

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

Unit Assessment System Handbook

Professional Education Unit

Approved, Teacher Education Committee, March 2012

Table of Contents

Professional Education Unit	3
Conceptual Framework and Unit Assessment System	4
Unit Assessment System	5
Data Elements Collected Transition Points and Candidate Assessment	7
Alignment of Key UAS Performance Assessments to Conceptual Framework Elements	10
Procedures for Data Collection, Aggregation, Analysis, Dissemination, and Use	12
Timeline for Data Collection and Aggregation	13
Use of Technologies in Data Collection and Aggregation	13
Procedures to Promote Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency, and Elimination of Bias	20

List of Tables

Table 1:	Guiding Questions of the UAS	6
Table 2:	Initial Programs (Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Initial Licensure) Transition Points and Candidate Assessments	8
Table 3:	Advanced Programs Transition Points and Candidate Assessments	8
Table 4:	Additional Data Collection and Analysis to Assess Unit Level Performance	9
Table 5:	Alignment of UAS Key Assessments to Conceptual Framework Elements	11
Table 6:	Data Elements and Responsibility for Collection, Analysis, and Action	14
Table 7:	Initial Program UAS key Assessments and Courses	17
Table 8:	Advanced Programs UAS Key Assessments and Courses	18
Table 9:	Initial and Advanced Program Plan for Establishing Reliability and Validity of UAS Measures	22

Professional Education Unit

The professional education unit at ISU is housed in the Bayh College of Education (BCOE) and in selected departments in the Colleges of Arts and Sciences, Business, Technology, and Nursing, Health and Human Performance. The Dean of the Bayh College of Education is the head of the unit, and the university's Teacher Education Committee (TEC) is the principal governance committee for the unit. This committee is charged with overall responsibility for planning, approving, and coordinating programs that prepare licensed educators.

The unit offers 29 programs, including initial teacher education programs, advanced programs for teachers, and advanced programs for other school professionals in communication disorders, school counseling, school psychology, educational administration, library media, and reading. Four programs for P-12 educators are offered through distance learning modalities, three in part and one entirely. The curriculum in each of these distance learning programs is exactly the same as the curriculum in their on-campus counterparts, and the assessment data collected in them are the same as the assessment data collected on campus.

The Bayh College of Education has four departments: Elementary, Early, and Special Education (EASE); Curriculum, Instruction, and Media Technology (CIMT); Educational Leadership (EDLR); and Communication Disorders and Counseling, School, and Educational Psychology (CDCSEP). The BCOE also includes two service departments, Education Student Services (ESS) and Instruction and Information Technology Services (IITS). Eight administrative, research, and service centers are housed within the BCOE which cover areas such as early childhood education, mathematics education, reading, professional development schools, school counseling, communication disorders, school psychology, and interdisciplinary studies in special education, school psychology, and communication disorders.

In 2010-2011, the unit enrolled approximately 1300 candidates in initial teacher preparation programs. Total college enrollment in 2011 was 683 undergraduate and 682 graduate candidates. For 2010-2011 the BCOE had 184 teaching undergraduate degrees completed and 211 graduate degrees completed.

Conceptual Framework

Becoming a Complete Professional

Educator as...

*expert or mediator of learning
person
member of communities*

The overarching theme of Indiana State University's educator preparation programs is *Becoming a Complete Professional*. Originally conceived in 1991, the conceptual framework has been reaffirmed and updated through the years. Our theme encompasses three broad areas that recognize essential areas of the work of an educator:

- Educator as **Expert or Mediator of Learning**,
- Educator as **Person**, and
- Educator as **Member of Communities**.

The word *complete* in the title acknowledges that, to be truly successful, an educator must be effective in all three of these areas. Similarly, the word *becoming* is included in the title because new graduates, alumni, and our faculty are never fully finished with their learning in their profession as a teacher, counselor, school psychologist, speech language pathologist, principal, or superintendent. The component “**Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning**” deals with an educator’s professional skill as a mediator of students’ learning and/or of the progress individuals make in achieving their potential. The component “**Educator as Person**” represents the traits and dispositions that make a successful educator justifiably respected and emulated by students while meeting the expectations of professional, state, and institutional standards. The component “**Educator as Member of Communities**” reflects the necessity of contributing to the various communities of which educators, as professionals, are members. A truly successful educator must concurrently exhibit the traits of expert or mediator of learning, person, and member of communities while incorporating the latest knowledge and technologies and demonstrating multicultural competence and sensitivity to diversity.

Our preparation programs embrace clinical practice as an underlying philosophy and methodology. Through field experiences, candidates are immersed in authentic environments that allow theory-to-practice connections, maximizing experiential learning.

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) provides the teacher education and other school professionals a means for collecting, aggregating, and analyzing data for purposes of making informed decisions at the program and unit levels. Five key assessments are used for continuous improvement: (a) dispositions, (b) technology, (c) diversity, (d) work samples, and (e) field evaluations and student teaching. These assessments are completed at specified times and the data are entered into an assessment management system. The assessment coordinator and the UAS committee present results of data analyses to members of the unit each September on Assessment Day. The conversations and activities on Assessment Day help to “close the loop” as we deliberate, evaluate, and reflect on next steps based on data.

Unit Assessment System

The BCOE maintains a unit assessment system (UAS) that enables stakeholders to evaluate initial and advanced candidates as they matriculate through programs to become complete professionals. The key assessments identified and utilized in the UAS form a common core to evaluate and monitor development of candidates, and thus performance of the unit, in the areas of educator as expert or mediator of learning, person, and member of communities. Additionally, UAS assessments are organized along a developmental sequence: admission to the program, midpoint, completion, and post-graduation.

The UAS was formed in such a way as to continuously provide information to help the unit answer questions about candidate performance and effectiveness of unit operations. For candidates, the guiding questions include how well they a) support P-12 student learning, b) use technology to support learning, c) develop and utilize appropriate dispositions, d) work with diverse learners, and perform overall. For unit operations, the guiding questions include how effective the unit operations are in terms of: a) faculty effectiveness, b) diversity of faculty and students, c) field operations, d) advising, e) placement and retention of graduates, f) retention of students, and g) reliability of key assessments. Table 1 presents information on the initial and advanced data sources associated with UAS guiding questions.

These data are aggregated into unit-level findings that inform unit-level decisions. Unit-level decisions are then introduced back into the programs. UAS key assessments form a data core common to programs in the BCOE and associated departments across the professional education unit. Program-level data collection surrounds this core, involving comprehensive and integrated assessments related to professional standards and to specialized professional association (SPA) assessments. Course-related assessments and associated student learning outcome measures form an outer ring of assessment surrounding programmatic and unit-level systems. Together, assessments at the course, program and unit level produce data that enable the TEC, Dean's Office, department chairs, and faculty to review student performance, view trends, and address challenges and opportunities that arise from the analyses of these trends.

TEC, the BCOE Congress, Professional Development Schools, and departmental committees are the formal structures providing extensive and ongoing review of programs. These structures serve as conduits for the flow of data into the system as well as being responsive to changes at the unit level. TEC has oversight and governance responsibilities over the UAS at both initial and advanced levels. TEC has empowered a UAS planning committee (UAPC) to oversee administration of the UAS, create and modify key assessments, and coordinate annual collection, analysis, and dissemination of data. This committee has primary responsibility for ensuring that assessments have content validity and meet standards of fairness, accuracy, and reliability. The UAPC is composed of faculty representing TEC, content areas, teacher preparation programs, department chairs, and the BCOE Assessment Director.

Unit Assessment System Guiding Questions

Table 1: Guiding Questions of the UAS

	Initial Program Data Sources	Advanced Program Data Sources
How Well Do Our Candidates...		
Support P-12 student learning	EESE and CIMT Work Sample Assessments Student Teaching Evaluation	Program Work Sample Assessments
Use technology to support learning?	EESE and CIMT Technology Assessments NSSE Data	Advanced Technology Assessment
Use appropriate dispositions?	Preservice Teacher Disposition Assessment Student Teaching Evaluation (INTASC 9 and 10)	Advanced Dispositional Assessment
Work with diverse learners?	Preservice Teacher Assessment of Diversity Student Teaching Evaluation (INTASC 3)	Advanced Diversity Assessment
Perform overall?	Praxis I and II Data Program Reports Alumni Survey Employer Survey Student Teacher Survey (Exit Survey)	Alumni Survey Employer Survey Exit Survey
How Effective Are Our Unit Operations in Terms of...		
Faculty effectiveness?	Faculty Effectiveness Questionnaire PDS Liaisons Faculty/Adjunct P-12 Experience	Faculty Effectiveness Questionnaire Faculty/Adjunct Experience from Program Reports
Diversity of faculty and students?	Faculty and Student Demographic Data (student exit and entry)	Faculty and student Demographic Data (student exit and entry)
Field operations?	Field Survey Field Demographics Average Hours of Field Work	Field Survey Field Demographics Average Hours of Field Work
Advising?	Advising Survey	Advising Survey Signed program of study percentage
Retention of our students?	University Retention Data Appeal Database Demographic Data (entry to end)	Percentage retained from Fall to Spring Demographic Data (entry to end)
Reliability of assessments	Data from reliability/validity plan	Data from reliability/validity plan

Data Elements Collected Transition Points and Candidate Assessment

Data collection decision points are approved by the TEC. The alignment with our conceptual framework and the belief that the purpose of teacher education programs is to move candidates along a continuum of becoming a complete professional has led to the organization of assessments at the initial level around “BCP” levels. Steps along this continuum are labeled with the initials BCP, referencing the conceptual framework upon which our programs are built. Five transition points are identified for initial programs, beginning with BCP 1, admission to teacher candidacy (becoming a student of education). Following successful completion of professional education courses, candidates progress to BCP 2, entry to professional experience and student teaching (becoming a student teacher). This is followed by a completion of professional experience transition point. Having completed all program requirements and having a favorable recommendation from the review department, candidates progress to BCP 3, exit from the program and graduation (becoming a licensed teacher). The final transition point for data collection is post graduation. Table 2 details initial program key UAS assessments and data collected at each transition point.

At the advanced level, a continuum is also evidenced as candidates move through the developmental sequence to becoming a complete professional, though the label of BCP is not applied to these transition points. Four transition points are identified for advanced programs, beginning with admission to the program. Following successful completion of introductory coursework, candidates progress to the second point, entry to professional experience. Having successfully completed all professional coursework, practicum and internships, candidates progress to the third point, exit from the program and graduation. The final point for data collection is post completion. Table 3 details advanced program key UAS assessments and data collected at each transition point.

Additional information is collected and analyzed to assess unit level performance which is not linked as heavily to particular transition points. This data is organized into the areas of academic advising, field placement information, diversity, student retention, program quality, and faculty effectiveness. Table 4 details the assessments and data collected within these areas.

Table 2: Initial Programs (Undergraduate and Post-Baccalaureate Initial Licensure) Transition Points and Candidate Assessments

BCP 1 Admission to Teacher Candidacy	BCP 2 Midpoint Assessments Entry to Professional Experience	Completion of Professional Experience	BCP 3 Exit from Program and Graduation	Post Graduation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Praxis I analysis • Petitions for admission to BCP 1 • BCP acceptance rates • Matriculating student demographics • Dispositional assessment (EPSY 202) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Diversity assessment • Performance evaluations of early field experiences with emphasis on P-12 student learning • Dispositional assessment • Technology assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of supervised teaching experience • Disposition assessment • Diversity assessment • Educator work sample 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Teacher Survey • Praxis II Analysis • Demographic data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alumni survey • Employer survey

Table 3: Advanced Programs Transition Points and Candidate Assessments

Admission to Program	Midpoint Assessments Entry to Professional Experience	Exit from Program	Post Completion
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Candidate demographics • Signed program of study by end of first semester • Disposition self-assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disposition course-assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work Sample • Evaluation of field experience • Technology assessment • Diversity assessment • Disposition field-based assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alumni survey • Employer survey • Graduate demographics • Exit Survey

Table 4: Additional Data Collection and Analysis to Assess Unit Level Performance

Academic Advising Evaluations	Field Placement	Diversity	Student Retention	Program Quality	Faculty Effectiveness
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor • Advising Survey (initial) • Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey (Advanced) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Placement data • Initial Field Supervisor Survey 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty diversity • Student diversity • Field placement/ experiences • Candidate skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • University retention data by program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SPA or accreditation reports/decisions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjunct vitas on degrees, P-12 experience, scholarship (advanced level) • Faculty Effectiveness Survey

Alignment of Key UAS Performance Assessments to Conceptual Framework

The key UAS assessments at initial and advanced levels for candidate performance are organized into the following areas:

- Admission and testing data
- Candidate dispositions
- Work sample from candidates working in the field
- Evaluation of candidate efficacy in fieldwork
- Candidate utility with technology
- Ability to work with diverse populations
- Assessment of faculty effectiveness
- Assessment of quality of faculty advising
- Surveys of alumni and employers.

Each data element, assessment or evaluation collected provides information to the unit valuable to assist in monitoring candidate performance within a UAS guiding question area. Additionally, each is linked to the conceptual framework components of person, mediator of learning, or member of communities. In becoming a complete professional, these components are not distinct, but function together to create a fully functioning educator or other school professional. Thus, any one assessment of progress towards becoming a complete professional cannot be completely compartmentalized into one of the three BCP essential areas. However, it is accurate that certain assessments have a greater affinity towards particular essential areas. Admission and testing data provide evidence of skills necessary for one to work in the educational profession, and are thus linked most heavily with educator as expert or mediator of learning. Professional dispositions truly cut across personal ethics and behavior, work as a professional, and work within communities. However, dispositional assessment is most closely aligned with educator as person, as they reside within the individual and influence all professional behavior. The diversity assessment involves evaluation of both attitude and skill in working with diverse students and clientele. For this reason, it is closely aligned with both educator as person, mediator of learning, and member of communities. Evaluation of field experiences and supervised teaching (initial level) allow information to be collected about the functioning of the candidate (person) in their professional field and professional community. These assessments are linked with all areas of the conceptual framework. Alumni and employer surveys allow collection of data on effectiveness within graduate professional fields and communities, and thus are most closely aligned with mediator of learning and member of community elements. Finally, assessment of skills in technology as well as professional products from the educator work samples allows evaluation of candidate efficacy as expert or mediator of learning. A visual depiction of the alignment of key UAS assessments with conceptual framework elements is presented in table 5.

Table 5: Alignment of UAS Key Assessments to Conceptual Framework Elements

		Educator as Person	Educator as Expert or Mediator of Learning	Educator as Member of Communities
Initial Programs	Praxis I		✓	
	Praxis II		✓	
	Dispositional Assessment	✓		
	Diversity Assessment	✓	✓	✓
	Technology Assessment		✓	
	Evaluation of Early Field Experiences	✓	✓	✓
	Evaluation of Supervised Teaching	✓	✓	✓
	Educator Work Sample		✓	
	Alumni Survey		✓	✓
	Employer Survey		✓	✓
Advanced Programs	Dispositional Assessment	✓		
	Diversity Assessment	✓	✓	✓
	Technology Assessment		✓	
	Evaluation of Field Experiences	✓	✓	✓
	Work Sample		✓	
	Alumni Survey		✓	✓
	Employer Survey		✓	✓

Procedures for Data Collection, Aggregation, Analysis, Dissemination, and Use

The Teacher Education Committee holds ultimate responsibility for the UAS. The UAPC has been charged by TEC to monitor, manage, and continuously improve the UAS through recommendation to TEC. As per TEC bylaws, the UAPC is composed of eleven to fifteen members nominated by the Dean's Office and affirmed by TEC. Membership includes at least three TEC members, at least two content area representatives, at least one representative from educational and school psychology (EPSY) or special education (SPED), and at least one member active in an all grades program. Additionally, department chairpersons from EESE and CIMT as well as the Assessment Director serve as ex officio members. The UAPC has the responsibility of reviewing the UAS annually. This committee determines where the data collection is strong and where there are gaps. Additionally, use of assessments, the system of data collection, and the assessment instruments are monitored and adapted as necessary to meet the needs of the unit, programs, and stakeholders. UAPC members bring feedback from their respective areas on recommended changes to the system or instruments. The elected chair of UAPC maintains periodic contact with TEC and brings recommended changes or information from the UAPC to TEC. The UAPC in collaboration with the Assessment Director analyze the collected data annually and prepare a report and presentation for Assessment Day to the unit. Following the annual Assessment Day, the UAPC reconvenes to synthesize the discussion and feedback from this venue and provides formal recommendations for action to TEC. TEC membership comprises faculty, administrators, students, and a P-12 partner representative. When additional feedback is needed and is necessary and appropriate, UAS issues may also be referred to the Professional Development Schools (PDS) Steering Committee for comment, though TEC retains authority for action.

Assessment Day, occurring annually in September, is a major venue and focal point for the flow of UAS data to stakeholders and stakeholder feedback to the UAPC. The UAPC collects this feedback, makes necessary modifications to the UAS, and provides recommendations for changes to TEC for possible action. This annual forum is organized around the unit's conceptual framework, focusing on one essential element each year. A three year cycle is followed. Year one of this cycle focuses on Educator as Person and corresponding UAS key areas of disposition, diversity assessment, demographics of field placement sites, and demographics of students and faculty. Year two of the cycle focuses on Educator as Expert of Mediator of Learning and corresponding UAS key areas of work sample, technology assessment, supervised teaching evaluation, and fieldwork assessments. Year three of the cycle focuses on Educator as Member of Communities with corresponding UAS key areas of alumni data, employer data, and faculty effectiveness measures. Use of this cycle for Assessment Day provides analysis and presentation of three years of data for each key UAS assessment area.

Collection of data for the UAS is multifaceted, with many individuals and groups playing important roles in collection, aggregation, analysis, and dissemination of information. Responsibility for collection, analysis, presentation, and action for UAS data elements for initial programs, advanced programs, and for unit operations is detailed in table 6. In general, programs and the Office of the Dean are responsible for data collection. Analysis and presentation is a collaborative effort between program areas, UAPC members, and the Dean's Office in collaboration with the Assessment Director for the unit. Analysis of the data is channeled to TEC

for action through the UAPC, whose members discuss the analyzed data and make recommendations for modifications to programs, the unit, and the UAS based on this discussion and data.

Candidate-level performance data are collected by faculty and field supervisors as a regular part of the curriculum and course instruction. Linkage of key UAS assessments with courses is detailed in table 7 (initial programs) and table 8 (advanced programs). Additional data for unit level performance are collected by different entities as outlined in table 6. Wherever possible, the Dean's Office facilitates data collection through central administration of surveys.

Timeline for Data Collection and Aggregation

Data collection and aggregation is an ongoing process in the unit. Data are summarized and analyzed on an annual basis for the unit. The timeframe for specific data aggregation is outlined in table 6. Candidate-level performance data is collected in associated courses as they are offered (see tables 7 and 8 for courses). Aggregation of annual candidate-level performance data utilizes a summer-fall-spring framework, allowing sufficient time for analysis and discussion prior to the early fall Assessment Day. All data for the academic year is to be made available no later than the end of May. Analysis of data by the UAPC begins in June and is completed no later than the end of August. Finally, particular instruments are administered and aggregated on a once every three-year cycle (alumni surveys, employer surveys, and faculty effectiveness survey).

Use of Technologies in Data Collection and Aggregation

Multiple technologies are used to maintain data for the UAS, including TK20, the University Student Information System (Banner), and Qualtrics survey software (for surveys requiring anonymous response). TK20 is the primary database and technology system utilized for UAS data. All programs utilize TK20 in collection of candidate-level performance data where possible. Where possible and pragmatic, program-level data collection will utilize TK20 as well. Use of TK20 allows the UAS database to go beyond merely storing data for retrieval into electronic storage, deployment of UAS assessment instruments, and comprehensive tracking of UAS data. This system further allows running detailed reports on the data for use in data analytic activities. The IITS Director oversees and supports faculty usage of TK20. The Director of Assessment oversees and supports faculty and unit assessment needs.

Responsibility for Data Collection, Analysis, and Action

Table 6: Data Elements and Responsibility for Collection, Analysis, and Action

	Data Element And Aggregation Timeline	Responsibility for Collection	Responsibility for Analysis and Presentation	Responsibility for Action (Presented at Fall TEC Assessment Day)
Initial Programs	Praxis I Analysis (spring)	Deans Office (Title II)	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Praxis II (spring)	Title II Data (Dean’s Office)	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Petitions for Admission to BCP 1 (spring)	ESS – Dean’s Office	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	BCP Acceptance Rates (spring)	ESS – Dean’s Office	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Matriculating Student Demographics (high school, GPA, rank, SAT, gender, ethnicity, county/state) (fall)	Dean’s Office	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Advising Survey (summer)	Programs	Programs	UAPC to TEC
	Evaluation of Early Field Experiences (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Student Teaching Evaluations (summer)	ESS and Music	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Dispositional Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Technology Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Diversity Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Educator Work Sample (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Student Teacher Survey (exit survey) (summer)			
	Alumni Survey (every three years)	Dean’s Office	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC
	Employer Survey (every three years)	Dean’s Office	Dean’s Office	UAPC to TEC

	Data Element	Responsibility for Collection	Responsibility for Analysis and Presentation	Responsibility for Action (Presented at Fall TEC Assessment Day)
Advanced Programs	Candidate Demographics (fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Signed program of study (fall)	Programs	Programs	UAPC to TEC
	Graduate Demographics (fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Dispositional Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Field Evaluations (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Diversity Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Technology Assessment (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Work Sample (summer)	Programs	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Alumni Survey (every three years)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Employer Survey (every three years)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC

	Data Element	Responsibility for Collection	Responsibility for Analysis and Presentation	Responsibility for Action (Presented at Fall TEC Assessment Day)
Unit Operations	Academic Advising Evaluations (summer)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Field Placement – Placement Data (summer)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Faculty Diversity Data (spring)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	TEC
	Student Diversity Data (fall)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	TEC
	Field Placement Diversity Data (summer)	ESS and Programs	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Student Teacher Evaluation of University Supervisor	ESS and Dean's Office	Programs and Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC
	Student Retention Data (summer)	Institutional Research	Dean's Office	TEC
	National recognition and accreditation decisions (spring)	Programs	Programs	UAPC to TEC
	Faculty Effectiveness Questionnaire (every three years)	Dean's Office	Dean's Office	UAPC to TEC

UAS Key Assessments and Courses

Table 7: Initial Program UAS key Assessments and Courses

	Disposition Admit to BCP	Disposition Midpoint	Disposition Student Teaching	Educator Work Sample	Evaluation of Early Field Experience	Evaluation of Student Teaching	Diversity Midpoint	Diversity Student Teaching	Technology Assessment
Assessment	Preservice Teacher Disposition Assessment			The Teacher Work Sample	ELED Evaluation of Supervised Teaching	Initial Evaluation of Supervised Teaching	Preservice Teacher Assessment of Diversity		Math Software Evaluation
Elementary Education	EPSY 202	ELED 250	ELED 451	ELED 457	ELED 400	ELED 451 ELED 453	ELED 400	ELED 451	ELED 335
Special Education	EPSY 202	ELED 250	ELED 451	ELED 457	ELED 400	ELED 451 ELED 453	ELED 400	ELED 451	ELED 335
Assessment	Preservice Teacher Disposition Assessment			CIMT Unit Report	Initial Evaluation of Supervised Teaching	Initial Evaluation of Supervised Teaching	Preservice Teacher Assessment of Diversity		CIMT Webquest Assessment
Secondary Education	EPSY 202	ARTE 391 BEIT 492 BEIT 592 ENG 486 LING 316 LLL 490 MATH 288 MATH 388 MUS 392 PE 497 SCED 396L TCED 490	CIMT 401 MUS 495/ MUS 496	CIMT 400L CIMT 402	CIMT 302 CIMT 400L	CIMT 401	CIMT 302	CIMT 401 MUS 495	CIMT 400
Secondary T2T		CIMT 602	CIMT 501	CIMT 604	CIMT 604	CIMT 501	CIMT 604	CIMT 501	CIMT 604

Note. For initial programs an Advising Survey is conducted fall and spring semesters by ESS. The Dean's Office administers an alumni survey (Alumni Teacher Survey) and employer survey (Principal Employer Survey) once every three years. The Student Teacher Survey serves as an exit survey for initial programs.

Table 8: Advanced Programs UAS Key Assessments and Courses

	Disposition Self Assessment	Disposition Course Based Assessment	Disposition Field Based Assessment	Work Sample	Field Evaluation	Technology	Diversity	Advising	Exit Survey
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			Advanced Action Research Rubric	None	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	None
ELED	ELED 660	ELED 660	None	ELED 686	None	ELED 532 ELED 668	ELED 532 ELED 668	ELED 667	None
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			Action Research	Assessment of Lessons	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	None
SPED	SPED 623	SPED 623	SPED 624	SPED 690	SPED 622	SPED 624	SPED 625	SPED 625	None
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			Long Term Project	Mentor Evaluation	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	Program Evaluation: Interns/ Mentors
EDLR M.Ed.	EDLR 650	EDLR 655	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793	EDLR 758/ EDLR 793
EDLR Ed.S.	EDLR 751	EDLR 754	EDLR 790/ EDLR 792	EDLR 790/ EDLR 792	EDLR 790/ EDLR 792	EDLR 790/ EDLR 792	EDLR 790/ EDLR 792	EDLR 754	None
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			Adv. Unit Wide Work Sample Rubric	Content Standards	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	Exit Survey
CD	CD 696	CD 620	CD 598	CD 598	CD 598	CD 598	CD 598	CD 697	CD 697

	Disposition Self Assessment	Disposition Course Based Assessment	Disposition Field Based Assessment	Work Sample	Field Evaluation	Technology	Diversity	Advising	Exit Survey
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			Case Presentation	IIEP Evaluation	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	Exit Interview
School Counseling	COUN 793b	COUN 634	COUN 739b	COUN 739b	COUN 739b	COUN 739b	COUN 739b	COUN 739b	Individually Scheduled
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			EDS Project	School Psychology Internship Evaluation	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	None
School Psychology	SPSY 600	SPSY 686	SPSY 791	SPSY 792	SPSY 791	SPSY 791	SPSY 791	SPSY 686	None
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			CIMT Advanced Research Project	None	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	None
Curriculum & Instruction	CIMT 610	CIMT 660	CIMT 775	CIMT 775	None	CIMT 775	CIMT 775	CIMT 775	None
Assessment	Identification and Assessment of Student Dispositions			CIMT Advanced Portfolio	CIMT Advanced Student Evaluation	Technology Questions (advanced programs)	Advanced Unit Wide Diversity Assessment	Advising and Faculty Effectiveness Survey	None
Ed. Tech. Library Media	CIMT 606	CIMT 631	CIMT 659	CIMT 659	CIMT 659	CIMT 659	CIMT 659	CIMT 659	None

Note. For advanced programs the Dean's Office administers an alumni survey (Alumni Survey – Advanced Programs) and employer survey (Advanced Programs Employer Questionnaire) once every three years

Procedures to Promote Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency, and Elimination of Bias

<i>Fairness:</i>	Assessment of those areas which are addressed in program curricula. Clear communication to candidates on what is expected of them on the assessments.
<i>Accuracy:</i>	Assessments measuring those areas which they purport to measure. Validity of assessment instruments.
<i>Consistency:</i>	Trustworthy and dependable data collection. Reliability of the assessment data.
<i>Avoidance and Elimination of Bias:</i>	Assessment instruments and administration free of contextual distractions and problems. Instruments free of racial/ethnic stereotypes and biased items. Consistent scoring utilized and active effort made to avoid discrimination through assessment.

The UAS is constructed in such a way to enable assessment instruments and data collection procedures to be fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias. The UAPC works to have common assessment items, whenever appropriate, across programs to ensure that all candidates are measured in a consistent manner. Further, the majority of UAS assessments utilize a common metric. A three point scale is utilized for UAS assessments, when appropriate, which identifies performances at the Exceeds Expectations level, the Meets Expectations level, and the Does Not Meet Expectations level. Striving for common assessments and metrics allows for clarity of communication with candidates and stakeholders.

The UAPC, which joins together content representatives from all programmatic areas, has worked collaboratively to develop and continually monitor all instruments used in the UAS. Assessments are linked to professional content standards and to the conceptual framework and guiding questions of the UAS. Additionally, the professional education unit has adopted the NCATE SPA Assessment system model. All initial and advanced programs are required to identify six to eight key assessments which are used to assess candidate proficiencies in relation to professional standards.

Programs have responsibility for providing an orientation to the assessment instruments and the conceptual framework to candidates to ensure fair and accurate assessment. Additionally, cooperating teachers and supervisors are trained on the usage of assessment instruments by Educational Student Services and programmatic faculty. Communication to and support for cooperating teachers and supervisors is provided by university supervisors and program faculty/program directors.

The UAPC is charged with continuous monitoring of UAS instruments and data collection procedures. The UAPC will continue its ongoing and iterative process of reviewing established instruments for face validity, content validity, fairness and assessment issues.

Further, a plan for establishing the reliability and validity of UAS instruments and data has been adopted. This plan focuses predominantly on establishing consistency within instruments (internal consistency), inter-rater reliability, content validity through UAPC review, and connections across data points (criterion related validity). The UAPC in collaboration with the Dean's Office and Assessment Director will carry out this plan and make adjustments or modifications to both the plan and the UAS instruments based on the findings of the reliability and validity studies. This plan is detailed in table 9. In addition, when possible based on the information available and population sample sizes, the UAPC in collaboration with the Assessment Director will carry out studies specifically designed to test for differences in performance evaluation based on gender and ethnicity.

Plan for Establishing Reliability and Validity of UAS Measures

Table 9: Initial and Advanced Program Plan for Establishing Reliability and Validity of UAS Measures

		Internal Consistency Reliability	Inter-Rater Reliability	Content Related Validity	Criterion Related Validity
Initial Programs	Disposition Assessment	Alpha Coefficient	Relate EPSY 202 with course and student teaching rating	Content Analysis	Relate to INTASC 9 and 10 of student teaching evaluation
	Diversity Assessment	Alpha Coefficient	Relate university supv. Rating with host teacher rating	Content Analysis	
	Technology Assessment	Alpha Coefficient		Content Analysis	
	Field Experience Evaluation	Alpha Coefficient		Content Analysis	Relate to student teaching evaluation
	Student Teaching Evaluation	Alpha Coefficient	Relate scores from 2 host teachers Relate univ. supv. with content faculty	Content Analysis	Relate to work sample evaluation
	Educator Work Sample	Alpha Coefficient	Relate scores from 2 faculty on sample of cases	Content Analysis	Relate to student teaching evaluation (university supv.)
Advanced Programs	Disposition Assessment	Alpha Coefficient	Relate course and field based ratings	Content Analysis	
	Diversity Assessment	Alpha Coefficient		Content Analysis	
	Technology Assessment	Alpha Coefficient		Content Analysis	
	Field Experience Evaluations	Alpha Coefficient	Relate scores from 2 supervisors	Content Analysis	
	Work Sample	Alpha Coefficient	Relate scores from 2 faculty on sample of cases	Content Analysis	