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Unit Assessment System Handbook

The educational preparation of children and youth is the subject of national and international discourse, of extensive research for the purpose of understanding its impact and practices, and of personal experience for most families. Dramatic changes in Indiana’s educational policies have redefined the state’s educational landscape by offering families increased options for where, when, how, and by whom their students are taught the lessons that are intended to serve them as they confront 21st century demands. Within this context, the IPFW educator preparation program (EPP) strives to retain effective practices in the training of teachers, counselors, and principals while remaining abreast of the ever-changing requirements of those professional endeavors. Based on the concept of the scholar-practitioner, IPFW’s approach values the ability to interact routinely with teachers, counselors, and principals whose insights and experiences augment faculty research so that students in educator preparation programs readily link what they are learning with the practices required of them in their professional responsibilities.

The IPFW Education Unit routinely examines its teaching, research, and service practices through comprehensive and integrated systems of community engagement and data analysis. This document, created through the joint efforts of the Office of the CEPP Dean and the Education Unit Assessment Team, establishes practices that provide information to be used in monitoring candidate performance and for managing and improving unit operations and programs for the preparation of professional educators.

Contents of this document will change periodically as warranted by the analysis of information related to program and unit performance. Feedback on included practices or documents should be shared with the Office of the CEPP Dean for inclusion at appropriate points in the Continuous Improvement Cycle.
I. History, Authority, Definition

History of CEPP

The College of Education and Public Policy (CEPP) represents the merger of two academic units at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW): the School of Education, with its two departments – Educational Studies and Professional Studies – and the Department of Public Policy, a singular division that was formerly a part of Indiana University’s system-wide School of Public and Environmental Affairs. Now housed in the CEPP, both units include faculty members who believe that they can engage effectively in promoting teaching, research, and service to the students of IPFW as well as to the citizens of the greater community.

Indiana University and Purdue University maintained separate, independent Departments of Education at IPFW when the campus was established in 1964. In 1976, these two departments were combined into one School of Education (SOE) with an Indiana University mission. On November 21, 1978, the faculty of IPFW’s School of Education developed and approved the School of Education Policy Handbook. The handbook included official policies and procedures for the School of Education and was subject to change and revision over time based upon faculty governance and approval of proposed changes by the faculty as a whole.

In a School of Education faculty meeting held on September 27, 2000, the faculty unanimously voted to approve the creation of two departments, the Department of Educational Studies and the Department of Professional Studies, within the SOE. In 2008, the governance document of the SOE was revised to reflect the responsibilities it had once had, which were now vested in the two departments. In that same year, faculty in each of the departments created their respective departmental governance documents.

The Division of Public and Environmental Affairs (DPEA) was established at IPFW in October, 1974, as part of the Indiana University system-wide School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA), and the Division’s first complete academic year was 1975-76. In 2008, the SPEA system dissolved, and a Memorandum of Understanding was forged between the School of Public and Environmental Affairs at Indiana University and IPFW. IPFW’s Division was granted affiliate status by the SPEA and continues to offer SPEA degrees to undergraduate and graduate students. With the creation of the College of Education and Public Policy (CEPP) at IPFW in 2010, the name of the DPEA officially changed to the Department of Public Policy.

In August, 2009, faculty members from the School of Education and the DPEA formed a working group to study the issue of whether or not a merger would be advantageous for both entities. The final report was shared with both units, and more discussion ensued between faculty members and those serving on the ad hoc Merger Committee. Final votes to approve the merger proposal were subsequently taken within the two units; the motion passed in the DPA unanimously and with overwhelming affirmation in the SOE. Following endorsement by the trustees of both Indiana University and Purdue University, the CEPP became an official entity in
October, 2010, including the Educational Studies, Professional Studies, and Public Policy departments.

Through the Educational Studies Department, IPFW offers bachelor’s degrees leading to licensure in:

- Early Childhood Education
- Elementary Education
- Secondary Education: Biology
- Secondary Education: Chemistry
- Secondary Education: Earth Space Science
- Secondary Education: English
- Secondary Education: French
- Secondary Education: German
- Secondary Education: Mathematics
- Secondary Education: Physics
- Secondary Education: Social Studies
- Secondary Education: Spanish
- Secondary Education: Middle Level
- All-Grade Education: Art
- All-Grade Education: Choral Music
- All-Grade Education: Instrumental Music

Through the Professional Studies Department, IPFW offers master’s degrees leading to licensure in:

- Couple and Family Counseling (formerly Marriage and Family Therapy)
- Educational Leadership
- School Counseling

Through the Professional Studies Department, IPFW offers graduate work leading to:

- Educational Leadership (Certification)
- Special Education (Minor)

Through the Public Policy Department, IPFW offers bachelor’s degrees in Public Affairs with majors in:

- Criminal Justice
- Environment Policy
- Health Services Administration
- Legal Studies
- Public Management

Through the Public Policy Department, IPFW offers master’s degrees in:

- Public Affairs
- Public Management

Through the Public Policy Department, IPFW offers certification in:

- Public Management
Authority of Educational Unit

The CEPP Policy Handbook states that programs and/or departments within the CEPP may affiliate for the purpose of acquiring or maintaining accreditation. Faculty members within an accreditation unit are responsible for addressing all accreditation requirements. The IPFW Educational Unit is accredited by National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

Definition of IPFW Educational Unit

The educational unit includes programs offered for the initial (ITP) and advanced (ADV) preparation of P-12 teachers and other school professionals at IPFW. The Educational Studies Department (ESD) offers ITP programs in Early Childhood Education (P-3), Elementary Education (K-6), Secondary Education (5-12), with certification in Mild Intervention. Secondary programs in earth and space science, social studies, and middle level education are housed in the ESD, while various departments in the College of Arts and Sciences (COAS) provide programs in life science, physics, chemistry, and mathematics. English education majors may enroll in either the CEPP or COAS. K-12 programs in World Languages (French, German, and Spanish) are housed in the Department of International Language and Culture Studies (COAS). The K-12 program in English as a New Language is housed in the English Department (COAS) and K-12 programs in Music and Visual Arts are each housed in their respective departments in the College of Visual and Performing Arts (VPA). With the exception of methods courses in VPA, all professional education courses are provided by the education unit, with some methods courses being taught by COAS faculty. Teacher certification is also available through content majors when accompanied by additional educator preparation courses.

The Professional Studies Department offers ADV programs (certification and/or M.S.) in Special Education (initial certification only), School Counseling, and Building Level School Leadership.

II. Foundation Statements

Conceptual Framework

The State of Indiana recognizes that educator preparation programs can take many forms as they lead to state licensure, with potential educators increasingly finding a variety of state-approved professional training opportunities available to them. In this regard, IPFW is distinguished from other educator preparation programs by the direction and implementation of its Conceptual Framework. Revised in 2010, the Conceptual Framework prepares program completers to meet the varied needs posed by a vast array of diverse students in a range of educational settings. Furthermore, it builds understanding of the importance of education, particularly public education, to the strengthening of communities in the region and beyond. Program completers often serve as the best recruiters for the IPFW educator preparation
programs as they provide testimony to the efficacy of IPFW’s programs through performance in the professional roles they fill.

Conceptual Framework

Transformative scholar-practitioners are broadly defined as leaders in education and public policy who weave between research and practice, and theory and experience, constantly working within communities to foster learning and a just, democratic society. Graduates of our programs use their strong foundational knowledge of content, methodologies, and exemplary practices as well as their habits of mind to critically reflect on those components. They advocate for public policies and practices that benefit the people they serve, their communities, and their professions while striving to build a more just, inclusive, democratic community, and to expand and strengthen public voice and identity.

Specifically, the departments strive to prepare future leaders who thoroughly understand, consciously apply, and intentionally use democracy and community, habits of mind, and advocacy in their professional endeavors. We define those concepts as:

Democracy and Community

Transformative scholar-practitioners need to be a part of a dynamic, diverse professional community. They actively explore what it means to live and participate in a diverse, just, and global world. They use that knowledge to inform effective practice which demonstrates their respect for and valuing of our multicultural, multilingual, and multi-abled society. Through this they work towards developing communities that are more cognizant of and compassionate toward democratic encounters over moral, cultural,
social, political and economic differences. Consequently, the departments support transformative scholar-practitioners who strive for and create democratic, just, inclusive communities.

Habits of Mind

Transformative scholar-practitioners develop more powerful cognition and action through their strong knowledge of content, methodologies, and exemplary practices. However, they realize that such knowledge alone is not sufficient. They practice critical thinking and reflection as they explore the reciprocal relationship between scholarship and practice. Within the context of a compassionate, caring community, transformative scholar-practitioners foster habits of minds such as investigating, inquiring, challenging, critiquing, questioning, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating. They view such habits of mind as necessary for engaging students, clients, community members, and the public in the process of teaching and learning. Consequently, the departments foster transformative scholar-practitioners who integrate critical habits of the mind in all aspects of their professional work.

Advocacy

Transformative scholar-practitioners develop and support the rights of students, clients, and community members as they advocate for the people they serve and the profession. They cultivate professional, public visions informed by historical and cultural perspectives. They strive to set the highest goals for themselves and the profession while inspiring their colleagues to do likewise. Transformative scholar-practitioners resolve professional and ethical challenges through the convergence of knowledge, theory, and practice. Consequently, the departments facilitate transformative scholar-practitioners’ development as professional and community advocates.

Vision Statement

The vision of CEPP’s members is to promote the common good in the dynamic arenas of education and public policy.

Education Unit Mission Statement

To prepare professionals in teaching, counseling, and leadership who demonstrate the capacity and willingness to continuously improve schools and related entities so that they become more effective with their clients by:

1) Becoming more caring, humane, and functional citizens in a global, multicultural, democratic society;
2) Improving the human condition by creating positive learning environments;
3) Becoming change agents by demonstrating reflective professional practice;
4) Solving client problems through clear, creative analysis;
5) Assessing client performance, creating and executing effective teaching, counseling and educational leadership, by utilizing a variety of methodologies reflecting current related research; and
6) Utilizing interdisciplinary scholarship, demonstrating technological and critical literacies, and effective communicating with all stakeholders.

Standards

Each program is based on standards for educators identified by the State of Indiana. Furthermore, programs identify Specialized Professional Associations (SPAs) that are aligned to desired program outcomes, using the SPA standards as the basis for guiding and measuring candidate performance and program effectiveness.

Expectations for Continuous Improvement

The IPFW Educational Unit is committed to continuous improvement throughout the academic year, and year after year. The unit assessment process is maintained through the Office of the CEPP Dean and includes full participation of faculty and unit staff in collecting, analyzing, and sharing data with community-based professional representatives for the purpose of educating program completers to become highly effective professionals in their fields.

Faculty members and unit staff within each accreditation unit are responsible for addressing all accreditation requirements as they: 1) administer assessments as they are designed to be used; 2) complete assessment evaluation and posting of scores within the prescribed grading period each semester; and 3) participate in processes that build assessment effectiveness in improving student outcomes.
III. Unit Assessment System

The Unit Assessment System (UAS) is designed to use multiple standards-based common assessments within multiple decision points to collect data from internal and external sources for use in regular analysis and for program improvement. Its cohesion is represented in the following diagram.

**IPFW Education Unit Assessment System**
Content

Based upon NCATE’s accreditation standards, the Unit Assessment System includes a set of evaluation measures that provide information for use in monitoring candidate performance, managing unit operations and programs that prepare professional educators, and continuously improving efforts to strengthen program outcomes. More than a series of isolated practices, the assessment system serves to unite the directions of unit programs and establish criteria for measuring their fulfillment.

The Unit Assessment System originates in the expectations held for the programs individually and collectively. The visions and missions of IPFW and the IPFW Education Unit, along with Indiana Educator Standards and SPA standards, are represented in the Conceptual Framework’s broad but powerful statements. Program faculty members identify candidate performance standards critical to each transition point in the program. Key Assessments designed to monitor student proficiency on those standards and to provide data that enables continuous program review are required in designated courses throughout the program. Key Assessments are scored based on a three-point rubric (Target, Acceptable, and Unacceptable) and housed in Taskstream. Supplemental assessments gather information needed by program faculty in order to provide additional information regarding program impact.

Program assessments based upon Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards are used routinely to monitor candidate learning according to four unit-wide transition points. Program-specific details related to each transition point can be found in respective program guides.

- **Transition Point 1: Admission to Program**

Admission criteria for all programs reflect general university requirements but can be supplemented with additional criteria that are essential to meeting the desired professional outcomes. Unit criteria currently include: 1) a designated grade point average for completed courses or a degree program; 2) an admission examination (e.g., state examination); 3) professional letters of recommendation; 4) written statements of purpose for applying; 5) an interview; or 6) completed courses or a degree. Programs are expected to monitor fulfillment of admission criteria and to provide data that can be used in assessing unit operations and impact.

- **Transition Point 2: Pre-Clinical Preparation**

Between admission to the program and clinical practice (i.e., student teaching, internship, practicum as an extensive and intensive culminating activity), program courses develop candidate proficiency in many areas. Key Assessments based on local, state, and/or SPA standards measure candidate proficiency in content knowledge, planning and implementation of professional services, impact on P-12 student learning, and professional knowledge and skills. Programs are expected to design and improve their Key Assessments and to implement them as designed, recording evidence of candidate proficiency, primarily through Taskstream and Qualtrics.
• **Transition Point 3 – Clinical Experience**

Following sufficient academic and field experience as defined by each program, candidates complete an extensive and intensive assignment comparable to the role for which they are preparing as a professional educator. Programs are expected to maintain working partnerships with schools, school districts, and other community-based resources where high quality clinical practice can be experienced. Throughout the clinical experience, the unit and programs provide oversight of and support for candidates while recording candidate proficiency through standards-based tools housed in Taskstream or Qualtrics. Candidate proficiency data includes but is not limited to content knowledge, planning and implementation of professional services, impact on P-12 student learning, professional knowledge and skills, and demonstration of the Conceptual Framework in practice.

• **Transition Point 4 – Post-Program**

Within six months of completion, program completers are surveyed regarding their IPFW experiences with academic advising, course focus and delivery, faculty scholarship and instructional practice, overall benefit of the program, and the Conceptual Framework. Within three to five years, employers of program completers are surveyed regarding program completers’ proficiency in the fields for which they were trained and with regard to the Conceptual Framework. Both electronic surveys are administered annually. Data on state licensure examinations are collected as evidence of professional proficiency. Survey results are aggregated by unit and disaggregated by program.

As illustrated, in addition to program data collected, unit operations data are also collected to determine relationship of unit operations to program outcomes and to modify unit operation performance in service of improved outcomes. Unit assessments by Transition Points include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Point</th>
<th>Unit Measure</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;Admission to Program</td>
<td>Admission GPA</td>
<td>University Cognos report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Admissions</td>
<td>University Cognos report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 2</strong>&lt;br&gt;Pre-Clinical Preparation</td>
<td>Candidate Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Planning/Implementation</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Impact on Student Learning</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Prof Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 3</strong>&lt;br&gt;Clinical Experience</td>
<td>Candidate Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Planning/Implementation</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Impact on Student Learning</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Prof Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Key Assessments - all Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 4</strong>&lt;br&gt;Post-Program</td>
<td>Candidate Content and Prof Knowledge</td>
<td>State Licensing Examinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Candidate Prof Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Employer and Program Completer Surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UG Program Completion 4 years</td>
<td>University Cognos Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IPFW Education Unit Program TRANSITION POINTS Aligned with Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Point</th>
<th>Admission to Program</th>
<th>EARLY CHILD ED</th>
<th>ELEM TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SECOND TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED</th>
<th>SCHOOL COUNSELING</th>
<th>ED LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition Point 1</strong></td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Exam</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of Recommend</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of Purpose</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Courses/ Degree</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Point 2</th>
<th>Pre-Clinical Preparation</th>
<th>EARLY CHILD ED</th>
<th>ELEM TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SECOND TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SPECIAL ED</th>
<th>SCHOOL COUNSELING</th>
<th>ED LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content Knowledge</strong></td>
<td>GPA Required Courses E327 Family Project* P450 Eco-Map Case Study</td>
<td>GPA Required Courses</td>
<td>GPA Required Courses</td>
<td>GPA Required Courses K370/K525 Research Paper</td>
<td>GPA P514 Life Span Project</td>
<td>GPA 15 cr hours in program J500 Curriculum Management Audit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Implementation</strong></td>
<td>E352 Experience Plan</td>
<td>E325, E328, E343, 370, E371 Lesson Plan</td>
<td>EDUC M44X/SS04 Unit Plan</td>
<td>K371/K535 Assessment Study</td>
<td>G542 Peer Program G580 Case Studies</td>
<td>A638 Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact on Student Learning</strong></td>
<td>M470 Use of Data Project</td>
<td>E325, E328, E343, 370, E371 Lesson Plan Analysis</td>
<td>EDUC X401 Literacy Plan</td>
<td>K352/K536 Lesson Plan Rubric</td>
<td>G542 Program Dev &amp; Eval Project G505 Assessment Project</td>
<td>A515 Instructional Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Knowledge and Skills</strong></td>
<td>E349 I/T Document Project* F400 Soc/Em/Behav Study</td>
<td>F300 Diversity in Lit P375 Family Involvement</td>
<td>EDUC P253 Multicultural Rsrch</td>
<td>K352/K536 IEP Project K465/K565 Collaboration Project</td>
<td>G504 Case Study</td>
<td>A510 Communications Plan A630 Budget Analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition Point 3</td>
<td>Transition Point 4 Post Program</td>
<td>EARLY CHILD ED</td>
<td>ELEM TEACHER ED</td>
<td>SECOND TEACHER ED</td>
<td>SPECIAL ED</td>
<td>SCHOOL COUNSELING</td>
<td>ED LEADERSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>GPA M426 Coop Teacher Obs</td>
<td>GPA M425 Coop Teacher Obs M425 Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>GPA M480 Coop Teacher Obs</td>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>GPA G575 Case Study</td>
<td>GPA A695 St 2 Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Implementation</td>
<td>M426 Coop Teacher Obs M426 Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>M425 Coop Teacher Obs M425 Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>M480 Coop Teacher Obs M480 Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>M470/K595 Coop Teacher Obs M470/K595 Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>G532 Group Proposal</td>
<td>A695 St 1, 4 Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Student Learning</td>
<td>M426 Use of Data Project</td>
<td>M425 Use of Data Project</td>
<td>M480 Use of Data Project</td>
<td>M470/K595</td>
<td>G550/G551 Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>A720 Action Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>M426 Analysis of Self Video</td>
<td>M425 Analysis of Self Video</td>
<td>M480 Analysis of Self Video</td>
<td>M470/K595 Coop Teacher Obs Univ Super Obs</td>
<td>G550/G551 Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>A695 St 3, 6 Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>M426 Coop Teacher Obs</td>
<td>M425 Coop Teacher Obs</td>
<td>M480 Coop Teacher Obs</td>
<td>M470/K595</td>
<td>G550/G551 Internship Evaluation</td>
<td>A695 St 5 Assignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transition Point 4</th>
<th>EARLY CHILD ED</th>
<th>ELEM TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SECOND TEACHER ED</th>
<th>SPEC ED</th>
<th>SCHOOL COUNSELING</th>
<th>ED LEADERSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content &amp; Professional Knowledge</td>
<td>IN State Licensing Exam (P-3) GPA</td>
<td>IN State Licensing Exam (K-6) GPA</td>
<td>IN State Licensing Exam (5-12) GPA</td>
<td>IN State Licensing Exam (Spec Ed) GPA</td>
<td>IN State Exam still in development GPA</td>
<td>IN State Licensing Exam (Bldg Leader) GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Knowledge and Skills</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This Key Assessment is associated with a pre-requisite course for Admission to the Program.
Construct

Designed as a cohesive, integrated, and ongoing system, the UAS is based on the belief that program and unit effectiveness rely upon having established and broadly known outcomes that can be measured both as candidates move through the various stages of their educational experiences and as they apply their training in professional settings. Community practitioners serve as essential partners as the programs and unit establish outcomes and the processes for monitoring the attainment of those outcomes.

The Unit Assessment System includes both tools for measuring candidate performance on standards and processes for faculty and stakeholders to use performance data to monitor and improve program effectiveness. To ensure the production of meaningful data, attention is given to the following:

**Fairness** - The curriculum for each program is intentionally mapped to national, state, and local program standards. As a result, all standards are adequately covered in an ongoing format that builds candidate understanding and proficiency. Course syllabi link standards to course objectives and course learning experiences, with candidate proficiency based on direct assessment of those standards. In each course with a Key Assessment, it is expected that all students will complete the Key Assessment as part of course requirements. To assure fairness, program and course expectations are published for access by all candidates in the program.

**Freedom from Bias** – Every effort must be made to ensure that all components of the Unit Assessment System are free of language, processes, or conditions that introduce sources of bias or adversely affect candidate performance. Students registered with the Disabilities Office may be approved for accommodations during the assessment process.

**Accuracy** - Instruments designed or adopted as Key Assessments are intended to measure candidate performance on standards. The format of each assignment and the descriptors on the rubric used to score that assignment measure what is stated as the purpose of the assessment. Accuracy is measured, in part, as candidate performance on standards/elements is measured in multiple ways and at multiple points during the program.

**Consistency** - As assessment tools become increasingly accurate, building consistency becomes increasingly important. Using techniques such as the creation or identification of exemplars, collaborative scoring, multi-rater scoring, or blind scoring, faculty and staff improve consistency for scoring candidate performance.

To build and maintain accuracy and consistency in the Unit Assessment System, faculty members are encouraged: 1) to research additional assessment tools and processes that have been shown to be of high quality; 2) to review their assessment tools on a continual basis in order to ensure that they are free of bias; and 3) to engage in efforts that build accuracy and consistency within assessment practices.

During early implementation of this revised Unit Assessment System, it is expected that program faculty and unit staff will work diligently to develop tools and practices that will produce information helpful in
making professional decisions related to unit and program effectiveness. In the first year of use, attention may be focused on determining the effectiveness of the assessment instruments themselves in representing the intended performance standards. However, each program and unit function should develop a plan for ensuring reliability of the assessment tools through group discussion, training, and collective practice.
Process for Monitoring Program Quality and Unit Operations

The Continuous Improvement Annual Cycle reflects the ongoing nature of assessment practices over the course of the calendar year. Each portion of the cycle includes the collection and analysis of data for the purpose of program and/or unit improvement, with results being shared with professional community representatives in discussions that consider possible changes to improve program completer performance in their professional roles.
Program Meetings and Unit Operations Meetings

In established meeting schedules, program faculty and unit staff analyze data from each of the transition points in search of patterns of student performance that need attention. From Key Assessment reports, surveys, and additional information analyzed in After Action Reviews (AARs), program faculty and unit staff formulate action plans designed to enhance programs and unit operational effectiveness. Semester reports that include action plans guide new actions and discussions with other university faculty whose courses contribute to program completion. Through a series of meetings with the following groups, action plans are shared and revised as needed based upon stakeholder input.

Assessment Team

The Assessment Team (AT) (composed of the Dean, Associate Dean, department chairs, program directors, and unit staff) monitors program outcomes based on data so that unit resources and operations can be redesigned, realigned, or reallocated to improve program results.

Teacher Education Council

The Teacher Education Council (TEC) (composed of unit faculty and other IPFW faculty) meets at least once per semester to provide coordination of unit program content so that program graduates meet all standards-based requirements.

Unit Advisory Council

The Unit Advisory Council (UAC) (composed of representatives of the unit faculty and community education practitioners) meets at least three times per year to promote a mutually beneficial exchange of information and to support between the unit and P-12 educators so that unit graduates are equipped to be effective in their professions.

As needed, additional task forces including community-based educational practitioners are convened to accomplish specified purposes.

Data are housed in Taskstream and Qualtrics to enable disaggregated program analysis and aggregated multi-program or unit analysis.

Unit Operations

Admissions – Admission criteria to all programs within the unit reflect general university requirements but can be supplemented with additional criteria deemed to be essential to meeting desired professional outcomes for the programs. Programs are expected to monitor fulfillment of admission criteria and to provide data that can be used in assessing unit operations and impact. Admissions data include average GPA upon admission and enrollment numbers.

Advising – All candidates are provided: 1) academic advising services to coordinate course completion; 2) professional mentoring services that orient candidates to the professional
conditions in which they will be working; and 3) licensing advising on rules and regulations regarding acquisition or continuation of state certification. Advising data include percentages of undergraduate students completing their programs in four years and survey responses from program completers (ITP and ADV) regarding the strengths of their training and satisfaction with unit services.

*Clinical Practice* – Programs maintain working relationships with schools, school districts, and community resources that can provide high quality clinical experiences for program candidates. Oversight of clinical experience is shared by university and site-based personnel, with candidate clinical performance evaluated based on program standards.

*Program Quality* – Program quality is characterized by program completers who are able to meet the expectations of their professions and whose training has been provided through effective use of university and community resources. Program Guides developed by each program provide information on their respective requirements and resources. Through distribution of accurate information aligned to university bulletins, all candidates have fair access to information essential to program fulfillment. Program quality is monitored through the UAS process for analyzing program data for continuous improvement, including examining all assessments for fairness, accuracy, consistency, and freedom from bias.

*Course Evaluation* – A process for collecting course evaluation data is outlined in governance documents. As part of the UAS, data on course schedules, academic content and delivery, and course evaluation procedures are collected through program completer surveys.

*Faculty Evaluation* – The faculty Annual Review process is outlined in governance documents. As part of the UAS, data on faculty scholarship, instruction, and interest in welfare and development of students are collected through program completer surveys.

**Evaluation of the UAS**

Three levels of UAS evaluation occur simultaneously as:

- programs routinely examine the quality of their assessment tools and practices, working diligently to ensure fairness, consistency, and freedom from bias so that data accurately reflect program quality,
- feedback from community-based education practitioners suggest changes to tools and/or practices in order to ensure that programs are aligned to intended outcomes;
- the Assessment Team uses both program and unit data to identify issues related to the UAS.

The Assessment Team is responsible for evaluating the UAS and recommending modifications as needed to provide meaningful information to measure program and unit outcomes.
Preparation for the next full accreditation visit and annual reporting required by NCATE assure that practices continue to comply with accreditation requirements.

IV. Accreditation

The Education Unit is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) following the Continuous Improvement option. Information on NCATE can be found at www.ncate.org
### Sample questions for conducting an effective AAR:

1. From the data, what did we learn about individual student performance?
2. From the data, what did we learn about how the curriculum impacts student performance?
3. From our data and experience, what did we learn about the assessment system?
4. Based on analysis of data and our experience, what changes need to be made to the curriculum? To the assessment system?
5. What has been the impact of changes made as a result of previous AAR decisions? Are further changes necessary?

AAR and semester reports are uploaded to Vibe for faculty access.