

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. MAE 0482</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	Apply 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 ● District Identification Plan (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (GTE 539) ● Gifted Education Unit Plan (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (GTE 537)

	○ 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 AI will provide a starting point for research for the “Gifted Education Unit Plan”.
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: District Identification Plan (GTE 540) 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 for standards alignment. From 2023-2024: 100% of students scored at or above the minimum of 115 of 150 points. 3 of the 4 indicators had a rate of 85% or above; 1 indicator was at 71% Strengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan in regard to Professional Foundations (Policy and Standards for Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.1 – 100% OrganizationStrengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan related to Professional Foundations (Collaboration with Colleagues and Families on Assessment/ Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.3 – 100%

	Plan for Improvement: Instrumentation and How to use Assessment Results: NAGC/CEC 4.4, 6.3 – 100% Design a Multimedia Presentation of the Content to Present your Findings – 71% Criteria 2: Gifted Education Unit Plan (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. From 2023-2024: 5 of the 6 indicators had a rate of 85% or above; 1 indicator was at 83% Curricular Components (CEC 3.1) – 100% Curricular Components (CEC 2.3, 3.1) – 94% Differentiation (CEC 3.3) – 100% Career Education (CEC 5.4) – 94% Assessment of Learning (CEC 4.3) – 100% Unit Evaluation (CEC 4.4) – 83%
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: District Identification Plan and Gifted Education Unit Plan – 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, District Identification Plan and Gifted Education Unit Plan, 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. We want to drill down into our Praxis data to find out the performance of our students that varies between the three pathways: GT Certificate GT MAE GT EDS
---	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Advocate for gifted learners and are able to highlight best practices for use in their learning environment.
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) – this is appropriate (GTE 537) ○ 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 for Gifted Education Project (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (PSY 432G) ○ 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. • Creativity Identification Comparison (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (GTE 540) ○ 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 “Gifted Education Unit Plan”.
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 1: Gifted Education Unit Plan (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. From 2023-2024: 5 of the 6 indicators had a rate of 85% or above; 1 indicator was at 83% Curricular Components (CEC 3.1) – 100% Curricular Components (CEC 2.3, 3.1) – 94% Differentiation (CEC 3.3) – 100% Career Education (CEC 5.4) – 94% Assessment of Learning (CEC 4.3) – 100% Unit Evaluation (CEC 4.4) – 83% Criteria 2: Advocacy for Gifted Education Project (PSY 432G) 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. From 2023-2024:

	All students who completed PSY432G for the 2023-2024 academic year were included in the sample. A rubric that was created according to the SPA standards was used to score the project. There were 9 students completing the course assessment (of the 11 enrolled, 3 Certification only, 3 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 3 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader). The skills measure were: –use understanding of development and individual differences to respond to the needs of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 1.2 – 100% –create safe, inclusive, culturally responsive learning environments that engage individuals with gifts and talents in meaningful and rigorous learning activities and social interactions. Standard 2.1 – 100% –use communication and motivational and instructional strategies to facilitate understanding of subject matter and to teach individuals with gifts and talents how to adapt to different environments. – 67% –use instructional strategies that enhance the affective development of individuals with gifts and talents. Standard 5.5 – 100% –advance the profession by engaging in activities such as advocacy and mentoring. Standard 6.5 – 100% –apply elements of effective collaboration. Standard 7.1 – 78% –serve as a collaborative resource to colleagues. Standard 7.2 – 100% –use collaboration to promote the well-being of individuals with gifts and talents across a wide range of settings, experiences, and collaborators. Standard 7.3 – 67% –Professional Design – 100% –Communication is Clear – 89% –Content – 100% –Presentation – 100% Criteria 3: Creativity Identification Comparison (GTE 540) 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. All students who were enrolled in GTE 540 and completed the Identification Comparison assignment. All students who completed GTE 540 for the 2023-24 academic year were included in this sample. A rubric based on SPA standards was used to score this project. There were 10
--	---

	students completing the course assessment (of the 12 enrolled, 5 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 2 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader; 2 Gifted EDS). The skills measured were: –Description of the Instruments – 100% –Critique of Instruments – 70% –Program Planning – 80% –Recommendation – 90% –Writing and Grammar – 90%
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results:</u> 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, Advocacy for Gifted Education Project, and Creativity Identification Comparison – 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 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. We want to drill down into our Praxis data to find out the performance of our students that varies between the three pathways: GT Certificate GT MAE GT EDS
--	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Use data from their learning environments to create programs that address the needs in their locations using research to support their activities.
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: ● District Creativity/Leadership Programming Reflection (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (GTE 540) ○ Changing the rubric ■ revise to include the new standards ● Capstone Project (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (EDU 599 or EDU 560/TCHL 560) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator ○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ● District Identification Plan (scored by rubric) – this is appropriate (GTE 539) ○ Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator

	○ Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria ○ Updating the rubric ■ revise to include the new standards AI will provide a starting point for research for the “Gifted Education Unit Plan”.
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 1: District Creativity/Leadership Programming Reflection (GTE 540) 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. All students who were enrolled in GTE 540 Creativity and Leadership were included in this sample. All students who completed GTE 540 for the 2023-24 academic year were included in this sample. A rubric based on SPA standards was used to score this project. There were 11 students completing the course assessment (of the 12 enrolled, 5 Gifted MAE, 2 Gifted Certificate, 2 MAE Advanced Teacher Leader; 2 Gifted EDS). The five skills measured were: –Program Design – 100% –Collaboration Plan – 73% –Program Evaluation – 73% –Reflection – 100% –Writing – 82% Criteria 2: Research Capstone (EDU 560/TCHL 560 or EDU 599) Criteria: 3 out of 4 or above on rubric for each indicator Program target: 85% or more of the students meet the criteria Two students were enrolled in EDU 560/TCHL 560 for the Teacher Leader pathway for MAE for Gifted Education for 2023-2024. No students were enrolled in the research pathway capstone EDU 599 for 2023-24. Criteria 3: District Identification Plan (GTE 539) 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. All students who completed GTE 539 for Summer 23 were included in these data (4 MAE; 3 EDS) for a total of 7 students. There were four indicators:

	Strengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan in regard to Professional Foundations (Policy and Standards for Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.1 – 100% OrganizationStrengths and Growth Areas of Assessment and Identification Plan related to Professional Foundations (Collaboration with Colleagues and Families on Assessment/ Identification): NAGC/CEC 4.3 – 100% Plan for Improvement: Instrumentation and How to use Assessment Results: NAGC/CEC 4.4, 6.3 – 100% Design a Multimedia Presentation of the Content to Present your Findings – 71%
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: District Creativity/Leadership Programming Reflection, Capstone, and District Identification Plan – 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 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. We want to drill down into our Praxis data to find out the performance of our students that varies between the three pathways: GT Certificate GT MAE GT EDS
--	--

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