

## **Unit Assessment Systems Executive Summary Indiana University Southeast School of Education**

Note: See the IUS School of Education website located at [www.ius.edu/education](http://www.ius.edu/education) for full documentation of the Unit Assessment System (UAS).

### **Introduction**

In compliance with the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB), the School of Education (SOE) has adopted a comprehensive UAS. The purposes of the UAS are to ensure that all candidates meet sets of standards defined by IPSB; promote and preserve the School's mission: *to develop high quality, caring professionals who stimulate continuous renewal of schools within a multicultural society*; and provide information about the overall quality of each education program within the unit.

The UAS incorporates components such as our conceptual framework, major assessments, transition/summative decision points, data collection and analysis, stakeholder involvement, communication of standards to candidates, tracking and storage of candidate information, and use of candidate assessment information for program and unit improvement. The unit consists of six programs and each has developed a subsystem of assessments that adheres to individual program standards. The uniformity of the UAS is embedded in a common conceptual framework, mission, rating system, dispositions, graduate surveys, entry and exit transition points, and UAS data review design and plan. The effectiveness of the system and its design are evaluated and refined according to a five-year assessment plan. The UAS is reviewed by a campus-wide assessment committee for its effectiveness.

### **Stakeholder Involvement**

The UAS incorporates stakeholder involvement in its development and management. School of Education (SOE) faculty and professional staff meet monthly during the academic year and often devote a segment of each session to some aspect of Unit Assessment. SOE program teams (Elementary, Secondary, Special Education, Counseling, Master's and Ed Leadership), SOE quality teams (Curriculum Development, Field Experiences and Clinical Practice, Diversity, Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation (PAUE, formerly Unit Assessment Team (UAT)), Faculty Performance and Development/Student Support and Recognition, Governance and Resources), and the Unit School Council (dean and coordinators from the SOE) discuss assessment issues and make assessment decisions. SOE faculty/staff retreats and ad hoc committees and meetings provide further opportunities to address assessment issues (see electronic copies of meeting minutes).

Each program has an advisory group composed of stakeholders specific to the academic area (elementary education, secondary education, special education, counseling, educational leadership, master's degree). Several of these academic areas maintain separate candidate advisory groups. Programs conduct advisory group meetings several times each year to keep stakeholders informed about data collection initiatives and to seek input on

the continuous improvement of programs. The Unit maintains an electronic database of stakeholder involvement and minutes from meetings. Various combinations of the following groups serve on these advisory committees: education faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, content faculty, candidates in the program, program alumni, and stakeholders more specific to the program (such as a parent of a child with a disability for the Special Education stakeholder group). Membership is monitored by the PAUE and efforts are made to maintain stakeholder groups with a variety of affiliations pertinent to the licensing/degree area: Louisville area, southern Indiana, males and females, minority representation, etc. The Dean's Office convenes additional advisory meetings with IUS deans, K-12 area school superintendents and other K-12 administrators in order to have cross-program, campus-wide and regionally focused dialogues. A newly-formed Council on the Preparation of Education Professionals (COPEP) committee ensures campus-wide involvement in the assessment process. Additional stakeholder meetings, such as the Superintendent's Breakfast and campus content faculty meetings, are convened to relay information and coordinate UAS efforts with top administrators in area schools used as SOE field sites.

Stakeholder feedback is obtained from exit survey candidate evaluations to provide instructors with firsthand information regarding the UAS impact on changes in instruction as viewed from candidates' perspectives. Alumni and employer surveys are conducted every 2-3 years and reviewed by programs and shared with stakeholder groups. Cooperating teachers are convened and/or surveyed to review and discuss candidate teaching assessment procedures. The Unit prepares survey and focus group findings and shares this information with program teams and stakeholder groups. PRAXIS and ISLLC scores are disaggregated for program analyses.

### **Unit Conceptual Framework (UCF)**

The Conceptual Framework was adopted by the unit in 2001. The UCF focuses on four themes embodied in the Unit mission: high quality educators, caring professionals, continuous renewal of schools, and multicultural society. The themes embody the standards and principles of IPSB content and developmental standards, INTASC, NBPTS, NCATE and the Learned Societies in areas such as technology, English and language arts, mathematics, and the social sciences.

The Unit Conceptual Framework is thoroughly integrated into the UAS design and implementation. Each program has worked diligently with stakeholder groups to assure the Unit that INTASC and IPSB standards are fully addressed. Each program team has documented how the INTASC principles and IPSB standards are incorporated into program goals, coursework, and assessments. Standards are embedded in assessment documents to ensure that all standards are an integral part of programs. Each program has created a grid clearly detailing how candidates meet IPSB content and developmental standards. The Transition to Teach program ensures the Unit that IPSB standards are met by candidates for the appropriate licensing area sought. The Master's Degree of Elementary and Secondary Education incorporates NBPTS as its outcomes and Educational Leadership depend heavily on ISLLC standards.

The Unit Conceptual Framework (UCF) is a shared vision by the SOE faculty/staff and its stakeholders. The UCF is monitored and reviewed annually by the PAUE (formerly UAT) to ensure that the framework is embedded into yearly planning goals as well as evident syllabi assessment and program evaluation. Content and developmental standards are systematically reviewed to ensure alignment with the UCF and INTASC principles. The description and knowledge bases for the UCF are updated annually and revisions are reviewed by faculty and stakeholder groups.

### **Performance Assessment**

The UAS includes a coherent, sequential, performance assessment system for individual candidates and programs. The UAS utilizes, for both formative and summative purposes, a range of performance-based assessment strategies throughout the program. The Unit adopted a uniform rating system that was revised in 2003. Course structures and summative evaluation processes are continuously reviewed in order to improve program and student outcomes.

Programs document a wide variety of performance-based formative assessments such as: lesson and unit plans, on-demand tasks, case studies, reflections on diversity issues, exams, research papers, logs, professional development plans, demonstrations, portfolios, self-evaluations and observations. Programs collect samples of work to benchmark various levels of performance and their impact on K-12 learning. Programs review candidates' work to ensure that all standards have been achieved.

Each program has clearly established benchmark transition decision points and assessment criteria for: (1) an initial summative decision point for admission to the program, (2) summative decision point(s) for assessing accepted candidates within the program, and (3) a final decision point prior to completion of the program. The summative assessment points combine information from a variety of sources: portfolio entries, ratings of observations, self-assessments, reflections, work sample analyses, evaluations from field placement supervisors, course evaluations, and standardized test results. Programs use one of two processes to make summative judgments: a) a formula used to aggregate data or sub-ratings, or b) a committee that makes a holistic judgment of the aggregated data or sub-ratings. Stakeholder groups are used to assure that valid indicators are identified to assess candidate learning. Candidate performance data is also identified through standardized testing (PPST, Praxis Specialty Tests, ISLLC) and portfolio development.

All programs in the Unit share a common set of dispositions that are aligned to IPSB standards. Candidate dispositions are evaluated at various points in programs, formatively and summatively, utilizing SOE faculty, clinical faculty, and/or self-assessment measures.

Program assessment forms include areas for comments on attainment of specific standards, and care is taken to provide annotated information in all cases where performance is assessed as unsatisfactory. The Unit has procedures for candidate remediation as well as procedures for denying candidate continuance in the program based on a cumulative record of weak and/or inappropriate performance, including dispositions.

Each program trains raters to ensure consistent and reliable ratings for high-stake summative decision-making assessments. Training is conducted in individual programs with participating faculty as well as through focus and training seminars with raters from the P-12 settings. Rubrics have been reviewed and revised with the assistance of stakeholder groups to ensure validity and reliability to the assessment measures used. The PAUE team reviews training protocols and reliability data and reports this information to the Unit.

Each program records candidate data on scantron forms created for formative and summative data collection. Rubrics, rating sheets, and other data are compiled as hard copies. Data are secured through Office of Institutional Review and Assessment (OIRA) and confidentially maintained via passwords and delineated by using student ID numbers. Designated clerical personnel are trained to enter and retrieve program data. Access to data is limited to Unit program key personnel, the Unit Assessment Coordinator, the SOE records officer, and two individuals from OIRA. The Unit continues to explore mechanisms to give candidates the ability to electronically monitor their own candidacy.

IUS OIRA provides data analyses to programs annually, and more frequently when asked to do so. Individual candidate files are confidentially maintained in the SOE Records Office.

Candidates are informed of the INTASC principles and IPSB standards they are expected to achieve during the course of the teacher education program within which they are enrolled. The UAT has compiled summative decision point grids to help clarify this information to candidates. Each program has worked with stakeholder groups to prepare printed documents and packets of materials outlining all elements of the new licensure system. Candidates are informed about IPSB standards and INTASC principles and the performance assessments used to measure these standards and principles in pre-admission literature about the program, at pre-admission advising sessions, in documentation regarding summative decision points given to candidates at various times in their programs, and embedded in course syllabi. The IUS Bulletin informs candidates about program standards and UCF. Candidates can access a website with links to specific information such as the UCF, mapping of standards, examples of portfolio entries, etc.

### **Program Quality**

The UAS uses the collective presentation of candidate assessments and related data to document the quality of programs to prepare candidates to meet the IPSB standards. Admission data for SOE programs are electronically collected each semester. The Unit documents the proportion of candidates who passed, passed with remediation, and failed specific standards and/or summative decision points that permits an overall assessment of the quality of programs within the Unit.

The Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Team (PAUE) collects data from individual programs to prepare Unit documentation to ensure that all IPSB standards have been appropriately, adequately, and cumulatively assessed across multiple assessment points. Descriptions and timelines are used to document how data from candidate assessments are reviewed systematically. Electronic scan sheets collect newly identified pertinent

information on programs as needed. Programs meet with advisory groups and hold focus meetings with candidate evaluators to improve program quality. Unit assessment data are included in Unit publication revisions. A delineation of candidates who successfully complete an induction program is also maintained and reviewed by the Unit.

### **Refining and Revising Conceptual Framework**

The UAS uses aggregate and disaggregated data from individual candidates and other sources to refine and revise the conceptual framework and programs. Programs seek stakeholders' input into candidate assessment data before modifications and changes to the UCF are voted on by the faculty. Proposed program changes require evidence of data analyses and stakeholder involvement to validate the proposed change. Candidate assessment procedures are reviewed by the Unit to ensure that curriculum changes bring about candidate improvement in the area under study.

### **Continual Management**

The OIRA has developed scanable summative decision point and disposition forms for each program in the Unit and produces candidate and program data reports in response to requests from the assessment coordinator and/or program coordinators. Some decision point data are first entered manually on a worksheet to help faculty efficiently consider all needed data and then pertinent data are entered on the scanable forms.

The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed. An Assessment Coordinator is provided release time to direct the work of the UAS. The Assessment Coordinator chairs the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation team and serves on the campus-wide assessment committee. The Assessment Coordinator developed grids, timelines, and procedures to manage the UAS and works closely with the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Team on annual goals to be accomplished. The Assessment Coordinator oversees monitoring, reviewing, and revision of the conceptual framework, program(s), and curricula for the Unit. The Assessment Coordinator oversees and meets monthly with the Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation team (PAUE) and with the dean, and provides updates and reports to the faculty/staff regarding the monitoring, reviewing, and revising of the UAS. The Assessment Coordinator serves on the campus assessment committee whose responsibility is to direct and monitor the campus-wide assessment initiatives.

### **Review and Revision of UAS**

The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system. The Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Team compile and distribute a timeline of tasks that need to be completed by the programs each year. Stakeholder input is assured by annual review documentation of stakeholder involvement provided by each program and the dean. The Program Assessment and Unit Evaluation Team prepare the necessary criteria and protocol for reviewing data collection and reporting this documentation to the Unit. A five-year assessment plan provides a timeline for each component of the UAS.