ADDENDA

to the

“Unit Assessment System
of the
School of Education
Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne
Fort Wayne, Indiana
June 12, 2002”

for the

ADVANCED PROGRAMS:
  School Counseling
  Educational Leadership
  Elementary Education
  Secondary Education

August 2005
These Addenda to the 2002 UAS augment the “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS)” written by School Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Elementary and Secondary Education. The Addenda respond to the IPSB’s seven criteria with details about the administration of the UAS deemed inappropriate to include in the widely distributed above named Program Guides/UAS documents.

All hyperlinks are to the NCATE 2005 Focused Visit Institutional Report available on the School of Education’s website: [http://www.ipfw.edu/educ/accreditation/default.html](http://www.ipfw.edu/educ/accreditation/default.html).

In Spring 2005 the Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) became the Indiana Department of Education’s Division of Professional Standards (IDOE/DPS). That name change has not been included in this document, since the criteria, themselves, reference the IPSB.
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CRITERION 1: The UAS incorporates stakeholders’ involvement in its development and management. Minimally, stakeholders should include education faculty, content faculty, P-12 faculty and administrators, candidates in the program, and program alumni. [Information remains the same for A.-C. of the 2002 UAS.]

D. Additional Stakeholder Involvement in Advanced Programs

1. Stakeholders continue to be involved as stated in the 2002 UAS. Ms. Kay Wells of EACS, continues to work with the UAS Taskforce, which reviews UAS developments by the various programs as they occur. (See UAS Minutes 2003-2005.)

2. The Community Advisory Board has been included in discussions about the Advance Elementary and Secondary Program Review and UAS development. They have also participated in discussions regarding the Educational Leadership UAS and new Cohort Option. (See Advisory Board Minutes.)

3. The Educational Leadership Program initiated a Portfolio Day at which the newly revised format for Educational Leadership portfolios was tested. Stakeholders from the area schools—Principals, Assistant Principals, and Central Office Administrators—participated in evaluating portfolios and in discussion of the portfolio assignment as part of the UAS, as well as the challenges of assessing consistently. A Portfolio Day will be held each semester. (See Portfolio Day invitation.)

4. The Educational Leadership Program and the Elementary and Secondary Programs each asked two stakeholders for feedback on and analysis of the respective UAS plans. Educational Leadership invited Dr. Jeff Abbott, EACS Retired Superintendent, and Dr. Douglas Coutts, FWCS Assistant Superintendent. Elementary and Secondary Education invited Dr. Ann Askren, FSCS Curriculum Administrator, and Ms. Connie Murphy, FWCS Retired Elementary School Principal. All invitees have also taught graduate courses as adjuncts for the SOE. Their reports were reviewed by the UAS Taskforce; reports of Abbott and Murphy are included as evidence of “Faculty and Stakeholder Work” in the NCATE 2005 Focused Visit Institutional Report.

5. School Counseling has created an Advisory Board, consisting of their adjunct faculty, to review the UAS DMS reports with the Counseling faculty every year.

6. Graduates who work as teachers and administrators were surveyed for their views about how the Advanced Programs in Elementary and Secondary Education should be revised. This was done as part of the Program Review in 2003-2004. We sequenced the Programs and built a new UAS on those revised Programs. (See Stakeholder Survey for Elementary/Secondary Program Review.)

7. To get feedback on the UAS of the various programs from all faculty in the SOE, at three successive Faculty Meetings in the spring of 2005, program faculty presented the UAS for their program in its entirety. In February School Counseling faculty presented their UAS; in March Elementary and Secondary Education presented; in April Educational
Leadership presented. The “Program Guide & UAS” for each of the programs was distributed to all faculty members ahead of time. (See Faculty Meeting Minutes.)

8. The Graduate Survey Questionnaire, that is sent to the graduates of all Advanced Programs is being revised in a form to make it more user-friendly and tie it explicitly to the Conceptual Framework and program standards. (See Post Graduate Survey.)

9. A post-graduate Employer Survey was created by School Counseling and emailed for the first time this Fall 2005.

10. The Dean participated in many Program Review meetings for the Elementary and Secondary Programs. He also participated in the initial meetings to revise the Educational Leadership Program and establish a Cohort Option. (See Program Review Minutes.)
CRITERION 2: The UAS includes evidence that the conceptual framework(s) for the unit’s programs incorporates (incorporate) all Indiana Professional Standards Board (IPSB) standards. IPSB standards include the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) principles and the IPSB content and development standards for each licensure area. [Information remains the same in A.-C. as in the 2002 UAS.]

D. Additional descriptions for the Advanced Programs.

1. Matrices have been developed for all programs to show course alignment with the Conceptual Framework and program-appropriate standards, e.g., IPSB, NBPTS, etc. (See Matrices.)

2. The various standards are assessed throughout the Advanced Programs. The portfolio, in each program, shows the culmination of these assessments. The “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS)” for each program is shared with all faculty and candidates on the SOE website and in booklet format. These Guides will continue to be made available each semester. These Guides list the points of assessment and the standards being used as criteria for assessment. (See School Counseling, Educational Leadership, and Elementary and Secondary Education.)

3. Syllabi in all programs include the Vision Statement of the program, the SOE Mission Statement, the Conceptual Framework, and appropriate IPSB professional standards. Course objectives are aligned with the Conceptual Framework and other program specific standards. (See syllabi.)

4. In the Educational Leadership portfolio three of the four main sections use the IPSB Standards as their criteria. One of those sections includes reflections on artifacts taken from previous coursework. The final section is a reflection on the whole process using the Conceptual Framework. (See Educational Leadership.)

5. Courses in the Advanced Elementary and Secondary Programs require two artifacts and two reflections in each course in the program, except the first and last. The first course-related artifact and reflection is measured on growth in the six areas of the Conceptual Framework. The second educational-setting related artifact and reflection is measured against the 5-Core NBPTS. Thus, growth against these standards is evaluated throughout the program. All of these artifacts and reflections are reflected upon as a group at portfolio checkpoints. (See Elementary and Secondary Education.)

6. As part of the application process, applicants for Educational Leadership and Elementary and Secondary Education write, respectively, a Goal Statement and a Position Statement, based on the Conceptual Framework. (See Applications for both programs and examples Application Essays.)
CRITERION 3: The UAS provides a coherent, sequential, assessment system for individual candidates that includes performance assessments. Performance standards are shared with candidates. The UAS utilizes for both formative and summative purposes, a range of performance-based assessment strategies throughout the program. The UAS has multiple decision points. [Information in A.-L remains the same as in 2002 UAS.]

M. Additional delineations and evidence for the Advanced Programs.

1. The “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS)” for all four programs—Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Educational Leadership, and School Counseling—delineate the multiple points of assessment, standards on which the assessments are based, and points in the programs at which summative decisions are made. Forms and rubrics for formative and summative assessments are included in the “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS).” (See School Counseling, Educational Leadership, Elementary and Secondary Education.)

2. Candidates and faculty are informed on all standards used in the program and how and when they will be assessed through the distribution of the “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS),” which is also available on the SOE website. Syllabi include all appropriate program standards and they are aligned with course objectives. (See syllabi.)

3. Candidates are given feedback throughout their coursework and at summative assessment points. The quantitative data is entered in the DMS at the end of each semester. At summative assessment points, multiple assessments are aggregated to make a decision about the candidate’s progress in the program. For School Counseling, the candidate can not proceed if the Annual Review results in failure. For Educational Leadership, the first Portfolio Checkpoint must be passed to receive licensure. A candidate who falls in the “Needs Major Improvement” category receives an “Incomplete” for the Checkpoint. It remains so until the portfolio has been resubmitted and reassessed as satisfactory. In Elementary and Secondary, candidates who do not pass the first Checkpoint must resubmit until they do pass.

4. We are in an ongoing process of studying and improving the consistency and fairness of our raters.
CRITERION 4: The UAS uses the collective presentation of candidate assessments and related data to document the quality of programs to prepare candidates to meet the IPSB standards. [Information in A.-E. remains the same as in the 2002 UAS.]

F. Additional information for the Advanced Programs.

1. The Educational Leadership program provides a delineation each semester of the number of candidates who passed the portfolio, and those who didn’t and need to resubmit. (See EL_PSbE_Report and EL_PSbS_Report.)

2. School Counseling provides end of year data of candidate scores on the Comprehensive Exam. (See SC_CE_Report.)

3. The Elementary and Secondary Programs provide reports on candidates who participate in the Portfolio Checkpoints. Since the process has just been initiated the number of candidates involved is small, but growing. The current checkpoints are “scaled-back” at this point, but will be expanded as the official number of candidates grows.

4. At the yearly Faculty Retreat, held the week before classes begin Fall Semester, faculty review aggregated data and reports by the Data Manager for the previous academic year (Fall, Spring, Summer), narrative reports on aspects of the assessment process, and checkpoint data analysis. Each program discusses the data and provides a report for the UAS Taskforce. (See Faculty Retreat Reports.)

5. The UAS Taskforce responds to the reports that impact the UAS itself. The UAS Taskforce delegates programmatic changes to the appropriate program. Programmatic changes are forwarded by program faculty to the Academic Affairs Committee, which acts on them and makes recommendations to the faculty for action.
CRITERION 5: The UAS uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine and revise the conceptual framework and programs.

[Information remains the same for A.-C. as in the 2002 UAS.]

D. Additional information for the Advanced Programs.

1. The data from candidate assessments are systematically reviewed during course work and at summative checkpoints as described the respective “Program Guide & Unit Assessment System (UAS)” for each program. The data collected is stored in the DMS and reports are generated each semester. Narrative Reports are written yearly by faculty on selected data for targeted assessments. Reports and aggregated data are reviewed by faculty at the Faculty Retreat held before Fall semester begins each year in August. The Reports generated at the meeting are taken to the UAS Taskforce to act upon or forward to the appropriate department or Standing Committee to act upon. Information regarding program or curricular change would be forwarded to departments in which the program resides. The UAS Taskforce would oversee changes in the Conceptual Framework. All faculty would have the opportunity to be involved in the process.

2. From 2003-2005 most changes in programs, courses, and fieldwork were a result of Program Review (for Advanced Elementary and Secondary), program revisions (for Educational Leadership and School Counseling), UAS revision (for all programs), responses to the NCATE BOT Report of 2003, or the NCATE Accreditation Action Report of 2003. With a new DMS for the Advanced Programs now firmly in place, the faculty will review reports on the aggregated data as well as other yearly reports, at the fall Faculty Retreat.
CRITERION 6: The unit ensures that its assessment system is continually managed.

[Information remains the same for A.-F. as in the s002 UAS.]

G. Additional information about review and revision of the Advanced Programs’ UAS.

1. A Data Manager (a part-time Graduate Professional) was hired in August 2004 for a two-year term, 2004-2006. His responsibilities have been and continue to be the building and managing of our DMS. His tasks in 2004-2005 have been to build out the DMS for the Advanced Programs and continue to manage and update the DMS already in place for the Initial Programs.

2. As the data management needs grow, the SOE is considering revising the Data Manager’s position to become part of a faculty line in Educational Technology. Other possibilities are also being considered.

3. An e-portfolio system is in the process of development beginning Fall 2005 to help manage data.

4. The Associate Dean, working with the UAS Taskforce and the Dean, monitors, reviews, and oversees recommendations and revisions of the Conceptual Framework, programs, and curricula. Faculty reviews all assessment data. The UAS Taskforce acts on their recommendations, referring program changes to appropriate departments, who, then, forward recommendations to the Academic Affairs Committee. Recommendations from Academic Affairs go to the full faculty for approval. The process was begun at the Faculty Retreat, August 18, 2005.

5. Increasing demands for technology to manage our UAS will involve ever-changing responses in the division of labor at the school level. The UAS Taskforce will be overseeing these changes as they become necessary.

6. Surveys to post graduates are sent out to all graduates the semester after they graduate. In School Counseling, an additional post-graduate survey is sent out two years after graduation.
CRITERION 7: The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system. 
[Information remains the same for A.-D. as in the 2002 UAS.]

E. Additional information about the Advanced Programs’ plans.

1. The UAS Taskforce meets biweekly and reviews assessment issues as they arise throughout the year.

2. The UAS Taskforce and the Community Advisory Board assure stakeholder involvement. All faculty members are provided with the Advanced Program’s “Program Guide & Unit Assessment (UAS)” and candidates in the respective programs also receive a copy of the UAS for their program. These UAS plans are also available on the SOE website. Candidates also provide feedback on the assessment system to program faculty.

3. For the newly revised UAS plans in Educational Leadership and Elementary and Secondary Education, area administrators provided feedback on the plans in August 2005.

4. At the yearly Faculty Retreat, held the week before classes begin Fall semester, faculty review aggregated data and reports by the Data Manager for the previous academic year (Fall, Spring, Summer), narrative reports on aspects of the assessment process, and checkpoint data analysis. Each program discusses the data and provides a report for the UAS Taskforce. (See Faculty Retreat Reports.)

5. The UAS Taskforce responds to the reports that impact the UAS itself. The UAS Taskforce delegates programmatic changes to the appropriate program. Programmatic changes are forwarded by program faculty to the Academic Affairs Committee, which acts on them and makes recommendations to the faculty for action.

6. The Associate Dean writes an Annual Assessment Report for the University which is shared with the faculty. (See SOE Dean’s Annual Report 2003 and 2004.)