

Accuracy and Effectiveness Study of the UAS Instruments:

Phase II

Report to the Unit

¹ requires the systematic gathering, summarizing, and evaluation of data and using the data (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

² provides candidates with ongoing feedback (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

Phase II of the UAS Study

Action Plan and Report to Unit

January 14, 2008

I. Phase I Summary: Following the reporting of Phase I Study of the Effectiveness of our UAS system to the UG department at the April 4, 2007 departmental meeting, the following suggestions were made during the departmental processing of the data:

- A. Identify the UAS tools which fully meet the purposes of a UAS (see minutes of October 18, 2006 meeting with the document entitled *Criteria for the Assessment System: Excerpts from Standard 1 & 2 of NCATE*). These purposes were summarized in the minutes of April 4, 2007 as provision of data to improve candidate KSD, program (including curriculum, field experiences, professor quality) and unit.
- B. The faculty identified as “keepers”: Final Student teaching evaluation, SPA data/tools, Practicum Evaluation.
- C. Identify those UAS tools that may not be necessary to meet the purpose of an UAS.
- D. The department identified the following as “not necessary for the UAS, but maybe for other purposes”: Curriculum Review cycle (is a “process” not a tool), the 5 Year Review Cycle of New programs, and the AIER (an institutional reporting process).
- E. Identify those tools that need modified or revision in order to achieve their purpose(s) of assessment.
- F. The department identified the following as needing updating/modification: 1st/5th year alum/employer surveys, Interviews for Admission, Evaluation of Student Teaching Experience, Recommendation for Admission to TE.

II. Phase II: Stage 1

In December, 2007 the Chair/Director of Teacher Education and the Assessment Coordinator met and implemented the following proposals for further refinement of the UAS. The following tasks were accomplished:

- A. Review of the Fall 2008 revision of the NCATE standards (<http://www.ncate.org/documents/standards/SummaryMajorChangesUnitStd.pdf>), noting the following changes that will affect EMU’s unit:

¹ requires the systematic gathering, summarizing, and evaluation of data and using the data (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

² provides candidates with ongoing feedback (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

- a. Std 2: Added the expectation that faculty have access to candidate assessment data and/or data systems (Task Stream will assist us in this)
 - b. Std 1: Eliminated the “evidences of the conceptual framework” section
 - c. Overall: Eliminated division between candidate performance and unit capacity standards
- B. Follow-through on the unit’s recommendation to eliminate the following tools from the UAS, per the Phase I study: Curriculum Review Cycle, 5 Year Review Cycle of New programs, Evaluation of the ST experience, Evaluation of the CT/UCs, Field Experience Diversity Report, institutional assessments (data is not disaggregated by departments anyhow), and the institutional reporting process of the AIER. The majority of these instruments will continue to be used as “informational tracking instruments” by other parties but will not formally be used in the UAS.
- C. Follow-through on the unit’s recommendation from Phase I that the unit revisit the purposes of the UAS, as measuring candidate performance especially at “gates”, and monitoring/improving program/unit performance. To further the measurement of candidate performance, the following three motions are put before the unit:
 - a. For assessment instruments that have ratings (other than a yes/no or dichotomous format), the unit implement cut-off scores that should indicate a higher level of scrutiny by the TEAC in its decision-making. (Note: the unit does not want to allow a single voice or single instrument to dictate the status of an admissions decision, but criteria should be implemented to give some semblance of integrity to the admissions process in order to make “informed decisions”).
 - b. The SPA portfolio, for most teacher education candidates, will not be completed prior to the need to be admitted to Student Teaching; therefore, it is likely that this cannot be used as the “candidacy portfolio” as initially imagined by the unit. This means that the decision to admit a candidate to student teaching is based primarily on two instruments: grades and recommendation forms. To ensure that the fairness and lack of bias in admitting students to ST, as well as to ensure that some level of “skill” is measured, it is recommended that the SPA Assessment #3 (Unit of Planning) and at least one Profile of Performance from a practicum other than ED 101/2 are utilized in the Admission to ST process.
 - c. The remaining UAS instruments will be placed into a 2-sided chart of responsibilities (see proposed chart, attached as Appendix A).
 - d. A clear process for those UAS instruments not housed within courses (eg. the reflection papers in the Entry Portfolio) will be outlined, including the appointment of a person/role to hold a formal meeting to introduce these “non-housed” requirements.
 - e. The following tools will be revised (revision assignments TBA):
 1st/5th year evaluations (this would include UG and MA tools),
 Interview for Admission to TE, Admission to TE/ST Recommendation

¹ requires the systematic gathering, summarizing, and evaluation of data and using the data (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

² provides candidates with ongoing feedback (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

forms.

- f. The revision of the MA portions of the UAS will be conducted simultaneously and led by the MA Director

¹ requires the systematic gathering, summarizing, and evaluation of data and using the data (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .

² provides candidates with ongoing feedback (Retrieved from NCATE standards, April 7, 2009 from <http://www.ncate.org/public/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=4> .