

MAR

Meta Assessment of the Unit's Assessment System & the Unit's Effectiveness

Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

NCATE Standard 2: The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

Unit Goal(s): The unit implements a comprehensive assessment system congruent with university assessment and reporting protocols. The assessment system provides data on student learning outcomes and other non-academic outcomes for initial and advanced programs. The data inform decision-making within the unit and the university at large.

** Adapted from a model developed by James Madison University*

1. UNIT'S ASSESSMENT SYSTEM						
Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Target 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	

<p>1.1 Involvement of professional community</p>	<p>The unit assessment system was not developed with, and is not reviewed by, the broader professional community (P-12 and arts and sciences faculty).</p>	<p>The unit assessment system was developed with some input from, but is not systematically reviewed by, the broader professional community on a regular basis.</p>	<p>The unit assessment system was developed with, and is systematically reviewed by, the broader professional community on a regular basis.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANAYLSIS: Although all unit faculty were invited to Unit Wide Assessment meetings, not all attended the meetings. This said, there was always a cross sectional representation. At this initial stage of the Unit Assessment System implementation, faculty from the institution were not invited to participate in the Unit-Wide meetings. At the March 8, 2017 Unit Assessment Committee Meeting, only a few community partners were in attendance, thereby limiting responses and recommendations from partners. RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must seek and institute opportunities to involve a greater number of faculty and community partners in the examination of the Unit Assessment System. The Unit must identify ways other than face to face meeting to get the professional community involved. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>What is the most effective method for creating greater collaborative inclusion in the assessment system process?</i></p>
---	--	---	---	----------	----------	---

<p>1.2 Alignment with conceptual framework, professional, state standards</p>	<p>The unit assessment system does not reflect the conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards.</p>	<p>The unit assessment system is aligned with the conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards.</p>	<p>The unit assessment system is aligned with conceptual frameworks and professional and state standards, and is regularly re-evaluated.</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: Faculty across the Unit have attended monthly meetings to work on aligning assessment with the CF. Minutes indicate that the CF was reviewed and is evident in syllabi. RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must continue to examine the language interpretation of terms in the CF, ie: the specific meaning of the term “National Standards, Diversity” QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>NA at this time.</i></p>
--	--	---	--	----------	----------	--

<p>1.3 Comprehensive and integrated measures</p>	<p>The assessment system consists of a collection of individual measures that are neither comprehensive nor integrated.</p>	<p>The assessment system includes some comprehensive assessment measures, but they are not integrated or lack relevant scoring criteria.</p>	<p>The assessment system includes comprehensive and integrated measures with relevant scoring criteria that are regularly re-evaluated.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>ANAYSLS: Faculty report that Initial Programs have considerable assessment measures that routinely use scoring criteria (rubrics) to evaluate candidates' levels of mastery and that these rubrics are part of data in the TK20 system. Also, some assessments in Initial Programs indicate a progression of skills across candidates' curricular sequence. Faculty also noted that not all Advanced Programs routinely use scoring criteria to evaluate candidates' levels of mastery. To remedy this, the Unit has instituted the CAR, PAR, UAR and MAR protocols to integrate data collection and to compare data sets across all programs. RECOMMENDATION: Initial and Advanced faculty must work together to identify scoring criteria and language to systematize candidates' levels of mastery (unacceptable, developing, target). QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>What is the most effective tool/method for sharing scoring criteria and sample rubrics so that an integrated system in both layout/structure and quantifiable criteria language emerge?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	--

<p>1.4 Identified decision gates (Transition Points)</p>	<p>The unit has not identified the major decision points (admission, appropriate transition points, and program completion) at which candidate performance data will be collected for each program.</p>	<p>The unit has identified the major decision points at which candidate performance data will be collected for each program.</p>	<p>The unit has identified, and collects candidate performance data at, the major decision points for each program.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANAYSIS: While the Unit has identified transitions points for Initial and Advanced candidates, the Unit has only collected data at entry and exit levels for Initial Programs. However, there is no evidence of data collection at the mid-level for Initial Programs. In the Advanced programs, the Unit has identified requirements for entry into each program, but there are no data collected at the entry or mid-level for Advanced programs. RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must attach the transition points (Gates) to all planning sheets and these documents must be used during all candidate advising appointments for all programs so that candidates' have fair and accurate information across the Unit. Initial and Advanced programs must collect and analyze data from key assessments identified at each transition point. The Unit must add diversity as one of the key assessments within the transition points for both Initial and Advanced programs. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Student Success Collaborative be used to communicate to all candidates and collect data from key assessments at all transition points within and across all Initial and Advanced programs?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	---

<p>1.5 Multiple assessment measures</p>	<p>The unit assesses its candidates using single or unaligned assessment measures at some decision points in their programs.</p>	<p>The unit uses multiple aligned and appropriate measures to assess its candidates at most decision points in their programs.</p>	<p>The unit systematically uses multiple aligned measures to assess its candidates at all major decision points in its programs.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: While the Unit has gathered evidence of multiple assessment measures that clearly document candidates' progression through course work and programmatic expectations (certification exams), the Unit has found that not all Initial programs' ISL have the same components. In addition, not all Advanced programs have multiple measures nor streamlined comparisons to assess candidates. RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must create, streamline and implement multiple measures across all programs, particularly ISL so that candidates' performance is assessed in an aligned way. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER SELF STUDY: <i>What is the most effective tool/method to accurately and fairly evaluate candidates using multiple assessment measures within and across all Initial and Advanced programs?</i></p>
--	--	--	--	----------	----------	--

<p>1.6 Assessment of unit operations</p>	<p>The unit has not defined and does not measure factors impacting unit operations.</p>	<p>The unit has defined unit operations and developed appropriate assessment measures, but the assessments are not conducted on a regular basis.</p>	<p>The unit systematically assesses unit operations on a regular basis.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS Since the Unit Assessment System is in its initial implementation stage, monthly Unit Wide NCATE meetings were scheduled for faculty to discuss the Unit's operations. Yet the Unit must find a structure (most likely Teacher Education Council) to continue to regularly examine the Unit and its operations. RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must determine a timeline within Teacher Education Council that regularly (yearly) examines the Unit's operations. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit better integrate data collection at the transition points into it's the Unit assessment timeline?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	--

<p>1.7 Fairness, accuracy, consistency, lack of bias</p>	<p>No steps have been taken to establish that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias.</p>	<p>Preliminary steps have been taken to establish that assessments are fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias.</p>	<p>Assessments have been established as fair, accurate, consistent, and free from bias. Assessments are regularly reviewed for bias, fairness, etc.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: While the Unit has made some progress in aligning candidates' outcomes with the CF, and faculty are discussing as a Unit issues pertaining to key assessments, specifically how to streamline them for consistency, the Unit noted the need to address a number of issues to ensure each program is fair, accurate, and free from bias. RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must examine data and specifically Unit key assessments to collect evidence of fairness within and across all programs, specifically in transition points (Gates), assessment measures, data structure/layout, and systems for data analysis within and across Initial and Advanced programs. For example, the Unit must revise current key assessment measures to better quantify candidates' levels of mastery (unacceptable, developing and target). QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>What is the most approach to accurately and fairly evaluate candidates using multiple assessment measures within and across all Initial and Advanced programs?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	--

2. DATA COLLECTION, ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION

Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Target 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	
2.1 Unit-wide data management system	The unit does not have a unit-wide electronic data system to collect and store candidate performance and program/unit operations data. Data collection systems at the program level do not interface with a unit-wide system.	A unit-wide electronic data system is in place that can collect and store all candidate performance and unit operations data over time. Program-level data collection systems interface with the unit-wide data system.	A unit-wide electronic data system is in place that can collect, store, and process all candidate performance and unit operations data over time. Maintenance and enhancement needs are anticipated.	2	1	<p>ANALYSIS While there is a consistent tool for Initial Programs to gather data from all Unit's key assessments, Advanced Programs do not collect data using TK20 for their Practicum and/or Capstone.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must include all Practicum and Capstone data from Advanced Programs in the same system for inputting and analysis. This Unit-Wide data collection will track red flags within the data structure and candidates' outcomes across the Unit.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>What is the most effective internal control (within Advanced Programs) to ensure that Practicum and Capstone data are collected in TK20?</i></p>

<p>2.2 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating candidate performance data</p>	<p>The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate candidate assessment data at identified decision points.</p>	<p>The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates candidate assessment data at some decision points in candidates' programs.</p>	<p>The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates candidate assessment data at all decision points in candidates' programs.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANAYSIS: While the Unit has identified transitions points for Initial and Advanced candidates, the Unit has only collected data at entry and exit levels for Initial Programs, but there is no evidence of data collection at the mid-level. In the Advanced Programs, the Unit has identified requirements for entry into each program, but there is no evidence of data collected at the entry or mid-level for Advanced Programs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must attach the transition points (Gates) to all planning sheets and these documents must be used during candidate advising appointments for all programs so that programs can collect, analyze and evaluate candidate data at entry, mid and exit levels. The Unit must add diversity as one of the key assessments within the transition points for both Initial and Advanced programs.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Student Success Collaborative be used to communicate to all candidates and collect data from key assessments at all transition points within and across all Initial and Advanced Programs?</i></p>
--	---	--	---	----------	----------	---

<p>2.3 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating program quality data</p>	<p>The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate program quality data on a regular basis.</p>	<p>The unit informally collects, analyzes, and evaluates program quality data on a sporadic basis.</p>	<p>The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates program quality data at regularly scheduled intervals as part of a comprehensive unit assessment plan.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANAYSIS: While the Unit created a program assessment rubric (PAR) for Initial and Advanced Programs, at first implementation of the PAR, the Unit was not successful in collecting data for all programs as expected. Some programs reported data on key assessments, but did not provide specific evidence for how data will be used to evaluate and change programs. These programs were advised to revise and resubmit their PARs. RECOMMENDATION: The Unit Wide Assessment Committee must continue to review PARs to determine programs level of compliance with the CF as it relates to programmatic changes. The Unit Wide Assessment Committee must continue to provide training for all faculty on how to report programmatic data. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit Wide Assessment Committee systematize data reports across all Initial and Advanced Programs?</i></p>
--	---	--	--	----------	----------	--

<p>2.4 Collecting, analyzing, and evaluating unit operations data</p>	<p>The unit does not collect, analyze, or evaluate unit operations data on a regular basis.</p>	<p>The unit informally collects, analyzes, and evaluates unit operations data on a sporadic basis.</p>	<p>The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates unit operations data at regularly scheduled intervals as part of a comprehensive unit assessment plan.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: The Unit has developed two rubrics (UAR and MAR) that include indicators to evaluate the Unit's operations. The quality of the Unit's operations is regarded in two ways: attainment of candidates' learning outcomes related to the CF and the Unit's outputs (completers, certification candidates, employment, and program accreditation). RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must analyze the output data on a yearly basis so individual programs can support the Unit's operations goals. As a result of the institution's broad classification of program completers (Freshman Cohort Graduation Rates), the Unit must collect its own data related to graduation rates to ascertain the exact number of candidates that enter programs according to the transition points and the number who graduate. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit better collect and report graduate rates for all programs?</i></p>
--	---	--	--	----------	----------	---

<p>2.5 Multiple sources of data collection</p>	<p>Limited or no assessment data are collected from some, but not all, of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.</p>	<p>Minimal assessment data are periodically collected from all of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.</p>	<p>Comprehensive assessment data are systematically collected from all of the following groups: applicants, candidates, faculty, graduates, employers, and other professionals.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: While the Unit recognizes that data are collected from all stakeholders, data collection is not consistent across all programs. For instance, the Unit Wide Assessment Committee found that 2016 dispositions data were only completed by candidates. In addition, the sample sizes for survey data can be considered as a limited view of the Unit's CF goals.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must ensure that all Advanced Programs collect data consistently from multiple stakeholders according to the Unit Assessment transition points (Gates). The Unit must increase survey respondents.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit increase the sample size for data at the Advanced and Initial levels for candidates and employers?</i></p>
---	---	---	---	----------	----------	--

<p>2.6 Internal and external assessments</p>	<p>The unit generates data only for external accountability reports (NCATE, SPA's, state, etc.). Programs administer some internal assessments but do not share data with the unit.</p>	<p>The unit generates some data based on internal unit standards, but does not attempt to integrate external and internal data as part of a comprehensive assessment system. External and internal assessments may duplicate each other or leave gaps.</p>	<p>A strong rationale guides the combination of internal and external assessment sources used in the assessment system. External and internal assessments complement, but do not duplicate each other and address all assessment needs.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: The Unit has internal assessments (program-designed assessments such as ISL) and external assessments (licensure tests and cooperating teacher evaluations). In addition, the Unit surveys employers and also uses data from SPA reports. Although not part of this report, the Unit is preparing data for the PDE program review and the Middle States. These two entities provide external assessment of the Unit.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must proactively implement timelines for data collection according to the Unit Assessment transition points (Gates). The Unit must integrate internal and external assessments to be sure that assessments do not duplicate but complement each other.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit confirm that assessment measures complement each other and address the CF goals without duplication?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	--

<p>2.7 Compiling, summarizing, and analyzing assessment data</p>	<p>Data are not regularly and systematically compiled and summarized.</p>	<p>Data are regularly and systematically summarized, but are not analyzed for program improvement.</p>	<p>Data are regularly and systematically compiled, summarized, and analyzed for program improvement. A strong rationale guides data analysis.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: Not until the implementation of the Unit Assessment System did the Unit routinely summarize and analyze data for Unit Wide improvement. RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must continue to implement the Unit Assessment System protocol. The Unit must routinely assess the protocol (CAR, PAR, UAR and MAR) and make changes accordingly. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit effectively analyze and summarize data for all key assessments for all programs?</i></p>
---	---	--	---	----------	----------	---

3. USE OF DATA FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT

Indicator	Unacceptable 1	Developing 2	Acceptable 3	Rating		Comments
				ITP	ADV	
3.1 - Unit-wide process for using data for program improvement	The unit makes assessment results available only to administrators as needed, and does not use the data for unit or program improvement.	The unit uses assessment results for individual program improvement, but there is no systematic process for making changes or improvements across programs or at the program or unit level.	An ongoing, systematic, standards-based process is in place for reporting and using data to make decisions and improve programs both unit- and university-wide. Data are regularly collected and stored, analyzed, and reported in user-friendly formats. Changes based on data are evident.	2	2	<p>ANALYSIS: Not until the implementation of the Unit Assessment System did the Unit routinely summarize and analyze data for Unit Wide improvement.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must continue to implement the Unit Assessment System protocol. The Unit must routinely assess the protocol (CAR, PAR, UAR and MAR) and make changes accordingly.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit effectively analyze and summarize data for all key assessments for all programs?</i></p>

<p>3.2 - Evaluation of courses</p>	<p>The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its courses. Course revisions based on evaluation data are evident.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: At the Initial and Advanced levels, the Unit developed and implemented a protocol (CAR) to assess course level data against the CF, and found that course level competencies were consistently analyzed, yet in the Unit not all courses addressed each CF goal. The curriculum mapping exercise (Fall 16) indicated that courses were addressing each CF goal, so there appears to be a discrepancy between the data evidence and the course content (i.e., syllabi).</p> <p>RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must revise course alignment with each CF goal to ensure that all courses address the CF goals appropriately. The Unit must ensure that new courses create a CAR as part of the UCC proposal to ascertain that such course matches CF goals and also provides an assessment plan to gather data as identified in the Unit Assessment System protocol.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit ensure that Advanced level courses contain Advanced level outcomes? How can the Unit ensure that data collected from courses actually reflect each CF goal at the Initial and Advanced levels? How can the unit ensure that embedded assessments are better aligned with the Unit-Wide assessments (ISL/capstone, student teaching/practicum, dispositions and diversity)?</i></p>
---	--	---	--	----------	----------	---

<p>3.3 - Evaluation of programs</p>	<p>The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its programs. Program revisions based on evaluation data are evident.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANAYSIS: Until the implementation of the Unit Assessment System, the Unit did not collect and analyze data as a Unit. It only relied on SPA results. As a result, a program such as C and I that does not have a SPA has found it difficult to evaluate outcomes for programmatic change. While the Unit has created a program assessment rubric (PAR) for Initial and Advanced Programs, the Unit was not successful in collecting all data for all programs as expected. Some programs did not indicate the use of data to evaluate and improve programs. These programs were advised to revise and resubmit their PARs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Unit Wide Assessment Committee must continue to review PARs to determine programs level of compliance with the CF as it relates to programmatic changes. The Unit Wide Assessment Committee must continue to provide training for all faculty on how to report programmatic data. The Unit must evaluate the entire C and I program and bring it into full compliance with the Unit Assessment System protocol.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit Wide Assessment Committee systematize the use of data across all Initial and Advanced programs to evaluate and improve all programs?</i> <i>How can the Unit guide the C and I program to implement data assessment for improvement?</i></p>
--	---	--	--	----------	----------	--

<p>3.4 - Evaluation of field and clinical experiences</p>	<p>The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its field and clinical experiences. Revisions to field and clinical experiences based on evaluation data are evident.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: For Initial Programs, the Unit routinely uses a variety of sources to evaluate field experiences; however, for Advanced Programs, the Unit has not reviewed data from all clinical experiences according to the CF. RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must systematize the data collection and analysis of candidates' outcomes in field and clinical experiences using a variety of sources and measures. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FUTURE THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit better guide the data collection for Advanced Programs to ensure that candidates' outcomes in field and clinical experiences are evaluated based on the CF and a variety of sources?</i></p>
--	---	--	--	----------	----------	--

<p>3.5 - Evaluation of unit operations</p>	<p>The unit does not use data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations.</p>	<p>The unit reviews data from a variety of sources to evaluate its unit operations. Revisions to unit operations based on evaluation data are evident.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: Until the implementation of the Unit Assessment System protocol, the Unit did not utilize existing data to evaluate the Unit's operations. RECOMMENDATIONS: The Unit must continue to examine output data as part of the battery of assessments to predict performance and make changes to the Unit. The Unit must analyze and share output data with all stakeholders in a consistent way. QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit better improve its use of data to predict and make changes to the Unit? How can the Unit effectively share output data with all stakeholders?</i></p>
---	--	---	--	----------	----------	---

<p>3.6 - Candidate reflection and improvement</p>	<p>Candidate assessment data are not shared with candidates.</p>	<p>Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates, but with little or no guidance for reflection and improvement.</p>	<p>Candidate assessment data are shared with candidates with guidance for reflection and improvement. The unit provides candidates with opportunities for remediation.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>ANALYSIS: At the course and program levels, some assessment data (i.e., ISL, Student Teaching) are shared with candidates and programs provide candidates with opportunities to improve outcomes. The Unit Wide Assessment Committee found that until the implementation of the Unit Assessment System protocol, the Unit did not share candidates' assessment data nor did provide candidates opportunities for remediation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDATION: The Unit must continue to share with the candidates their assessment data and provide candidates opportunities for remediation.</p> <p>QUESTIONS TO DRIVE FURTHER THE UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM: <i>How can the Unit consistently share candidates' assessment data and provide candidates opportunities for remediation?</i> <i>How can the Field Placement Diversity Questionnaire better collect candidates' perceptions on their ability to plan, implement, and/or reflect on diverse PK-12 students' learning?</i></p>
--	--	---	--	----------	----------	--

