

## STANDARD 2: ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND UNIT EVALUATION

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

### 2.a. Assessment System

*2a1 How does the unit ensure that the assessment system collects information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework, state standards, and professional standards? (3,539: Limit 4,000 characters)*

The unit ensures collection of information on candidate proficiencies outlined in the conceptual framework through assessment of signature assignments. Signature assignments are key assessments of course-based proficiencies demonstrated by candidates' in professional education courses and program-specific courses. Signature assignments also include key assessments of candidates' proficiencies demonstrated in the series of field-based activities known as the Candidate Field Assessment Process (CFAP). All proficiencies assessed through both course-based and field-based signature assignments are aligned with the unit's conceptual framework. Proficiencies include knowledge, skills, and dispositions expected of candidates in all undergraduate and graduate programs that qualify candidates for initial and advanced licenses. An example of the conceptual framework's alignment with proficiencies is found in the Observation of Formal Lesson instrument used at the graduate level, both initial and advanced licensure levels: "The candidate applies research in fulfillment of educational roles and responsibilities." A parallel example at the undergraduate, initial licensure level is: "The candidate develops plans appropriate to students' needs, interests, and abilities." Detailed tables of signature assignments' alignment with the conceptual framework are found in [Conceptual Framework Alignment Tables, 2003-2009](#) and [Conceptual Framework Alignment Tables, 2010](#).

The unit ensures collection of information on candidate proficiencies outlined in state standards through alignment of professional education courses and program-specific courses with Indiana Department of Education's state standards. Knowledge and performance proficiencies emphasized in courses are detailed in [course matrix charts](#). In addition to illustrating the alignment of each course with professional standards, course matrix charts designate the evidence used by instructors to assess candidates' acquisition of proficiencies. All courses that comprise each of the unit's programs are configured in [program alignment matrices](#). These matrices illustrate the number of times in programs' courses that state standards are addressed. Program alignment matrices indicate the alignment of the unit's conceptual framework with state standards. Finally, every program alignment matrix indicates the alignment of state standards with professional standards. An example of a proficiency taken from the program alignment matrix of school counseling program, School Counseling Professionals, Standard 1 is: "The teacher has the knowledge of change theory and educational reform." Also noted on the matrix is Standard 1's alignment with the unit's conceptual framework, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) standards, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS).

The unit ensures collection of information on candidate proficiencies outlined in professional standards. At the undergraduate initial licensure level, candidate proficiencies are aligned with the INTASC standards. At the advanced licensure level, candidate proficiencies are aligned with INTASC, NBPTS, and standards from the American School Counselor Association (ACSA). In the graduate initial licensure level, candidate proficiencies are aligned with INTASC standards and standards from the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC). In the graduate advanced licensure level, candidate proficiencies are aligned with NBPTS and CEC.

***2a2 What are the key assessments used by the unit and its programs to monitor and make decisions about candidate performance at transition points such as those listed in Table 6? (0:0)***

## **Transition Point tables [HERE](#)**

***2a3 How is the unit assessment system evaluated? Who is involved and how? (3,248: 3,500)***

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is evaluated by professionals external to the unit through the UAS Review, which occurred in 2008. Representatives from institutions of higher education and the Indiana Department of Education evaluated the capacity of the unit's assessment system to generate data useful for making improvements in candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

The unit's external advisory councils are involved in evaluating the UAS. For example, advisory councils, such as the Teacher Education Advisory Council (TEAC) and the School Counseling Advisory Council have reviewed and suggested improvements to field assessment instruments that programs have redesigned. As well, the Teacher Education Advisory Council participated through workshops in the redesign of the unit's conceptual framework.

Unit personnel and the University Technology Services (UTS) evaluate the capacity of the UAS to collect and process useful data from multiple assessments. Unit and UTS personnel monitor the data collection and processing to ensure it is efficient and successfully integrating university-wide systems, such as Jenzabar, with unit-specific technology, such as the Candidate Tracking System (CTS) and Taskstream. An example of such collaboration between the unit and UTS is their collaboration to develop the in-house CTS. CTS interfaces with the university's student management system, Jenzabar, to enable the unit to track candidate progression through program transition points.

The unit employs a full-time UAS manager and UAS coordinator to oversee the functioning of unit assessment system. Together with the department of education chair, they are responsible for ensuring that information is collected and processed for analysis in a timely, efficient manner. They evaluate the capacity and efficiency of assessment system to ready information used by the unit in making decisions on candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

Unit faculty also evaluate the utility of UAS information on candidate performance. The unit's early Excel-based data processing and reporting mechanisms were deemed less than optimal,

requiring centralized data entry and lacking flexibility in the capacity to generate reports. In response to faculty's unfavorable evaluation of the Excel-based system, the unit adopted TaskStream to track candidate performance on course and field-based signature assignments.

In addition to collaborating with UTS, the unit works with the university's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE). A prominent illustration of collaboration among OIRE, UTS, and unit occurred in 2008-2009 with investigations of data management systems that integrate university-wide and unit-specific technologies. The university needed a data management system to assess program quality. At the same time, the unit needed a system other than TaskStream that would more readily integrate with the university's student management system, Jenzabar. Collaborative investigation among UTS, OIRE, and the unit led to the adoption of Blackboard Outcomes. Changes resulting from evaluation of the unit assessment system are detailed in the [UAS History of Change](#) document.

***2a4 How does the unit ensure that its assessment procedures are fair, accurate, consistent, and free of bias? (5,869: 3,000)***

The unit's practices ensures fairness in assessment procedures by multiple means. Directions for completing signature assignments are detailed and clear, and candidates have access to rubrics and field evaluation instruments early in the assignment cycle. Not only are evaluation rubrics from field-based signature assignments reviewed in courses, they are also posted on either the university's internet portal, Cougar Connection, or on course Blackboard sites.

The unit consults advisory board stakeholders for guidance in developing and refining assessment instruments. Additionally, with input from field practitioners, the unit better understands the kinds and level of performance demands that can be fairly made on teacher and counselor candidates.

To promote fairness in assessments, undergraduate dispositional performances are evaluated, first, in light of fundamental professional behaviors expected of all candidates (e.g., punctuality, respectfulness, and proper attire). Second, the design of Assessment of Professional Dispositions rubric reflects the developmental nature of candidates' dispositional proficiencies. For example, although all candidates are expected to demonstrate a common set of dispositions, the level of dispositional development is expected to vary from the point of program admission to the point of program completion.

Candidates receive course syllabi that are explicitly state the percentage values of assignments and their due dates. Syllabi clearly state expectations, such as attendance and class participation, that support candidates' successful course completion. Both through electronic media or face-to-face contact, candidates have ample opportunities and are encouraged to pose questions regarding assignments to their instructors before assignments are due. Officially, at the undergraduate level, policies permit candidates to remediate major assessments, a process that frequently entails one-on-one conferencing between candidates and course instructors. As deemed appropriate, graduate level instructors may permit remediation of assignments.

Assessment accuracy is ensured through alignment of signature assignments with performance proficiencies outlined in the unit's conceptual framework. An example of promoting assessment accuracy occurred in the 2007-08 with the school counseling program's revision of field evaluation instruments and dispositional assessment instruments to better reflect candidate performance expectancies. Another example of ensuring assessment accuracy occurred in 2008-2009, across all education programs, with redesign of multiple course-based and field-based signature assignments, which are aligned with the unit's revised conceptual framework.

In field-based courses, such as practica, the major assessments are designed to reflect authentic work candidates perform in their school settings. Other assignments, such as those measuring verbal skills, are scored through portfolio presentations and interviews. Candidates are afforded the opportunity to set and self-pace their completion schedule.

The unit is committed to accuracy during the development of assessments. An example of such commitment was the department of education's contracting of a nationally-recognized author in the field of dispositional assessment, Dr. R. Lee Smith. Dr. Smith, the principal author of *The passion of teaching: dispositions in the schools*, conducted a workshop with faculty to guide the formulation of a revised dispositional assessment instrument. Furthermore, to ensure accuracy in interpreting and scoring dispositional assessment instruments, the unit offered training workshops to cooperating teachers (field-based faculty) and for university faculty in academic departments offering secondary education programs. To avert potential assessment bias in the school counseling program, the director monitors scoring of disposition instruments through discussions with field supervisors and advisory board members.

To ensure consistency, all programs utilize a common grading scale at both the initial and advanced licensing levels. Consistency in assessments is further promoted in undergraduate initial licensing programs, where benchmark scores of seventy-three percent to pass signature assignments are set in all courses. In the department of education, key assignments, such as portfolio essays and portfolio interviews and presentations, are scored by multiple assessors. Assessors include faculty from the content disciplines and stakeholders from the professional community.

In the school counseling program, candidates submit a portfolio and present to counseling faculty and stakeholders from the professional community. Across the unit, field-based observation are evaluated both by university supervisors and field-based faculty (cooperating teachers / school counselors). Although rare, when substantial scoring discrepancies occur, university supervisors communicate with field supervisors to address inconsistencies.

The unit's assessments promote the avoidance of bias. Signature assignments are project-based, thereby affording candidates ample time to pace themselves and choose conditions under which they best complete assignments. The vetting of assessment rubrics by advisory council members assists avoidance of conceptual contradictions, vagueness, and syntactic confusion. Finally, bias is reduced by the availability of faculty to co-score course-based signature assignments and re-assess candidates' field-based performance.

As a check on potential bias and unfairness, the unit provides appeal processes for candidates who wish to appeal course grades and other non-policy matters. Details of the processes are accessible to candidates in the [Undergraduate Teacher Education Handbook, the Graduate Handbook, and the University Student Handbook](#).

***2a5 What assessments and evaluation measures are used to manage and improve the operations and programs of the unit? (5,135: 3,000)***

Unit operations are managed and improved through information generated from both external and internal assessment mechanisms. External assessment is provided by the unit's review of assessment reports from Educational Testing Service (ETS). These reports enable the unit to track candidate eligibility for admittance into the initial licensure level of the teacher education program. Information on candidates' Praxis I performance prompted the department of education to require candidates to take Praxis I exams early in their program.

The unit oversees candidate performance on the Praxis II summative assessment through information provided by the annual Title II / IPEDS Report. Furthermore, annual reports from the Indiana Department of Education's Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program (IMAP) assessment provide the unit with information on its program completers' success in meeting state licensing benchmarks.

In utilizing another component of operational assessment aside from measuring candidate performance, the unit measures candidate satisfaction with information provided by the university-wide Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (NLSS). One of the NLSS indicators is satisfaction with student advising. Results of 2005 NLSS affirmed the need for a dual advising model for secondary teacher candidates. The model was approved by the Teacher Education Committee (TEC) for implementation in 2006-2007.

External assessment data support management of unit personnel with information on faculty performance from the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (I.D.E.A.) evaluations. I.D.E.A. results facilitate continual formative assessment and direction for improvement in faculty performance.

An internal, non-academic assessment of a unit program occurs in conjunction with the university's Office of Enrollment Management and the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE). These offices provide the unit with reports on enrollment and retention trends. A recent example of information impacting program change is enrollment data that affirmed the department of education's decision to explore the redesign of its master's level programs in exceptional needs.

Program assessments occur in the context of the Indiana State Department of Education's (IDOE) Program Review process. Review teams from the IDOE and peer reviewers from institutions of higher education assess key academic components of unit programs. The last such review occurred in 2008, resulting in full approval of twelve programs. Subsequent revisions of one conditionally approved program, Health and Physical Education / Mild Intervention were approved by the Indiana Department of Education and the university's Faculty Forum in 2009.

Advisory councils play a role in assessing unit programs. External stakeholders on the unit's three advisory councils comprised of administrators, teachers, and school counselors assess the validity and utility of program improvements. For example, in 2008-2009, the Teacher Education Advisory Council participated with the department of education faculty to revise the unit's conceptual framework. An internal mechanism for consultation on education program changes is the Teacher Education Committee (TEC). In 2007-2009, the TEC was consulted on development of general education capstone courses in both secondary and elementary education.

Internally, curricular changes are assessed for approval at the university level through the university's shared governance structure. Undergraduate and graduate curricular changes require approval by Academic Council and Graduate Council, respectively, with subsequent approval required by the university-wide Faculty Forum.

The unit's licensing program is managed by the unit's half-time licensing officer. The licensing officer monitors changes to state requirements, oversees course requirements for licensing candidates, and recommends program completers for state licensing.

Upon program completion, candidates provide assessment data on program quality and self-perceptions of their level of preparation by means of the Student Teaching Exit Survey. Based on results from the survey, the undergraduate program added student teaching workshops on topics such as classroom and behavior management and teaching high ability students. The unit's surveys of alumni and employers affirmed the findings from the Student Teaching Exit Survey.

Signature assignments are key assessments utilized to manage program performance and improvements. Aggregated data from course-based and field-based signature assignments enable the unit to assess program quality. Coupled with the monitoring mechanism of course linkage charts and program alignment matrices, academic programs are systematically monitored and periodically revised to ensure adherence to conceptual framework outcomes and state and national standards.

Unit operational and program changes and improvements are documented in the "Unit History of Change," which chronicles the origins of and rationales for major changes in the unit's operations, programs, and policies.

## **2b. Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation**

***2b1 What are the processes and timelines used by the unit to collect, compile, aggregate, summarize, and analyze data on candidate performance, unit operations, and program quality? (9,204: 8,000)***

- ***How are the data collected?***
- ***From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?***
- ***How often are the data summarized and analyzed?***
- ***Whose responsibility is it to summarize and analyze the data? (dean, assistant dean, data coordinator, etc.)***

- *In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)*
- *What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?*

The unit's processes and timelines for collecting, compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing data for assessment of candidates, programs, and the unit are depicted in the [Comprehensive Assessments Tracking \(CAT\)](#) charts.

### Candidate Performance

- **How are the data collected?**

Internally, the unit collects data on candidate performance from course-based and field-based signature assignments. Field-based signature assignments are part of the [Candidate Field Assessment Process \(CFAP\)](#), the process through which data on candidate field performance are collected. Additional data on candidate performance are collected from dispositional assessments and portfolios. *Is there something more to add here, seems like an FYI is that the purpose?* At the graduate level, the unit collects data on candidate performance on personal interviews. These internal data are variables used to determine candidate eligibility for admission to the exceptional needs and school counseling graduate programs.

Externally, the unit collects data on undergraduate and graduate performance from Praxis I and Praxis II exam scores. Data on candidate performance at the initial licensure level is collected from Praxis I to determine candidate eligibility for admission to programs. Subsequently, Praxis II data determine candidate eligibility for recommendation from the unit for state licensing. Additional external data on candidate performance include [Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program \(IMAP\)](#) results. IMAP provides data on the performance of all initial licensure teaching and school counseling graduates who are provisionally licensed by the state. External data from undergraduate grade point averages, GRE/MAT scores, and personal references are collected by both the exceptional needs and school counseling programs. These data determine candidate eligibility for admission to those programs.

- **From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?**

Internal data sources are collected by professional education faculty and university field supervisors. As appropriate, cooperating teachers, university faculty from content fields outside the unit, and representatives from the community collect data on candidate performance. An example of community and non-unit faculty involvement in candidate assessment is faculty and administrative personnel who take part in portfolio-based interviews in EDUC 201, Practicum in Teaching.

- **How often are the data summarized and analyzed?**

Assessment purposes dictate the frequency of data collection, summarizing, and analysis. Ongoing assessments include faculty review of candidate performance on course-based and field-based signature assignments, measures of candidates' impact on student learning, and candidates' dispositional performance. Data on candidate performance are analyzed by faculty

throughout the semester in their respective courses. Data on candidate performance is formally analyzed at transition points to determine candidate eligibility for program progression.

- **In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)**

Data from course-based and field-based (CFAP) signature assignments and from dispositional assessments are summarized and analyzed in report form. Aggregated Praxis I and Praxis II scores are summarized in table form and analyzed by faculty and the unit assessment coordinator during routine department meetings. IMAP scores are analyzed in the format provided by the Indiana Department of Education. At the graduate level, admission committees of the exceptional needs and school counseling programs use scoring rubrics to analyze letters of reference, interview results, GRE / MAT scores, and undergraduate transcripts.

- **What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?**

TaskStream is among the unit's principal information technologies. TaskStream is used by faculty to score signature assignments. TaskStream data reports are run by the Unit Assessment Manager and used by faculty to summarize and analyze candidate performance. TaskStream is augmented by the Candidate Tracking System (CTS). The CTS is used to maintain individual Praxis and GRE/MAT scores, record candidates' field placement venues, and indicate candidate program progression. Jenzabar, the university-wide student management system maintains candidate data that are downloaded to the unit's CTS.

The [Report Bank](#), found on the university's intranet site, assists the unit in maintaining its assessment system. Maintained by the university's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE), the Report Bank provides data on student satisfaction by department and school, student progress by department, course enrollment, historical enrollment by major, student retention analysis, and term enrollment demographics by department and by major.

### **Program Quality and Unit Operations**

- *How are the data collected?*

Internally, the unit collects data on program quality and unit operations. Data are aggregated from aggregated candidate performance evaluations, such as course-based and field-based signature assignments. Additional data on program quality and unit operations are collected from aggregated scores on candidate dispositional assessments and portfolios. Data collection processes are outlined in the [Comprehensive Assessments Tracking \(CAT\)](#) charts.

The unit collects external sources of data at the initial and advanced levels from commercial reports, such as Noel Levitz Satisfaction Survey and IDEA Course Evaluations which are completed from anonymous student responses. Data from state reports, such as Title II and PEDS are also collected annually to measure program quality and unit operations effectiveness.

- ***From whom (e.g., applicants, candidates, graduates, faculty) are data collected?***

Faculty, cooperating teachers, and university field supervisors are internal data sources. Additional data are collected from alumni surveys, employer surveys, student teaching evaluations, field-based experience assessments, career services survey, and evaluations of universities supervisors and cooperating teachers by student teachers.

The Indiana Mentoring & Assessment Program (IMAP) and Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey are external data sources for evaluation of program and unit performance.

Routine consultations with the unit's three advisory councils, comprised of local P-12 faculty, staff, and stakeholders, provide additional sources of information for assessing program quality and unit operations.

- ***How often are the data summarized and analyzed?***

The purposes of assessment processes at the initial and advanced levels dictate the frequency of data collection and analysis. Faculty review of candidate and unit quality, as related to program performances, is reviewed annually as referenced in the [CAT](#). Summaries are shared with faculty, the dean, Leadership Council, and the provost as requested.

External data from the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey are summarized and analyzed bi-annually. For example, data gathered every two years on candidate satisfaction with faculty advising indicate performance by program and school. External data on faculty teaching performance from Individual Development and Educational Assessment (I.D.E.A) evaluations is summarized and analyzed on a semester basis by the university's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness.

- ***In what formats are the data summarized and analyzed? (reports, tables, charts, graphs, etc.)***

Aggregated program and unit data derived from candidate performance assessments are summarized and analyzed in report form. Survey data are presented in chart form to faculty and advisory councils for review.

- ***What information technologies are used to maintain the unit's assessment system?***

TaskStream is the unit's principal internal assessment technology for maintaining data on program quality. For example, faculty score and post grades for signature assignments and on TaskStream. TaskStream data are aggregated by program for subsequent analysis and reporting.

In addition to TaskStream, the unit uses Microsoft OneNote to document a variety of information used to maintain the unit's assessment system, such as: meeting minutes, concerns and accomplishments of candidates voiced by faculty, candidate [requests or appeals](#), changes in policies and procedures ([History of Change](#)), and proceedings and findings from training workshops.

The Candidate Tracking System (CTS) is used by the unit in conjunction with Jenzabar, Report Bank, and BlackBoard to maintain information on field placement demographics, program enrollment trends, and scores on Praxis, GRE, and MAT exams.

***2b2 How does the unit disaggregate candidate assessment data for candidates on the main campus, at off-campus sites, in distance learning programs, and in alternate route programs? (998: 3,000)***

The unit uses TaskStream to disaggregate data on candidate performance by program, course, and program transition points. Data from Alumni, Employer, and Student Teaching Exit Surveys are disaggregated by program under the management of the university's Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) utilizing SPSS analytical software. The UAS Coordinator collaborates with the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness to disaggregate the data for initial licensure elementary, secondary, and K-12 visual art programs. Due to the low number of secondary education graduates and low survey response rates, survey results from all secondary education program completers are aggregated. At the advanced licensure level, data are disaggregated by school counseling and exceptional needs programs.

Data analysis have prompted revision of the following assessment instruments: observation of formal lesson, student teaching evaluation, and assessment of professional dispositions.

***2b3 How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions? (723: 2,000)***

All candidates are encouraged to resolve requests and appeals related to the unit through informal and direct contact with the appropriate faculty or staff unless a university policy or procedure exists, such as the [Grade Appeal Policy](#) or the [Harassment Policy](#). For matters that fall outside the university's appeal policies, the candidates may initiate procedures detailed in the [Grievance and Appeal Policies](#). Once complaints are resolved, all related information and documents are maintained in a secure, confidential file located in the offices of the chairs of education and psychology and counseling, respectively. Access to files is limited to department chairs and the dean of the School of Professional Studies.

## **2c. Use of Data for Program Improvement**

***2c1 In what ways does the unit regularly and systematically use data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses, programs, and clinical experiences? (3,000: 7,000)***

All department of education faculty, at both graduate and undergraduate levels, meet for annual Data Decision Day (D3) sessions to review the variety of data generated by candidate and program assessments. Faculty subgroups meet to peruse assigned data, formulate conclusions, and propose recommendations for action. A guide to tracking the data can be examined by referencing the [Comprehensive Assessments Tracking](#) (CAT) tables. CAT tables indicate sources of data, description of data, the technology and chronology involved in managing the data, the individuals involved in data collection, how the data are summarized and formatted,

personnel who supervise the data process, and to whom and when the findings are disseminated. The [History of Change](#) document, 2003-Present, chronicles actions taken in response to data-based evidence and other factors. Ad hoc committees of faculty are assigned to monitor various aspects of the assessment process according to the chronology outlined in the [UAS Review Plan](#).

Beginning in 2006-07, faculty began the process of targeting specific areas of the conceptual framework for more intense scrutiny (see [Conceptual Framework Assessment Cycle](#)). The targeted review began with analysis of 2 of the 6 areas of the framework, “Learner” and “Pedagogy.” The following year the focus shifted in those two areas from analysis to needs assessment while two more areas were targeted for analysis, “Self” and “Spiritual.” In year three of the cycle, for the areas of “Learner” and “Pedagogy” the emphasis shifted to design and implementation; the areas of self and spiritual shifted to needs assessment and the last two areas, “Partner” and “Content” began with analysis. Utilization of this process ensures that focus is maintained on all 6 areas of the Conceptual Framework annually and that the entire cycle of analysis, needs assessment, and design and implementation occurs for all areas every three years.

Several examples of regular and systematic use of data to evaluate the efficacy of and initiate changes to its courses are: (1) Teacher Education Committee meets on the same date as Faculty Forum (monthly). TEC receives data and reports of actions taken or discusses need for action to be taken regarding items affecting the department of education and content faculty across campus; (2) the Teacher Education Advisory Council meets once each semester. Data are shared with a broad range of stakeholders and used for making recommendations to department of education faculty.

(3) School Counseling Advisory Council meets at least twice a year [fall and spring]. Information on initiatives is shared and input is requested for planning and data review. Recommendations are used for program development and improvement; (4) The Exceptional Needs Advisory Council meets once each semester. Data are shared regarding the major program revisions completed in Fall 2009 (see [Minutes, Exceptional Needs Graduate Advisory Council](#)).

## ***2c2 What data-driven changes have occurred over the past three years? (4,090: 4,000)***

The unit’s [History of Change](#) documents all major changes in the unit’s programs and operations for the past seven years. Many of the changes are data-driven.

In 2006-07, data from the undergraduate [Exit Survey](#) (N=27) indicated perceptions on the part of program graduates for additional information on accessing resources for exceptionalities, legal issues, and instructional technology. Likewise, data from the Employer Survey (N =10) indicated a need for intentional preparation of candidates to work with high ability gifted and talented students, and for ways to integrate technology into instructional processes. As a result of the two surveys, the following topics were added to the curriculum of the student teaching seminar: a legal issues and high ability gifted. To address the need for strategies for integrating technology into instruction, the in EDUC 205, Technology Applications in Teaching, was altered to ensure that technology integration was the focus of the course’s signature assignment lesson plan. Furthermore, technology integration became an assessed criterion in the signature assignment lessons that candidates practiced in their field placements.

The [Employer Survey](#) data at the graduate level echoed a need for increased skill in integration of technology into instruction. In response, the signature assignment in EDUC 502, Technology Applications in Teaching, was altered to ensure that technology integration was the focus of the course's signature assignment lesson plan. Furthermore, technology integration became an assessed criterion in the signature assignment lessons that candidates practiced in their field placements and/or P-12 classrooms. An additional data-driven change from the Employer Surveys was development of signature assignments for SPED 514, Severe Disabilities/Intense Intervention and SPED 518, Functional Curriculum/Assistive Technology that required candidates to formulate their plans for professional development.

Employer Survey data also prompted changes to better address issues of collaboration with educational personnel in the design of the learning environment in SPED 508, (Methods and Techniques for Teaching Exceptional Elementary Children) and SPED 509 (Advanced Methods for Teaching Exceptional Middle and High School Youth). In SPED 537 (Collaboration and Communication in Exceptional Needs), the School Action Plan signature assignment specifies details for establishing and fostering partnerships and collaboration with parents to improve student learning.

Data from the [Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey](#) (for bar graph of "Student Advising" gap scores) affirmed faculty's perception of the need to change the single advisor model, whereby secondary education candidates had advisors exclusively from either the subject discipline or from education. In 2005, the dual advising model was implemented, providing candidates advisors in their subject disciplines as well as in education. Based on the data derived from the School Counseling forms, all field evaluation instruments have been updated. Changes occurred due to the lack of useful information coming from the formats. Evaluation instruments were redesigned to provide greater variability in scores and a closer alignment to school counseling activities at field sites.

Several changes in the graduate and undergraduate clinical experiences (student teaching) have resulted from data provided by candidates themselves on the Exit Survey and by cooperating teachers on the [Field-Based Experience Assessment Survey](#). The first change involved lengthening the student teaching experience from 15 to 16 weeks. A second student teaching change entailed decoupling knowledge and skill assessment from dispositional assessment. This resulted in two distinct evaluation instruments to assess student teachers, one of which is the Assessment of Professional Dispositions. A third change in student teaching resulted in significant reduction in the number of items comprising the knowledge and skill-based [Student Teaching Evaluation Form](#).

***2c3 What access do faculty members have to candidate assessment data and/or data systems?  
(1,484 : 2,000)***

The [Comprehensive Assessments Tracking \(CAT\)](#) charts outline faculty access to candidate assessment data for undergraduate, graduate exceptional needs, and school counseling programs, respectively.

Faculty members have access to several candidate assessment data and data systems. Faculty have individual secure access codes for information of a confidential nature stored on these systems. For candidate assessment data, faculty may access current semester rubrics from assignments they have evaluated on TaskStream. Rubrics from past semesters are readily accessed upon their request to the UAS manager. Also, from the Candidate Tracking System (CTS), faculty may access data on the status of candidates in meeting program transition points. On campus, candidate transcripts and schedules are accessible to faculty through the university's student management system, Jenzabar. From off campus, faculty can access candidate transcripts and advising-related information via the web portal, Cougar Connection. Faculty may utilize Blackboard to manage grades and attendance. Additional data systems accessible to faculty include the [Report Bank](#), whose function is explained in 2b1.

Faculty have access to graduate and undergraduate hard copy files. Individual files of education major are organized by transition points. Access to Title II and PEDS data occurs through summary reports provided in faculty meetings by the licensing officer and documented in meeting minutes.

***2c4 How are assessment data shared with candidates, faculty, and other stakeholders to help them reflect on and improve their performance and programs? (3,057: 2,000)***

Data on candidate performance are shared with candidates on TaskStream. Faculty scoring and comments on assessment rubrics communicate to candidates their level of success and requirements for remediation of assignments. Faculty also communicates assessment data to individual candidates via email, written commentary on hard copies of assignments, phone conversations, face-to-face discussions or coaching/mentoring sessions. Candidates access assessment information on Blackboard's Discussion Board. Notations from faculty, explaining candidates' grades, are posted in Blackboard's Grade Center.

Candidates may access assessments performed by school-based personnel via TaskStream. Graduate program applicants receive assessment information on their application interview through scoring rubrics, written comments, and oral discussion with faculty. Graduate candidates receive assessment information on professional growth plans and portfolio presentations through scoring rubrics, written comments, and oral discussion with faculty.

Data are shared with candidates in formal meetings with faculty. The [Candidate Advancement Committee \(CAC\) process](#) is a formal meeting among faculty and candidates where data are shared on candidate performance.

Finally, as noted in 2c 1, data on both candidate and program performance are shared with faculty for purposes of analysis on an annual basis during the department of education's Data Decision Day (D3).

Data are shared with faculty via Jenzabar, TaskStream, Blackboard, Cougar Connection and the Candidate Tracking System (CTS). Faculty participate monthly in [Candidate Concerns and Accomplishments](#) meetings to share assessment data, both qualitative and quantitative, on candidate performance.

Faculty have access to formal evaluation data generated as part of the continued employment process. IDEA evaluations are distributed to faculty by department chairs. One on one formal performance evaluation meetings occur annually, during which chairs provide present formal written evaluations to faculty. Individual faculty members and chairs may also meet on an interim basis to discuss IDEA results and to plan and evaluate corrective measures. Department chairs may request peer observation or faculty may request peer observation to provide feedback for improvement of teaching and learning outcomes.

Each semester, the Director of Field Experiences shares data from candidate surveys with faculty who serve as university supervisors. During department meetings faculty examine data presented from the semi-annual Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (NLSS). NLSS data are also accessible on the university's intranet site.

Faculty receive information about the university's faculty evaluation process through the faculty handbook, the [FROG](#). Both tenure and non-tenure faculty receive routine oral and written feedback from the members of their Peer Development Committee. Results of program and unit performance are shared with stakeholders during bi-annual advisory council meetings.