1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?
The student learning outcomes used for assessment purposes are the Advanced Standards for Physical Education Teacher Education from NASPE. The outcomes assessed were 1A (did you mean 1C?), 2B, 3A and B. As reported in the previous year’s report, the Health and Physical Education program is a two year cohort program. Students are only accepted into the program every other year subsequently, classes are taught on an every other year timeline. Thus, annual assessment of all of the outcomes is not possible.

2. How were they assessed?
The information concerning the assessments is included in the table placed below.

A) What methods were used?
B) Who was assessed?
C) When was it assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1A</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of content in movement and pedagogy</td>
<td>AC has broad understanding of movement or pedagogy. Or, understands both without knowing how they relate to learning and teaching in physical education</td>
<td>AC has a depth of understanding in several aspects of both movement and pedagogy and can explain how they relate to learning and teaching in physical education.</td>
<td>AC synthesizes concepts from multiple aspects of both movement and pedagogy and can articulate how this information applies to specific students and contexts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals: 1, 5
Related University Goals: 1, 6
Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment)
Who Assessed (population, item):
When Assessed (term, dates): Projected to be assessed during the spring of 2013 in PE 561
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: See targets above
Results for 2011-12: Not assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1B</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of how to represent content knowledge to make it comprehensible to learners (i.e., pedagogical content knowledge)</td>
<td>AC knows that the integration of content and pedagogy is central to learning and teaching in physical education.</td>
<td>AC knows how to transform the content into understandable forms adapted to general learner characteristics.</td>
<td>AC knows how to transform the content into understandable forms tailored to the variations in ability and background presented by the learners and the learning context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals: 1, 5
Related University Goals: 1, 6
Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment):
Who Assessed (population, item):
When Assessed (term, dates): This will be assessed during the 2013
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: See rubric above
Results for 2011-12: none (DOWN BELOW IT SAID 12 PASSED 0 FAILED Tom’s note)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1C</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of processes and methods of systematic intentional inquiry about learning and teaching in physical education</td>
<td>AC has general understanding of systematic inquiry, takes research findings at face value, and tries to apply them to learning and teaching in physical education.</td>
<td>AC has a thorough understanding of multiple modes of inquiry and can critique, synthesize, and apply research findings to learning and teaching in physical education.</td>
<td>AC identifies pertinent questions about learning and teaching in physical education, as well as designs processes for collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data to answer those questions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals:
Related University Goals: 1, 6
Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?): Effective pedagogical behaviors were identified followed by each student observing videotapes of him/her teaching. The videotape observation enabled them to identify strengths and weaknesses in their teaching. They then designed a systematic analysis tools specifically to help them
improve their teaching effectiveness. Tools were designed to collect pedagogical information through event, duration, interval or placheck data collection systems. Upon the completion of the systematic tool creation, the student watched his/her videotapes while using the systematic analysis tool they created. The systematically collected information was then reported through appropriate statistics and concluded with objective goal setting pertaining to his/her teaching. The reporting of this information was completed in a Powerpoint presentation to the class. The systematic tools were analyzed with a systematic analysis tool rubric that included seven components that were assessed based on four levels of performance. As a part of this analysis, students also were required to set goals that were directly related to the systematic inquiry that they had completed.

Who Assessed (population, item): HPE cohort, which was just beginning their second year in the program. Course was PE 560.

When Assessed (term, dates): Summer 2012

Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: See Rubric Above

Results for 2011-12: Twelve students enrolled in and completed the two-week intensive summer class. Target -12, Acceptable – 0, Unacceptable – 0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2A</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching reflects understanding and application of content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge appropriate to the learners, the learning environment, and long- and short-term outcomes/goals</td>
<td>AC demonstrates through planning and/or instruction limited or shallow understanding of content knowledge and PCK appropriate for the specific learners, context, and/or long- and short-term outcomes/goals. Or, planning and/or instruction reveal gaps or misunderstandings in content knowledge or PCK.</td>
<td>AC demonstrates through planning and/or instruction accurate and sufficient content knowledge and PCK appropriate for the specific learners, context, and long- and short-term outcomes/goals.</td>
<td>AC demonstrates through planning and/or instruction a deep understanding of content knowledge and PCK as well as articulating a rationale for instructional choices. Or, discovers opportunities to refine or develop new understandings that add to the professional body of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals: 1, 2, 5
Related University Goals: 1, 4

Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?):
Who Assessed (population, item): HPE 700 & HPE 577
When Assessed (term, dates): Projected to be assessed winter of 2013
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement:
Results for 2011-12: Not assessed
### Outcome 2B (see below)

| Teaching reflects integration of planning, instruction, and assessment as a unified process to achieve long- and short-term outcomes/goals | AC aligns some but not all of the components of the learning cycle (planning achieving, instruction, assessment, and reflection) with the other components, learner needs, and/or long- and short-term outcomes/goals. Or, teaching deviates from planned activities so that desired goals are not assessed or achieved. | AC uses knowledge of learners’ current level of progress in desired outcomes/goals (results of prior assessment) to design and carry out appropriate sequential learning experiences and instructional activities, and to assess learner progress and/or achievement. The results of this latter assessment are then used to further design or modify and carry out future learning experiences. | AC uses learners’ prior knowledge and personal history (e.g., language, culture, family, and community) to plan, implement, and assess meaningful learning experiences. AC engages learners in the process of defining long- and short-term outcomes/goals, designing or choosing learning experiences, and monitoring their own learning in ways that are developmentally appropriate. |
personal and cultural characteristics of learners regardless of their personal strengths, characteristics, and/or experience. Or, the range of learner characteristics and needs exceeds the multiple learning experiences provided. concepts, a variety of appropriate learning tasks and structures, and a variety of assessment strategies in order to design and/or adapt instruction to meet the current needs of individual learners.

respects and celebrates learners’ diverse experiences and approaches to learning. AC uses multiple strategies to engage learners in appropriate opportunities that promote the development of performance capabilities, critical thinking skills, and/or the ability to recognize their own needs and seek experiences to meet those needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 2D</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2D. Teaching reflects systematic inquiry about their practice and the learners they serve</td>
<td>AC places responsibility on learners for failure to achieve desired outcomes. And/or the reflective cycle and assessment are too shallow to provide insight about ways to improve practice.</td>
<td>AC regularly and systematically analyzes the effectiveness of instruction on learner engagement and progress in meeting short- and long-term goals. AC takes responsibility for using this information to modify instruction and develop professional learning goals and plans.</td>
<td>AC engages learners in the process of analyzing teaching effectiveness and learning and uses the results of systematic analysis to test hypotheses and generate knowledge according to the methods of inquiry and standards of evidence used in physical education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals: 1, 2, 5
Related University Goals: 1, 4
Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?):
Who Assessed (population, item):
When Assessed (term, dates): Will be assessed in summer 2013
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: See Rubric Above
Results for 2011-12: none assessed

NASPE Standard 3: Professional Leadership
Advanced physical education candidates are continuous, collaborative learners who further their own professional development and use their abilities to contribute to the profession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3A</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A. Conducts inquiry into professional knowledge and practice and communicates results of inquiry to the profession and community</td>
<td>AC assesses teaching by thoughtfully considering own practice in relationship to successful practitioners. Results from reflection may be used to improve instruction but are not disseminated to or shared with others.</td>
<td>AC conducts inquiry into professional knowledge and practice. AC shares professional knowledge with colleagues and/or community.</td>
<td>AC questions professional knowledge and practice by conducting formal inquiry into teaching and learning. AC seeks formal means of sharing findings with the profession as a whole and/or advocating for instructional and school improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Related College Goals: 4
Related University Goals: 4, 5

Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?): Students reviewed a variety of perspectives related to promoting their physical education programs. They examined the latest trends in regard to advocacy. Students then selected three task assignments to design and implement in their school settings. The selection was to come from the following: bulletin boards, newsletters, websites, theme-based calendars, parental involvement plans, or a school-wide promotional event. These were assessed with an advocacy rubric.
Who Assessed (population, item): HPE 578 Physical Education and Health Promotion
When Assessed (term, dates): Winter 2012
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: See rubric above
Results for 2010-11: Results of the assessment were Target 12, Acceptable 0, Unacceptable-0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3B</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continues personal development through contributions to the growth and</td>
<td>AC participates in professional learning opportunities for personal benefit.</td>
<td>AC contributes to the improvement of peers’, colleagues’, or others’ practice that leads to the</td>
<td>AC contributes to the development of all involved through sustained formal curricular and/or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for 2011-12: none assessed
professional learning of others

professional learning of all involved.

instructional support to fellow professionals by serving as a mentor, instructional coach, or in other leadership roles.

Related College Goals: 4
Related University Goals: 4, 5
Method(s) of Assessment (What is the assessment?): This was not assessed through or associated with a specific course. There was not an assignment to require students to meet this outcome. However, it is specific to what students who are in an advanced degree of study should be doing. To assess SLO, students were asked if they would share when or if they were involved in information dissemination opportunities or in leadership roles within and beyond their local districts. Information reported here was collected strictly through observation at conferences along with statements from the students. It should also be noted that we are unable to conclude as to whether a student’s performance is less than at target, since they may be involved in related opportunities without sharing them with the faculty at CWU. While this may seem a bit odd to be assessed in this fashion, it is actually not only appropriate, but very insightful as to the success of the program.

Who Assessed (population, item): 2010-2012 cohort
When Assessed (term, dates): during the 2011-2012 year
Standard of Mastery/ Criterion of Achievement: Results for 2011-12: Twelve students were in the cohort. Five have presented professionally, four at the state conference. Two presented on two different occasions and one of the five has had his project accepted for presentation at the 2013 national conference. One of the students also ran for a leadership role in his state association. Target – 5, Acceptable – unknown, Unacceptable – unknown.

3. What was learned?
As has been reported previously, a small percentage of the outcomes are being assessed this year. When the graduate program determined that these were a better standard for our HPE program to strive to achieve, a reexamination of the courses had not taken place. After discussions with the faculty who teach these classes as well as an examination of the syllabi, the SLO’s are reflected within the existing curricula. However, two SLOs need specific assessments to be designed creating the evidence of student achievement. These SLOs are 1B and 2C. It is also noted that it is difficult to analyze the teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge. This is an area along with the finding other methods to assess pedagogical skills.

4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information?
As stated in the 2010-2011 report, the graduate faculty in PESPH needed to meet and reexamine the curricula relative to the SLO’s. This, in fact, began in the spring. This hoped for scrutiny uncovered a number of issues that were much more reflective of a department that combines several content areas rather than being able to adjust the curricula to better assess a couple of the SLO’s that are not currently being assessed. The tangents that were brought up by graduate faculty who do not teach in the HPE program were specific to desires of offering other graduate degrees or even including
more content that extends beyond the current NASPE Advanced Candidate standards. Tasks were assigned for this review to continue and the department is awaiting those items to be completed for discussions to continue.

5. What did the department or program do in response to last year’s assessment information?

In answering this question, please describe any changes that have been made to improve student learning based on previous assessment results. Please also discuss any changes you have made to your assessment plan or assessment methods.

As stated above, tasks have been assigned in relation to the larger issues of changing or adding graduate programs to PESPH. Meetings will continue when the tasks are completed. However, it is also noted that in relation to the current SLO’s the HPE program is very successful. In all but one SLO, the students are meeting the target.

Additionally, it was noted in the previous report that the on-time graduation rate had been consistently lower than 28%. As stated,

“...The report also called for the need to explore and implement more practical projects to increase the on time graduation rate. The on time rate has rarely been higher than 28%. Anecdotally, the program has improved. Of course the information extends beyond the 2010-2011 report in that the students were only completing their first year in the summer of 2011. However, it does need to be reported that changes in the research class HPE 557 appears to have had a positive effect in the timeliness and appropriateness of projects. One student proposed her project during the summer of 2011 (earlier than any previous year) and 10 students have formally proposed the projects to their committees. Changes that have led to this appear to have been successful in increasing the timeliness of completion.”

It is obvious that changes, which had been made, did have a positive impact. In fact, for the cohort who completed coursework in the spring of 2012, 75% successfully defended their projects. That is a huge success, which comes after almost 11 years of failed attempts to get the students to complete their projects. Additionally, five students made professional presentations and one has had his project accepted to be presented at the 2013 national conference. Four others are working at combining their projects into a formal presentation proposal for the 2014 national conference.

6. Questions or suggestions concerning Assessment of Student Learning at Central Washington University: