

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>College of Education and Behavioral Sciences</i>	<i>School of Teacher Education</i>
<i>Gifted and Talented Ed. Certificate #1764</i>	
<i>Susan Keesey, Director of STE</i>	
Is this an online program? ☐ Yes ☐ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☐ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your **ASL Rep** by **May 15, 2025**.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will apply data literacy concepts/strategies and foundational concepts of gifted education including terminology, theories, and best practices.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? If it has recently changed, please explain. Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? Do you have the appropriate numbers of SLOs to measure regularly? Please consider choosing the most important. The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure?

	Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our three direct measurements are: • Praxis II for Gifted Education – this is appropriate • Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate ○ Changing the rubric ■ revised rubric is included at the end of this document ■ revise to include the new standards ■ make more accessible, supportive, instructive, and practical for the students • Advocacy Video (scored by rubric) – we are wanting to revise this assignment and rubric. The artifact needed to have choice built in rather than only a “video” as the product. ○ Change the title to: “Advocacy for Gifted Education Project” ■ revising to give choice, using digital tools, and differentiated to apply to the student’s contextual setting. ■ rubric is revised and included at the end of this document AI will provide a starting point for research for the “Gifted Education Unit Plan” and for the “Advocacy for Gifted Education Project”.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful--ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? If you have successfully made your targets consistently, consider a more challenging target. Criteria 1: The Praxis II test for Gifted Education Endorsement measures the degree to which the student understands and can apply foundational concepts of gifted education. This test is required for state-wide endorsement in gifted education. The components of the test are Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students, Learning Environment for Gifted Students, Instruction of Gifted Students, Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students, and Professionalism. Target from 23-24: 90% on overall pass rate and 90% scoring 70% or higher average score for each of 5 components. Achieved: 94% overall pass rate. 5 of 5 component categories are above an average of 70% Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students 53% Learning Environment for Gifted Students 82% Instruction of Gifted Students 59% Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students 65% Professionalism 76% Keep: 90% on overall pass rate and 90% scoring 70% or higher average score for each of 5 components.

	Criteria 2: Gifted Education Unit Plan Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. Criteria 3: Advocacy for Gifted Education Project (changed title) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: The Praxis II exam for gifted education: We are seeing a gap in performance in the areas: Development and Characteristics of Gifted Students 53%, Instruction of Gifted Students 59% Identification and Assessment of Gifted Students 65% We see a need for more focus on making sure our students are learning what is needed for success in these areas. For the two assignments: Gifted Education Unit Plan and Advocacy Project – there are no surprises and we see these as important experiences for assignments. The revised rubrics will help guide important growth. Conclusions: Praxis II is the certification exam required for licensure. The performance on the exam can be improved. We are redesigning our courses to have more emphasis on the three areas noted above. We also are considering how to support our students via Praxis II preparation. We are going to be more intentional in our approach for preparing students for certification success. The two assignments, Gifted Education Unit Plan and Advocacy Project, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: ● collect a more appropriate artifact ● create new program outcomes ● adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met ● need to reconstruct your curriculum map ● sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided

	Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have two new/updated rubrics. The targets will be the same as we have not consistently met the criteria. We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics. For Praxis improvement, we are planning a Praxis preparation workshop that highlights areas that need to be reinforced in light of the data (like identification). We are adding to the curriculum for the GTE 536 course with a module on identification. In the GTE 538 practicum, we will continue having the discussion and preparation sessions for taking the Praxis. We will work with the Student Success Center to further develop Praxis support.
--	---

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will analyze research and best practices to recommend professional learning to improve the lives of gifted children and adolescents.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our three direct measurements are: • Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) (GTE 537) • Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 536) • Gifted Practicum Reflection – Capstone Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 538)
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? Criteria: • Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) (GTE 537) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria

	○ We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. ● Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 536) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ● Gifted Practicum Reflection – Capstone Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 538) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ○ We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. AI will provide a starting point for research for the Assignments.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: For the three assignments: Gifted Education Unit Plan, Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project, Gifted Practicum Reflection – there are no surprises and we see these as important experiences for assignments. The revised rubrics will help guide important growth. Conclusions: The three assignments, Gifted Education Unit Plan, Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project, Gifted Practicum Reflection, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: ● collect a more appropriate artifact ● create new program outcomes ● adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met ● need to reconstruct your curriculum map ● sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have two new/updated rubrics. The targets will be the same as we have not consistently met the criteria. We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Students will systematically develop job-embedded practices that implement research for gifted children and adolescents.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The program learning outcome is still relevant as we look at the data from the last cycles. The outcome is multi-aligned. We have streamlined the wording to align with CAEP accreditation standards and SACSCOC guidance. The program outcome is also aligned with the latest national gifted standards (Council for Exceptional Children Initial Performance-Based Professional Preparation Standards for Gifted Educators) and state Kentucky Teacher Performance Standards.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Our three direct measurements are: • Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) (GTE 537) • Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 536) • Gifted Practicum Reflection – Capstone Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 538)
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? Criteria: • Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) (GTE 537) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ○ We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. • Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 536) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria • Gifted Practicum Reflection – Capstone Project (scored by rubric) (GTE 538) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ○ We are revising this rubric and will use the criteria and program target that was used previously. AI will provide a starting point for research for the Assignments.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain

	<u>Conclusions:</u> What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool. Results: For the three assignments: Gifted Education Unit Plan, Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project, Gifted Practicum Reflection – there are no surprises and we see these as important experiences for assignments. The revised rubrics will help guide important growth. Conclusions: The three assignments, Gifted Education Unit Plan, Underrepresented Students in Gifted Education Project, Gifted Practicum Reflection, are critical assignments that will be improved with refinement of the rubrics.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in “closing the loop.” For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle. For the 2025-2026 - 2027-2028 school years, we plan to keep this learning outcome and use the same measurement items. The measurement tools will have two new/updated rubrics. The targets will be the same as we have not consistently met the criteria. We will implement these assessments in the designated courses and will use the newly revised rubrics.

To add more outcomes, if needed, select the table above and copy & paste below.