

Accuracy and Effectiveness Study of the UAS Instruments: Phase I

Report to the Unit

April 4, 2007

Framework of the Study: Phase I

Background

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has approved the Teacher Education program of University M as accredited. In order to maintain the NCATE accreditation status, University M must meet each of the NCATE standards. Professional Standard 2 of the NCATE (2006) states: “The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs” (p. 10). In addition, “the unit conducts thorough studies to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its performance assessment procedures. It also makes changes in its practices consistent with the results of these studies” (p. 21). In other words, the unit must ensure that the assessment system itself is evaluated to ensure that assessment instruments are necessary, are anchored to the conceptual framework and to professional standards, and provide useful data for candidate, program, and unit improvement.

Iterative Process

In order to establish the criteria for the initial phase of the effectiveness study, a formative and a summative panel were formed to review and revise the criteria for the study. The following criteria were validated for phase one, regarding the effectiveness of the instruments in the UAS: (a) effectively measures candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSDs); (b) effectively measures program quality; and (c) is systematically administered in an efficient manner. The formative and summative panel also reviewed and revised the survey used to measure the criteria. The survey was released to all members of the unit, in hard copy. Samples of all of the assessment tools that were evaluated were stored in the central office of the unit, for perusal by each member of the unit during the survey completion period from March 21-28, 2007. Responses from the survey were typed directly into a template of the survey, to provide aggregated data for each section of the survey, and distributed via email to the unit members. In addition, two summary tables of data are provided here in this report: (a) Survey Data: Measures of Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions (see Attachment A); and (b) Survey Data: Measures of Program Quality (see Attachment B). In attachments A and B, the quantitative data is reported as frequency/distribution data and the qualitative comments are summarized, in order to facilitate discussion within the teacher education unit. In this study $n=6$. All 6 of the faculty members completed the survey for a 100% response rate.

Research Questions

Three research questions were established to begin the effectiveness study:

1. How effective is each instrument of the UAS in measuring student knowledge, skills, and dispositions?
2. How effective is each instrument of the UAS in measuring program quality?
3. How often should an instrument be administered in order to retain its

effectiveness?

Data Trends

Measures of Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

Several trends were noted in the quantitative data regarding the measures of candidate performance.

- One instrument received a 100% response rate for the category of “Effectively measures candidate KDSs”: the *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation*.
- Three other instruments had a distribution of 100% within the categories of “Effectively measures” and “Somewhat measures”, with no ratings of a “Does not measure”: *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*, and *1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Survey*.
- The *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation* was rated quite high as well with five scores distributed across the “Effectively measures” and “Somewhat measures”. One person did not rate this tool.
- The *MA Exit Interview* also had five scores distributed across the “Effectively measures” and “Somewhat measures” categories, and one rating of a “does not measure”.
- Two instruments received at least 4 ratings of “does not measure KDSs”: *Field Experience Report*, *Curriculum Review Cycle*.

Several trends were noted in the qualitative data regarding the measures of candidate performance.

- Two tools received strong comments as “very effective” and “well-designed”: and *1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Survey*.
- Two tools primarily measure dispositions: *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, and the *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*.
- There is a fair amount of confusion surrounding the use of the following tools, either regarding the instrument’s purpose or need to be in the UAS: *1st Years Teacher’s Dinner Interview*, *Institutional Effectiveness Instruments*, *Letter of Recommendation for MA Admission*.

Measures of Program Quality

Several trends were noted in the quantitative data regarding the measures of program quality.

- One instrument received all 5 ratings (one person forgot to rate) as “effectively measures program quality: *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation*.
- Seven instruments had all 6 ratings distributed within the “effectively measures” or “somewhat measures” columns: *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation*, *Evaluation of ST Experience by the CT*, *Student Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience*, *Course Evaluation*, *MA Exit Interviews*, *1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys*, *1st Year Teacher’s Dinner Interview*.

- One instrument had 5 out of 6 ratings as a “Does not measure” program quality: *Letter of Recommendation for MA Admission*.
- The *Admission to Teacher Ed/Student Teaching Recommendation Form* had a divergent distribution with 2 scores as “Effectively Measures program quality” and 3 scores as “Does not measure program quality”.

Several trends were noted in the qualitative data regarding the measures of program quality.

- High value was noted on the 1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys and Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation
- The *Course Evaluation* tends to measure the professor not the course.
- Programs need to actively discuss the data retrieved from the valuable tools.
- Wide range of divergent opinions on following tools: Admission to Teacher Ed/Student Teaching Recommendation Form, Student Evaluation of Student Tchg Experience, Field Experience Diversity Report.
- Redundancy was noted within the 1st Year Teacher’s Dinner Interview; it overlaps with 1st/5th year alumni/employer Survey.

Summary and Recommendations

The two tools ranked most consistently, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as effective in measuring BOTH candidate performance and program quality are the 1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys and Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation. Three additional tools were rated high in measuring candidate KSDs: *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*, and the *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation*. Two additional instruments were rated high for effectively measuring program quality: *Student Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience* and the *Course Evaluation*.

It appears that several instruments were questioned regarding whether a need exists to have these instruments in the UAS: *Institutional Effectiveness Instruments*, *the Institutional 5 Year Review Cycle*, and possibly the *Curriculum Review Cycle*.

Several trends exist within the entire UAS:

- Need to review the wording or semantics of the tools that the unit members eventually intend to keep within the UAS, to ensure the accuracy and alignment of the instrument with its intended purpose and/or program standards.
- Clarification of whether to use “candidate data on KSDs” simultaneously as “program data”.
- Need to reduce any redundancies within the UAS.
- Need to reduce the tools to make it more manageable so that the data collected is actually used.
- Need for programs to make the time to review the data to make decisions about program improvement.

The following recommendations are made based on Phase I of the *Effectiveness Study of the UAS Instruments*.

1. Review of the Standard 2 of the NCATE at a departmental/unit meeting, prior to

discussion of the data results of Phase I.

2. Review of the data results from Phase I by the Teacher Education Unit in order to locate inconsistencies in the quantitative and qualitative data.
3. Creation of a grid that lists all of the instruments and “plots” the measurement of candidate knowledge, candidate skills, candidate dispositions, and program quality, so that a “full picture” can be established before any instruments are considered for deletion from the system.
4. Implementation of Phase II, in which the unit determines:
 - a. Which UAS instruments are needed to ensure that decisions are made about candidate performance at multiple gates in program?
 - b. Which UAS instruments are needed to ensure that decisions are made by internal and external stakeholders?
 - c. Which UAS instruments are required by NCATE and are not optional (e.g. SPA data)?
 - d. Which instruments provide an even distribution of measurement of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions?
 - e. Which instruments provide an even distribution of measurement of program courses, program faculty, and program field experiences?
 - f. Which instruments should be maintained, but as an instrument outside of the UAS for a different purpose?
 - g. Which instruments within the UAS need revision to ensure accuracy and absence of bias?

Accuracy and Effectiveness Study of the UAS Instruments: Phase I

STUDY DESIGN and REPORT

Lori H. Leaman

Assessment Coordinator

April, 2007

Table of Contents

Introduction	2
<i>Background</i>	2
<i>Problem Rationale</i>	2
<i>Purpose of the Evaluation</i>	2
<i>Research Questions</i>	3
Review of the Literature	3
<i>Rationale for the Evaluation</i>	3
<i>Involvement of the Professionals</i>	4
<i>Program Criteria</i>	4
Evaluation Methodology	4
<i>Information Gathering and Criteria Development</i>	4
<i>Iterative Review Process of the Criteria</i>	5
<i>Iterative Review Process of Survey</i>	5
<i>Implementation of Data Gathering</i>	7
<i>Data Analysis and Reporting</i>	7
Results	7
<i>Measures of Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions</i>	7
<i>Measures of Program Quality</i>	8
Summary and Recommendations	9
<i>Recommendations</i>	9
Appendix A: Survey	13
Appendix B: Candidate KSD Survey Data	22
Appendix C: Program Quality Survey Data	28

Abstract

This evaluation project was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the assessment instruments within the Unit Assessment System (UAS) of the Teacher Education Program at EMU. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has approved the Teacher Education program of EMU as accredited. In order to maintain the NCATE (2003) accreditation status, the Teacher Education unit must demonstrate that it “has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs” (p. 10). However, since the renewal of its accreditation status in 2005, the unit and the advisory Assessment Committee have determined that the current number of assessment instruments is too high to maintain over time with integrity. The unit, however, has stalled in its efforts to determine how to evaluate the integrity of each instrument and to determine which instruments should be retained and which should be deleted from the UAS. If this dilemma is not solved in the very near future, the unit risks losing its NCATE accreditation status.

The purpose of this evaluation was to evaluate the effectiveness of each UAS assessment instrument in providing data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions (KSD) and program quality. In order to evaluate the effectiveness of these instruments, formative and summative panels were formed to first validate the criteria of effectiveness necessary for maintaining a valid unit assessment system. A draft of the criteria was created by the researcher after a careful review of the literature and reviewed and approved in an iterative process by the formative and summative panels. Following this validation of the criteria, the formative and summative panels assisted in the iterative formation of a survey used to evaluate the effectiveness of the UAS instruments. Six full-time faculty in the unit were surveyed between March 21-28, 2007. The response rate was 100%. The results revealed that two of the instruments are perceived as highly effective in measuring both candidate KSD and program quality. In addition, a second tier of instruments were identified as effective, but in need of revision. Several patterns of possible redundancy or ineffectiveness were noted also across several instruments. All data is available in Appendices B and C.

The evaluation resulted in several recommendations to the unit for moving into a second and third phase of evaluation, which would include a plan of action for reducing redundancy by eliminating a few instruments and for revising those instruments that were rated as “somewhat effective”. In other words, the innovation of assessment is sustained over time by ensuring that the assessment system itself is evaluated. The evaluation provides data to ensure that assessment instruments are necessary, are anchored to the conceptual framework and to professional standards, and provide useful data for candidate, program, and unit improvement.

Introduction

Background

The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) has approved the Teacher Education program of EMU as accredited. In order to maintain the NCATE accreditation status, EMU must meet each of the NCATE standards. Professional Standard 2 of the NCATE (2003) states: "The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on the applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs" (p. 10). The Unit Assessment System is designed to measure the teacher education candidate's knowledge, skills and dispositions, as well as to ensure the alignment of instruction and curriculum of the unit with institutional, professional and state standards.

In addition, the university is required to maintain a *Continual UAS Action Plan* in order to identify the system maintenance plans for ensuring that the UAS continues to be based on comprehensive sets of multiple assessments that measure candidate performance at transition points and that utilize data to evaluate program and unit effectiveness. In other words, the unit must ensure that the assessment system itself is also evaluated to ensure that assessment instruments are necessary, are anchored to the conceptual framework and to professional standards, and provide useful data for candidate, program, and unit improvement.

"Innovations fall short because we keep creating innovations and reforms that focus on everything *but learning*" (McClenney, 1998, p. 4). The institution must focus on increasing the learning of its students, as well as on becoming an organization that learns about itself. "To transform learning requires *first*, clarity about what is to be learned; *second*, regular assessment of learning; and, especially *third*, a willingness to look at what those data tell us about the learning that is or is not occurring" (McClenney, 1998, p. 4). EMU will be more likely to sustain the unit assessment system as an innovation if the university is willing to evaluate the effectiveness of its assessment system.

Problem Rationale

Since its implementation in 2000, the UAS includes approximately 20 assessment instruments. In its 2005 NCATE Accreditation Report, EMU stated: "The 2005 *Continual UAS Action Plan* demonstrates how further mechanisms will be developed to not only strengthen the systematic nature of the UAS but to revise the underlying data systems themselves". However, since the renewal of its accreditation status in 2005, the unit and the advisory Assessment Committee have determined that the current number of assessment instruments is too high to maintain over time with integrity. The unit, however, has stalled in its efforts to determine how to evaluate the integrity of each instrument and to determine which instruments should be retained and which should be deleted from the UAS. If this dilemma is not solved in the very near future, the unit risks losing its NCATE accreditation status.

Purpose of the Evaluation

The UAS should (a) monitor candidate performance; (b) provide data to monitor and manage the quality of teacher education programs; (c) use multiple assessments to assess

candidate performance at appropriate transition points in program; (d) includes data from the candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community; (e) data is regularly collected and analyzed to provide useful data on the above criteria. The purpose of this evaluation is to evaluate the effectiveness of each assessment instrument in providing data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions and program quality.

Research Questions

The initial stage of evaluation, in which a “comprehensive list of potentially important evaluation questions is developed,” will likely result in the generation of many evaluation questions that could be posed when evaluating an entire academic program (Fitzpatrick, Sanders & Worthen, 2004, p. 233). The NCATE requires, however, that each unit specifically assess the effectiveness of the unit assessment in its ability to measure candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions and program quality, for the specific purpose of refining and updating the UAS on a regular cycle. Thus, the two evaluation questions are:

4. How effective is each instrument of the UAS in measuring student knowledge, skills, and dispositions?
5. How effective is each instrument of the UAS in measuring program quality?

Review of the Literature

Rationale for the Evaluation

A unit assessment system provides an innovative approach for university programs to chart a course for future change. Innovative change is characterized by a willingness to think about an issue from a new perspective in such a way that risk-taking becomes valued for its potential to bring about a higher quality of life or functioning for an individual, a department, or an entire institution (Diamond, 2002). “Innovations fall short because we keep creating innovations and reforms that focus on everything *but learning*” (McClenney, 1998, p. 4). The institution must focus on increasing the learning of its students, as well as on becoming an organization that learns about itself. “To transform learning requires *first*, clarity about what is to be learned; *second*, regular assessment of learning; and, especially *third*, a willingness to look at what those data tell us about the learning that is or is not occurring” (McClenney, 1998, p. 4).

In addition, Tierney (2000) summarizes: “The message one sends when benchmark data is collected is that the institution wants initiatives that are not simply acceptable, but excellent, and that the initiative is a dynamic process that will continue to improve once it has been implemented” (p. 15). The maintenance of a unit assessment system is as important as the original creation of such a system. The existence of too little or too much data can result in a stagnation of the use of data.

The [NCATE] committee encourages assessments constructed so as to provide information about several elements of a standard, or portions of several standards, that are “meaningful” . . . The committee discourages assessments that attempt to measure atomized bits of learning—those forms of assessment limit the utility of results and make comprehensive understanding of candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions unmanageable. (Elliott, 2003, p. 15)

Allen (2004) recommends that units “routinely examine the assessment process and correct [it], as needed” (p. 10).

Involvement of the Professionals

Diamond (1998) recommends that faculty become involved in the ongoing discussions and evaluations of an assessment system. Diamond notes “Keeping the culture in tune with the assessment system requires ongoing socialization . . . new people need to become involved in order to bring fresh perspectives to bear” (p. 286).

James Madison University has been cited for its benchmarked practices in assessment (Banta, 2002, p. 140). Bradley (personal communication, March 26, 2007), of James Madison University, notes the following two characteristics of an effective assessment system: (a) systematic decisions about the improvement of the assessment system are conducted regularly and (b) are conducted by the professional community. It is important to utilize the faculty perspectives regarding the effectiveness of a unit assessment system.

Program Criteria

According to NCATE the UAS should (a) monitor candidate performance; (b) provide data to monitor and manage the quality of teacher education programs; (c) use multiple assessments to assess candidate performance at appropriate transition points in program; (d) includes data from the candidates, graduates, faculty, and other members of the professional community; (e) data is regularly collected and analyzed to provide useful data on the above criteria (2006a, pp. 21-22). Bradley (personal communication, March 26, 2007) also supports these criteria: “The unit collects, analyzes, and evaluates candidate and program quality data at regularly scheduled intervals as part of a comprehensive unit assessment plan.” Allen (2004) provides a similar set of criteria and indicates that an assessment system should measure the knowledge, skills, and values that students are expected to develop within an educational program (p. 33). Allen further posits that the assessment system must measure the alignment of what the program requires students to do within program and what the faculty expect them to learn (p. 39).

Evaluation Methodology

Information Gathering and Criteria Development

Although an evaluation of all aspects of the UAS would be helpful to the institution, the scope of the evaluation project was limited to an evaluation of the effectiveness of the assessment instrument, due to the limitations of the six-week time frame for the study. Beginning in late February, the researcher conducted an initial review of the literature from the NCATE, in order to establish a foundation for the development of the evaluation criteria. The basic criteria for the effectiveness of a Unit Assessment System are already embedded within a three-point rubric used by the NCATE to evaluate the unit’s achievement of the standard. The NCATE rubric contains three levels of performance: *Unacceptable*, *Acceptable*, or *Target*. A more in-depth review of the literature substantiated the following three criteria for evaluation: (a) effectiveness of the UAS in providing data on candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions; (b)

effectiveness of the UAS in providing data on program quality; and (c) regular administration of the assessment instruments.

Iterative Review Process of the Criteria

In February the researcher drafted the evaluation criteria for the primary evaluation instrument in this study. Subsequently, in early March, a formative advisory panel was formed to include two members of the education faculty; the faculty members were selected because of their familiarity with the NCATE criteria. The members of the formative panel were given a written draft of the evaluation criteria and then met in a conference with the evaluator to share their recommended revisions. The formative panel made the following recommendations:

1. Collapse the four subcategories of data categories into two categories to reduce the confusion of new faculty members who are unfamiliar with the UAS.
2. Substitute the word “measure” for the word “monitor” when referring to the effectiveness of the UAS.
3. Consistently use the phrase “provides data” in the criteria statements.

All of the recommendations made by the formative committee were incorporated into the evaluation criteria. These changes were returned to the formative panel for their approval; no further recommendations were made.

The revised criteria were then submitted to a summative panel. Two researchers from the Office of Institutional Research, with expertise in survey research, were invited to serve on the summative panel. These two members have expertise in the area of assessment and are familiar with the NCATE criteria, and yet neither member is directly invested in the NCATE process or directly affected by the accreditation status of the Teacher Education Committee. The summative panel was asked to provide assistance in validating the criteria. The summative panel made no recommendations for the evaluation criteria. Thus, the iterative process provided further validation of the following criteria for measuring the effectiveness of the instruments in the Unit Assessment System: (a) effectively measures candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions (KSD); (b) effectively measures program quality; and (c) is systematically administered in an efficient manner.

Iterative Review Process of Survey

The researcher drafted the template of the survey to serve as the primary evaluation instrument in this study. The formative panel was asked to provide assistance in validating the survey to ensure that the survey items were direct and clear measures of the criteria that had been established. The formative panel made the following recommendations:

1. Affirmed the use of a survey.
2. Recommended that copies of all assessment instruments being evaluated be made available in a place accessible to all respondents. They stressed the need for this considering the high number of new faculty this year.
3. Recommended that for the purposes of the survey, the four subcategories of instruments be deleted to simplify the survey format.
4. Recommended that a categorical scale of “perceived effectiveness” replace the use of “recommendation boxes” using such phrases as “Keep,” “Delete,” or “Revise” this instrument.
5. Recommended that a different “row” of the survey be used for each of the criteria.

6. Recommended that the survey be distributed in hard copy so that respondents could complete the survey while accessing the instruments in an unrestricted way. In addition, it was recommended that the pages from the UAS manual, listing each instrument by name with a description of its purpose and the schedule for assessment, be distributed for reference sake along with the survey.

All of the suggestions of the formative panel were incorporated into a revised survey and re-submitted to the formative panel during the first week of March. The formative panel then sent it back to the researcher to correct the inadvertent use of the word “monitor” instead of “measures” in the categorical stem phrases of the scale. Following this minor correction, the formative panel approved the survey with no further recommendations and the survey was sent to the summative panel as part of the iterative process.

Upon reviewing the work of the formative panel, the summative panel members made the following recommendations regarding the survey questions and data collection methods:

1. Within each row provide a “Comments” section for the purpose of gathering qualitative data that might assist future decision-makers in interpreting the categorical data.
2. Consider using frequency counts of the 3 categories (3=Effectively measures; 2=Somewhat measures; 1=Does not measure) rather than mean scores for reporting purposes. Mean scores are less valid and meaningful with categorical data. In addition, it is difficult to interpret what a mean score, such as 2.3, might actually mean.
3. Effectiveness of data collection instruments is a crucial element in an assessment system; however, the effectiveness of an assessment system also depends heavily on the appropriate scheduling of assessments. It is recommended that the respondents be asked to recommend how often an instrument should be measured.
4. For reporting purposes, it is recommended that the quantitative and qualitative data be tallied

All three of the recommendations were incorporated into the final survey (see Figure 1). Recommendation three provided a means for representing the idea that instruments should be “regularly administered” (Bradley, 2007; NCATE, 2002). The summative committee approved the revised version of the survey and it was finalized during the second week of March (see Appendix A).

Instrument 1: Interview for Admission to Teacher Education			
a)	3 =Effectively measures	2=Somewhat measures	1=Does not measure
Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2 nd year Every 3 rd year Other cycle: I don't know		
b.)	3 =Effectively measures	2=Somewhat measures	1=Does not measure
Provides data on			

program quality	Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2 nd year Every 3 rd year Other cycle: I don't know
--------------------	--

Figure 1 Excerpt from Survey

Implementation of Data Gathering

In February when the original timeline for the study was drafted, the researcher gained approval for the study through the Director of Teacher Education. In addition, the researcher confirmed that the survey could be introduced to the faculty at the scheduled departmental meeting on March 21, 2007. The survey was released to all members of the unit, in hard copy on March 21. Samples of all of the assessment tools that were evaluated were stored in the central conference room of the unit, for perusal by each member of the unit during the survey completion period, from March 21-28, 2007.

Data Analysis and Reporting

The data was tallied for each line item of the survey in order to provide a frequency distribution of all of the data. In addition, all of the qualitative comments were entered onto the summary document, per line item of the survey. The researcher then created two tables, one for Candidate KSD and the other for Program Quality, in order to disaggregate the data according to frequency distribution of ratings, trends in the qualitative data, and frequency distribution of the recommendations for length of assessment cycle. This was done for both of the categories of assessment instruments: (a) measure of candidate knowledge, skills and dispositions, and (b) measures of program quality (see Appendix B; Appendix C). In order to facilitate the unit's discussion of the data, the researcher also drafted a short report to provide a review of the NCATE criteria, trends in the data, summary, and recommendations.

Results

Measures of Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions

The survey was released to the six full-time faculty members and returned at a 100% response rate. Several key trends were noted in the quantitative data regarding the measures of candidate performance.

- One instrument received a 100% response rate for the category of "Effectively measures candidate KDS": the *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation*.
- Three other instruments had a distribution of 100% within the categories of "Effectively measures" and "Somewhat measures", with no ratings of a "Does not measure": *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*, and *1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Survey*.
- The *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation* was rated quite high as well with five scores distributed across the "Effectively measures" and "Somewhat measures". One person did not rate this tool.
- The *MA Exit Interview* also had five scores distributed across the "Effectively

measures” and “ Somewhat measures” categories, and one rating of a “does not measure”.

- Two instruments received at least 4 ratings of “does not measure KSD”: *Field Experience Report, Curriculum Review Cycle*.

Unanimity of opinion regarding the effectiveness of the *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation* should allow the unit to at least begin the process of identifying which instruments are effective, with little or no revisions necessary.

Several trends were noted in the qualitative data regarding the measures of candidate performance.

- Two tools received strong comments as “very effective” and “well-designed”: *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation* and *1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Survey*.
- Two tools primarily measure dispositions: *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, and the *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*.
- There is a fair amount of confusion surrounding the use of the following tools, either regarding the instrument’s purpose or need to be in the UAS: *1st Years Teacher’s Dinner Interview, Institutional Effectiveness Instruments, Letter of Recommendation for MA Admission*.

The qualitative data presented here is consistent with the quantitative data regarding the highest rated instruments for measuring candidate KSD. This triangulation of data should provide a higher degree of confidence for the unit members in any ensuing discussion or decision-making regarding the instruments in the UAS.

Measures of Program Quality

Several trends were noted in the quantitative data regarding the measures of program quality.

- One instrument received all 5 ratings (one person forgot to rate) as “effectively measures program quality: *Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation*.
- Seven instruments had all 6 ratings distributed within the “effectively measures” or “somewhat measures” columns: *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation, Evaluation of ST Experience by the CT, Student Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience, Course Evaluation, MA Exit Interviews, 1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys, 1st Year Teacher’s Dinner Interview*.
- One instrument had 5 out of 6 ratings as a “Does not measure” program quality: *Letter of Recommendation for MA Admission*.
- The *Admission to Teacher Ed/Student Teaching Recommendation Form* had a divergent distribution with 2 scores as “Effectively Measures program quality” and 3 scores as “Does not measure program quality”.

It is interesting to note that more instruments were rated as effective, or somewhat effective, when measuring program quality than candidate KSD. It appears, therefore, that a number of measures of candidate KSD can be interpreted as “somewhat effective” measures of program quality. This trend is consistent with the position of NCATE (2006b): “Institutions with programs covered by the program standards must demonstrate, through the program review process that the candidates have the content knowledge and professional knowledge and skills outlined in the program standards” (p. 1).

Several trends were noted in the qualitative data regarding the measures of program quality.

- High value was noted on the 1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys and Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation.
- The *Course Evaluation* tends to measure the professor not the course.
- Programs need to actively discuss the data retrieved from the valuable tools.
- Wide range of divergent opinions on following tools: Admission to Teacher Ed/Student Teaching Recommendation Form, Student Evaluation of Student Experience, Field Experience Diversity Report.
- Redundancy was noted within the 1st Year Teacher's Dinner Interview; it overlaps with 1st/5th year alumni/employer Survey.

Summary and Recommendations

The two tools ranked most consistently, both quantitatively and qualitatively, as effective in measuring both candidate performance and program quality are the 1st/5th Year Alumni/Employer Surveys and Assessment of Student Teaching Final Evaluation. Three additional tools were rated high in measuring candidate KSD: *Interview for Admission to Teacher Education*, *Admission to TE/ST Recommendation Form*, and the *Field Experience Practicum Evaluation*. Two additional instruments were rated high for effectively measuring program quality: *Student Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience* and the *Course Evaluation*.

It appears that several instruments were questionable, regarding whether a need exists to have these instruments in the UAS: *Institutional Effectiveness Instruments*, the *Institutional 5 Year Review Cycle*, and possibly the *Curriculum Review Cycle*.

Several trends exist within the entire UAS:

- Need to review the wording or semantics of the tools that the unit members eventually intend to keep within the UAS, to ensure the accuracy and alignment of the instrument with its intended purpose and/or program standards.
- Clarification of whether to use “candidate data on KSD” simultaneously as “program data”.
- Need to reduce any redundancies within the UAS.
- Need to reduce the number of instruments in order to ensure that sufficient time is available to process, and use, the data.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on Phase I of the *Effectiveness Study of the UAS Instruments*.

5. Prior to discussion of the data results of Phase I of this evaluation, the Coordinator of the UAS should consider reviewing the standards of the NCATE, regarding the maintenance of a unit assessment system.
6. In order to bring closure to Phase I of this evaluation, the unit members should consider reviewing the data results from Phase I to locate inconsistencies in the quantitative and qualitative data presented within this report.
7. The Coordinator of the UAS should consider drafting a grid that lists all of the instruments and “plots” the measurement of candidate knowledge, candidate skills, candidate dispositions, and program quality, so that a “full picture” can be

established before any instruments are considered for deletion from the system. This resource would serve as a for unit members to visualize and track the complexity of criteria necessary for maintaining all requirements of the UAS.

8. The Coordinator of the UAS should consider drafting an implementation process for Phase II to ensure that the following questions are addressed:
 - a. Which UAS instruments are needed to ensure that decisions are made, by both internal and external stakeholders, about candidate performance at multiple gates in program?
 - b. Which UAS instruments are *required* by NCATE and are not optional?
 - c. Which instruments provide an even distribution of measurement of candidate KSD and program quality?
 - d. Which instruments, if any, should be maintained as an instrument “outside of” the UAS, for an alternate purpose? Which instruments within the UAS need revision to ensure accuracy and absence of bias?
9. The Coordinator of the UAS might draft a plan of action for a Phase III of the project, to outline the responsibilities and timelines for revisions.

The evaluation resulted in several recommendations to the unit for moving into a second and third phase of evaluation, which would include a plan of action for reducing redundancy by eliminating a few instruments and for revising those instruments that were rated as “somewhat effective”. In other words, the innovation of assessment is sustained over time by ensuring that the assessment system itself is evaluated. The evaluation provides data to ensure that assessment instruments are necessary, are anchored to the conceptual framework and to professional standards, and provide useful data for candidate, program, and unit improvement.

References

- Allen, M. J. (2004). *Assessing academic programs in higher education*. Bolton, MA: Anker.
- Banta, T. W. (2002). *Building a scholarship of assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R. M. (1998). *Designing and assessing courses and curricula: A practical guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Diamond, R. M. (2002). *Some final observations*. In R. M. Diamond (Ed.), *Field guide to academic leadership* (pp. 471-490). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Elliott, E. (2003). *Student learning in NCATE accreditation*. Retrieved March 28, 2007 from http://www.ncate.org/documents/articles/STUDENT_LEARNING_4th.pdf
- Fitzpatrick, J.L., Sanders, J.R., & Worthen, B.R. (2004). *Program evaluation: alternative approaches and practical guidelines*. Boston: Pearson.
- McClenney, K. (1998). *Community colleges perched at the millennium*. Retrieved January 24, 2007 from <http://www.league.org/publication/abstracts/leadership/labs0898.htm>
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2006a). *Professional standards for the accreditation of schools, colleges, and departments of teacher education*. Retrieved

February 14, 2007 from <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/standards.asp>

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2006b). *Program assessments in the unit assessment system*. Retrieved March 28, 2007 from <http://www.ncate.org/institutions/resources>

Tierney, W. G. (2000). Developing the high performance organization: Impediments to change and innovation in colleges and universities [Electronic version]. Retrieved January 24, 2007 from <http://www.usc.edu/dept/chepa/Papers/Tierney.doc>

Appendix A: Survey

Department of Teacher Education

Eastern Mennonite University

Unit Assessment System Survey

Instructions: Please review the assessment instruments that are a part of our Unit Assessment System. The **title** of each instrument is highlighted in gray.

1. Please circle your response (3,2, or 1) to indicate the instrument's level of effectiveness in measuring (a) candidate performance and (b) quality of program.
2. Please list comments to explain your answer.
3. Please circle how often this assessment should be administered.
4. Return the survey to Lori Leaman by noon on March 26.

Instrument 1: Interview for Admission to Teacher Education		
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know	
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know	
Instrument 2: Admission to Teacher Education/Student Teaching Recommendation Form		
a)	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure	

Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 3: Letter of Recommendation for the M.A. Education Admission	
a.) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know

Instrument 4: Assessment of Student Teaching (Final Evaluation instrument)	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 5: Field Experience Evaluation (Practicum evaluation completed by Prof or CT)	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year

	Every 3 rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 6: Evaluation of Cooperating Teacher and University Consultant	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 7: Evaluation of Student Teaching Program by Cooperating Teacher	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know

Instrument 8: Student Teaching Evaluation (ST evaluates the experience)	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 9: Field Experience Diversity Report	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 10: Course Evaluation	

a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispostions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 11: Curriculum Review Cycle	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispostions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know

Instrument 12: Institutional 5 Year Program Review (required for new programs)	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 13: MA Exit Interviews	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 14: 1st and 5 th Year Evaluations of Alumni/Employers	

a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 15: 1 st Year Teacher's Dinner Interview	
a) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 16: Institutional Assessments: SSI, CIRP, CSS, NSSE	
a) Provides	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure

data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
Instrument 17: <i>AEIR Report</i>	
a.) Provides data on candidate knowledge, skills or dispositions	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know
b.) Provides data on program quality	3 =Effectively measures 2=Somewhat measures 1=Does not measure Comments: Data from this instrument should be collected <u>(circle one)</u> Every semester Every year Every 2nd year Every 3rd year Other cycle: I don't know

Appendix B: Candidate KSD Survey Data

UAS Instrument	N=rated as a 3 (Effectively Measures)	N=rated as a 2 (Somewhat Measures)	N= rated as a 1 (Does not measure)	N=Recommend ed Cycle for the Assessment	Comment Trend:
Interview for Admission to Teacher Ed	2	4	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 5 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 0	Measures mainly dispositions and knowledge of Concept Framework.
Admission to TE/ST Recommendatio n Form	3	3	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 4 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	Measures mainly dispositions early in program
Letter of Recommendatio n for MA Admission	2	2	2	Every semester: 0 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 3	Wide range of comments: a screening, TEAC may not use it heavily, essential measure, needs

					modified?
Assessment of Stu Tchg (Final Eval)	6	0	0	Every semester: 3 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Well-designed. All scored “effectively measures’.
Field Exper Eval (Practicum eval by Prof/CT)	4	1	0	Every semester: 4 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Few comments except that one uses it redglaf weak students early on to assist them.
Eval of Coop Teacher and UC	2	0	3	Every semester: 2 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	Not really an evaluation unless all data is given to CT and UC; Excellent tool but “so what are we doing with data”. Excellent tool, but not of candidate K,S,D. Is it a program quality

					tool?
Eval of ST experience by CT	0	3	2	Every semester: 1 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 2	Assesses “program” not “candidate”.
Stu Eval of ST Experience	0	5	1	Every semester: 2 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Vague questions; may need to focus more on K,S,D; maybe is “program” tool only.
Field Exper Diversity Report	0	1	5	Every semester: 1 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 3	Not candidate tool.
Course Eval	0	3	3	Every semester: 3 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0	Evaluates professor/program , not candidates.

UAS Instrument	N=rated as a 3 (Effectively Measures)	N=rated as a 2 (Somewhat Measures)	N= rated as a 1 (Does not measure)	N=Recommended Cycle for the Assessment	Comment Trend:
Curr. Review Cycle	0	0	4	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 3	Does not measure KSDs. Not an assessment tool
Instit 5 Yr Program Review (new programs)	0	2	2	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 2 I don't know: 2	.
MA Exit Interviews	2	3	1	Every semester: 0 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 2	Wide range of comments: Yes, it measures KSDs but too late to help them grow; invaluable tool b/c

					it collects data directly from students; lacks clarity.
1 st /5 th Year Alum/Employer Survey	5	1	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 1	One of most invaluable, effective; interesting information.
1 st Yr Teacher's Dinner Interview	0; 1=2.5	3	2	Every semester: 0 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 1 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 2	Wide range of responses: Allows student to feel valued; vague questions that give limited responses; too hard to measure KSDs with this tool.
Institutional Effectiveness Instruments	1	2	1	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I	No comments.

				don't know: 3	
AIER reports	0	3	1	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 2 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 2	Data is duplicated from other sources.

Appendix C: Program Quality Survey Data

	N=rated as a 3 (Effectively Measures)	N=rated as a 2 (Somewhat Measures)	N= rated as a 1 (Does not measure)	N=Recommended Cycle for the Assessment	Comment Trend:
Interview for Admission to Teacher Ed	0	5	1	Every semester: 0 Every year: 4 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 0	Measures mainly dispositions and familiarity with Conceptual Framework; do we want it to target K/S? Programs need to use the data.
Admission to TE/ST Recomm. Form	2	1	3	Every semester: 0 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 3	Wide range of opinions from “essential tool” to “doesn't measure”.
Letter of Recommendation for MA	0	1	5	Every semester: 0 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I	Instrument needs modified; may keep tool but not in UAS?

Admission				don't know: 3	(Caution: remember the gates data must be collected).
Assessment of Stu Tchg (Final Eval)	5	0	0	Every semester: 4 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Need to regularly aggregate and discuss this valuable data.
Field Exper Eval (Practicum eval by Prof/CT)	3	3	0	Every semester: 4 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	
Eval of Coop Teacher and UC	2	3	1	Every semester: 3 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	
Eval of ST experience by CT	4	2	0	Every semester: 3 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	

Stu Eval of ST Experience	2	4	0	Every semester: 3 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Wide range of comments: Vague questions on tool; "is invaluable data to program change".
Field Exper Diversity Report	1	3	2	Every semester: 3 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	Wide range of opinions: "is this a report, not assessment tool?" to "provides valuable data"; "seems as though diversity element is difficult to control"
Course Eval	3	3	0	Every semester: 3 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 0	Two: "Measures professor, not course"; One comment: Excellent instrument.
	N=rated as a 3	N=rated as a 2	N= rated as a 1	N=Recommended Cycle for the	Comment Trend:

	(Effectively Measures)	(Somewhat Measures)	(Does not measure)	Assessment	
Curr. Review Cycle	0	3	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 1 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 2	This was not rated by 3 persons. Instrument needs more detail as to how to assess; can we make it “do- able”?
Instit 5 Yr Program Review (new programs)	2	3	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 2 I don't know: 3	Doesn't apply b/c we don't have new programs?
MA Exit Interviews	2	4	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 3 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 0	-can we make it focus more on program quality?
1 st /5 th Year Alum/Employer	4	2	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 2 Every 2 nd year: 1	Invaluable; effective measure. Three “no

Survey				Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 2 I don't know: 1	comments".
1 st Yr Teacher's Dinner Interview	2; 1=2.5score	3	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 4 Every 2 nd year: 0 Every 3 rd year: 1 Other cycle: 0 I don't know: 1	Looks at "unit needs"; vague questions; redundant with 1 st year survey?
Institutional Effectiveness Instruments	1	2	1	Every semester: 0 Every year: 0 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 3	No comments; or "I don't know's"
AIER reports	2	3	0	Every semester: 0 Every year: 1 Every 2 nd year: 1 Every 3 rd year: 0 Other cycle: 1 I don't know: 2	Is intended to measure program quality (program goals).