goals for SLO 4 so that you can continue to track and report results for those subgoals. We also understand that rubrics have been built and aligned for your use, so hopefully the next steps to using the system are not too burdensome.**

That is one of our primary departmental goals for this year—to move to all digital forms, data collection, and data storage.

- 3. The committee understands that your department may not have any students who are in the educational studies major. APAC would ask that you start to include an assessment results table for this major in next year's annual assessment update as well as any relevant information on new assessment measures and benchmarks. If no data can be collected because classes are not offered or there are no students in the major, then just enter "n/a" for the relevant Student Learning Outcomes in the assessment results table. We have been asking departments to include such tables as this helps keep APAC up to date on an annual basis on assessment in all majors and helps us avoid overlooking majors where assessment data collection might be missing.**

Since last year we have both added a student to the program and lost a student. It was the same student, and they did not take any of the courses that house data collection points.

We do appreciate the reminder to keep considering a best path forward for students who enter the program in the future. Because this suggestion came in response to last year's submission, I am including the table with this year's traditional undergrad report (see page 4). If you would like that separately submitted, I will gladly do so.

Education Studies Assessment Matrix

Core	#1	#2	#3	#4
EDU102: Foundations of Education*	I	I	I	I
EDU206: Survey of Exceptional Individuals*	R	R	R	R
EDU227: Instructional Technology	R		R	
EDU243WI: Diagnosis and Correction of Reading Problems	R	R	R	
EDU304: Educational Psychology	A	R	R	R
EDU315: Behavior Management	R	A	R	R
EDU340CC: Human Relations	R	R	R	R
EDU409: Philosophy of Education	R	R	A	A

Student Learning Outcomes:

Upon completing the Education Studies program, graduates will:

1. understand the history of education theory and what current education policies and programs are considered advantageous for certain levels of development.
2. identify how each child is fearfully and wonderfully made in the image of their creator which impacts the way each learner relates to the world around them, including but not limited to the classroom, their classmates, and their teachers.
3. know how to seek opportunities to advance learning and student well-being in formal and/or informal education spaces specific to the graduate's chosen track(s) of study.
4. personalize the departmental "teacher as servant" motto, linking their past educational experiences and future call in education to help "train up a child in the way they should go." (prov. 22:6)

Summary Data

	2025-2026
SLO #1	N/A
SLO #2	N/A
SLO #3	N/A
SLO #4 (overall)	N/A

NORTHWESTERN COLLEGE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT
InTASC Standard Concern

Name of Student

Course Name and Number

Name of Instructor

InTASC Standard and Score

Clarification of Concern:

Course and Assessment for Remediation:

Personal Goals for Improvement:

You are being issued this InTASC standard alert because you scored below proficient on a signature assessment. It is imperative that this issue be addressed satisfactorily prior to being approved for licensure.

Signatures (*copy to each*):

Course instructor

Date

Student

Date

Department chair

Date