

Standard 2 criteria (2008)	Current Need to be Addressed: + <i>Strength</i> - <i>Weakness</i>	Improvement Element: Data Procedures Template	Improvement Element: Validity/Data Study (List the type of study to be conducted)	Improvement Element: Training of Faculty	Improvement Element: UAS alteration	Other:
2a.1 regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications	-Too many instruments/few personnel to do this.				Reduce # of instruments housed in UAS	
2a.2 Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and in practice after completion of programs.	-Some instruments give data that is not used for the decisions at the gates. (e.g. disposition scores; the multiple reflection papers)				Create method for using the data: include data as a weighted element in the gate decision; include data as a qualitative component of decision; or eliminate the data.	
2a.3 Data show a strong relationship of performance assessments to candidate success throughout their programs and later in classrooms or schools.	+correlation has been shown between ST final evals and 1 st yr. performance +PRAXIS scores are mandated by program reviews.		-Conduct correlation study between Disposition ratings and ST/1 st year teaching performance -Conduct correlation study between		-Consider eliminating the instruments that measure knowledge of Conceptual Framework (NCATE no longer requires measurement of knowledge	

Criteria numbers 2a, 2b, and 2c are taken from the NCATE Standard 2. Criteria numbers for 2d are derived from NCATE's Supporting Explanation of Standard 2 in the 2008 standards revisions (<http://www.ncate.org/boe/unitStandardsRubrics.asp?ch=113#stdn2>).

	+?State requires a minimum GPA. +DOSL directly measures impact on student learning. -need a correlation study between dispositions and ST and 1st year teaching performance -may need to do correlation study between Phil of Ed paper and later performance -do the reflection papers demonstrate performance or is this a weak tool?	scores on Phil of Ed entry paper and ST performance or alumni surveys -Conduct correlation study between scores on Reflection papers and ST performance or alumni surveys, if the unit predicts that there actually may be a correlation	of conceptual framework, but emphasizes impact on student learning and teaching skill- see 2d.1)
2a.4 conducts thorough studies to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit	-Accuracy may not be defensible if correlations		

operations.	have not been established or if instruments measure knowledge of conceptual framework rather than candidate performance -Fairness needs assessed for gate-level decisions when the decision rests on the instruments with cut-off scores, and not on all data required for admission (see			
2b.1 assessment system provides regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations, and candidate performance at each stage of its programs, extending into the first years of completers' practice.	-Data is available but not systematically reported/used	Create template for data reporter to submit regularly	Training needed on how to analyze, report, and use data	Adjust # or use of instruments in the Gate System, for which data is being collected but not used
2b.2 Assessment data from candidates, graduates, faculty,	-Gap: practicum data			Consider reducing # of

and other members of the professional community are based on multiple assessments from both internal and external sources that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs.	from prof community is not used in Early Gate System or in many SPAs -Program faculty (often 1-2) are primary evaluators at all points in system -Tools in gate system may not be based heavily enough on program review/course performance data (2d.3) -Lack of balance (2d.4; see also summary statement below, bullet #6)			writing assignments that are not directly related to lesson planning/tchg performance from Gate System and substituting practicum data or authentic performance assessments from SPAs for Gate System
2b.3 data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance,	-Data is available but not systematically reported/used	Create template for data reporter to submit regularly	Training needed on how to analyze, report, and use data	Adjust # or use of instruments in the Gate System, for which data is

program quality, and unit operations				being collected but not used
2b.4 has a system for effectively maintaining records of formal candidate complaints and their resolution	-Loose: broad EMU policy, and Grievance policy during ST but not during program			-Design Grievance Policy for “During Program”
2b.5 is developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system	+TaskStream +Jenzibar -Data collection for Gate decision-making			
2c.1 has fully developed evaluations and continuously searches for stronger relationships in the evaluations, revising both the underlying data systems and analytic techniques as necessary.	-Many instruments in Gate System do not have process for weighing/using the scores			-Develop cut-offs and weighting system -Design qualitative review -Consider having students present work
2c.2 not only makes changes based on the data, but also systematically studies the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences.				
2c.3 Candidates and faculty	-Action Plan	-Collect UC	-Train advisors	-Design formal

review data on their performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data.	System for students denied admission is informally designed -Faculty performance as UCs is not yet shared w/faculty	performance data and give frequency counts per semester on performance, as well as collect/share all qualitative data (stripped of identifiers)	of how to develop action plans systematically with students	system for working with students initially denied admission -Ensure system of denial/action plans has a way to prevent bias and to always offer opportunity for improvement -Faculty receive UC perf data, along with course data
---	---	---	---	---

2d.1 Final Summative Criteria of Std2 The unit's assessment system should examine the (1) alignment of instruction and curriculum with professional, state, and institutional standards; (2) efficacy of courses, field experiences, and programs, and (3) candidates' attainment of content knowledge and demonstration of teaching that leads to student learning or other work that	-Program Review Cycle does not formally require analysis of SPA data, ST data, or other gate system instruments -Gate system may require more wrtg than			-Design program review guidelines to require analysis/use of this data
--	--	--	--	--

supports student learning.	necessary and too little emphasis on performance data	
2d.2What the UAS measures: should include the assessment of candidates' content knowledge, pedagogical and/or professional knowledge and skills, professional dispositions, and their effects on student learning	-Tools in gate system may not be based heavily enough on program review/course performance data	
2d.3Basis of the UAS: assessment system should be based on the assessments and scoring guides that are the foundation for NCATE's program review process	-Tools in gate system may not be based heavily enough on program review/course performance data	
2d.4Data Sources must be balanced: unit assessments and evaluations must consider how to provide and use information constructively from various sources—the unit, field experiences, clinical sites, general education courses, content courses, faculty, candidates, graduates, and employers.	-Data from Gen Ed/Content Area courses is not included formally in Gate System, except in form of overall GPA (performance assessment is not included)	-Consider student selection of performance assessment from GenEd/Content area as “artifact w/written rationale” as Gate System tool

					-Use SPA assessment #3 in Adm to ST -Use practicum eval in Adm to ST
2d.5 Avoidance of Bias in Decision-Making (higher level of scrutiny in 2008 Stds): Fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias in the assessment system must be considered, especially when the assessments are used to determine whether candidates continue in or complete programs. Attention must be paid to the potential adverse impact of the assessments on a diverse pool of teacher candidates.	-Jan 08 UAS report from Dept notes that a number of tools are collected but not used in Gate System (Phil of Ed, numerous reflections, dispositional scores, Tech Stds, Caregiver Comm, etc.) so decision is based on GPA and test scores rather than on performance in teaching	-Develop the decision- making system for TEAC: is the decision based solely on scores or is it a mixed methods approach	-Create scoring system with weighting to determine how to use the instruments in Gate System that are not currently used	-Train TEAC members	-Reduce # instruments in Gate System
2d.6 System for Analyzing Data; Assessment systems include plans and timelines for data collection and analysis	Timeline exists but has been unmanageable; too many tools, even with the F07 cuts in # of tools				

Figure 1

Assessment systems include plans and timelines for data collection and analysis related to candidates and unit operations. Assessment systems usually have the following features:

- Unit faculty collaborate with members of the professional community to implement and evaluate the system.
- Professional, state, and institutional standards are key reference points for candidate assessments.
- The unit embeds assessments in programs, conducts them on a continuing basis for both formative and summative purposes, and provides candidates with ongoing feedback.
- The unit uses multiple indicators (e.g., 3.0 GPA, mastery of basic skills, general education knowledge, content mastery, and life and work experiences) to identify candidates with potential to become successful teachers or assume other professional roles in schools at the point of entry into programs (as a freshman, junior, or postbaccalaureate candidate).
- The unit has multiple decision points, (e.g., at entry, prior to clinical practice, and at program completion).
- The unit administers multiple assessments in a variety of forms and aligns them with candidate proficiencies. These may come from end-of-course evaluations, written essays, or topical papers, as well as from tasks used for instructional purposes (such as projects, journals, observations by faculty, comments by cooperating teachers, or videotapes) and from activities associated with teaching (such as lesson planning, identifying student readiness for instruction, creating appropriate assessments, reflecting on results of instruction with students, or communicating with parents, families, and school communities).
- The unit uses information available from external sources such as state licensing exams, evaluations during an induction or mentoring year, employer reports, follow-up studies, and state program reviews.
- The unit has procedures to ensure credibility of assessments: fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias.
- The unit establishes scoring guides, which may be rubrics, for determining levels of candidate accomplishment and completion of their programs.
- The unit uses results from candidate assessments to evaluate and make improvements in the unit, and its programs, courses, teaching, and field and clinical experiences.

In the evaluation of unit operations and programs, the unit collects, analyzes, and uses a broad array of information and data from course evaluations and evaluations of clinical practice, faculty, admissions process, advising system, school partnerships, program quality, unit governance, etc.