The Indiana University Purdue University School of Education has developed a comprehensive program that meets the requirements and intent of the rules established by the Indiana Professional Standards Board. After a succession of Deans in the past, the School of Education became focused in August 2000 in developing a functional Unit Assessment System (UAS) Plan that successfully implements the seven criteria established by the Standards Board.

The Dean of the School of Education appointed a UAS Task Force chaired by the Associate Dean. Members of the Task Force include Department Chairs, faculty members, the Director of Licensing and Advising, and the Director of Secondary Curriculum of the East Allen County School Corporation. In addition, a Data Manager and Education Specialist have been added to the Task Force. This Task Force meets weekly and, thus far, has met 56 times since August 2000.

The efforts of the Task Force are reflected in the UAS Plan submitted. The School of Education has successfully made the transition from the licensing patterns governed by Rules 46-47 to the new licensing system described by the UAS. Two highlights of the School of Education UAS Plan include a new course (F300) which provides a comprehensive introduction to the profession of teaching and the new performance-based standards, as well as our emphasis on the use of portfolio development as one of the multiple assessment measures.

The UAS Plan as submitted reflects the sincere effort on the part of the School of Education to comply with all requirements of the Indiana Professional Standards Board. The School of Education is committed to the continued application and improvement of the UAS Plan.
UNIT ASSESSMENT SYSTEM PLAN

Outline and Criteria for UAS

School of Education, Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne

The following report shows the progress the School of Education at Indiana University-Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) has made in DEVELOPING a Unit Assessment System (UAS). The following rubric was applied to each item listed in the criteria Outline for a UAS Plan:

RUBRICS:
- Fully implemented;
- Partially implemented;
- Not currently implemented, planned;
- Not currently implemented, projected at a future point in time; and
- No evidence.

Record of all developments can be found in the minutes of the UAS Task Force Committee on file in the Associate Dean’s office.

CRITERION 1: The UAS incorporates stakeholder’s 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.

A. Names of stakeholders and their affiliations

1. All stakeholders included in undergraduate & graduate programs
2. Representative school districts and their constituents:
   a. East Allen County Schools (EACS)
   b. Fort Wayne Community Schools (FWCS)
   c. MSD Southwest Allen County
   d. Northwest Allen County Schools

3. The Dean’s Community Advisory Board reviews the UAS Plan. Members of this Board represent the following organizations:
   a. Allen County Local Education Fund
   b. Allen County Superior Court
   c. Asset and Estate Management, Inc.
   d. Canterbury School (private)
   e. Catholic Schools of Fort Wayne
   f. East Allen County Schools
   g. Fort Wayne Community Schools
   h. Fort Wayne Lutheran Schools
   i. Mental Health Association
   j. Northwest Allen County Schools
   k. Region 8 Education Service Center
   l. SCAN, Inc. (Stop Child Abuse and Neglect)
   m. MSD Southwest Allen County
   n. Three Rivers Literacy Alliance
   o. Wood Youth Center
   p. YWCA Domestic Violence Service
   q. Fort Wayne Museum of Art
4. Current categories include:
   a. School corporation representatives in Allen County & Northeast Indiana
   b. Undergraduate and graduate students
   c. Stakeholders include:
      School of Education (SOE) faculty, visiting, and adjunct/associate faculty
      School of Arts and Sciences (A&S) faculty (content area):
      J. Clausen (foreign language)
      C. Ericson (social studies)
      A. Friedel (science)
      J. Hersberger (mathematics)
      M. Nusbaumer (social studies)
      Y. Ramsey (English)
      B. Resch (music)
      P-12 faculty and Administrators from Allen County & NE Indiana area
      administrators:
      § Ms. Kay Wells, Director of Secondary Education, EACS, is a participating
      member of the IPFW SOE Unit Assessment Task Force, which meets on a
      weekly basis.
      § EACS teachers and administrators are partnering with the IPFW SOE in a
      mentoring program for teacher candidates and will assist in the assessment
      of candidate portfolios.
      § Candidates in the program from Educational Administration and Counselor
      Education
      § Current undergraduate & graduate students
      § IPFW Program alumni
      § Dean's Community Advisory Council

   ❖ Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented

B. The structure of stakeholders' involvement

1. There are a number of advisory committees and councils that exist in the SOE; their
   structure is spelled out in the SOE Policy Handbook.¹
   a. Teacher Education Council
   b. Dean's Undergraduate Student Advisory Council
   c. Dean's Community Advisory Council

2. IPFW Community Advisory Council (J. Clausen, representative)

3. SOE Dean participates as a member of the FWCS Superintendent's Cabinet, which meets
   weekly

4. Allen County superintendents meet regularly with IPFW Chancellor, SOE Dean and/or
   SOE faculty representative

5. Student representatives on SOE standing committees

6. SOE faculty participate on regional or local advisory boards, such as: Region 8 Advisory
   Committee (J. R. Cochren); Region 8 Beginning Teacher Induction Performance
   Assessment Portfolio (BTIPAP) Local Advisory Group (P. Agness); Fort Wayne Junior
   Achievement Curriculum Advisory Board (G. Hickey).

7. The SOE Curriculum Laboratory hosts numerous technology-related outreach activities and
   programs for teachers, school-age children, and parents (J. Jordan). Technology is infused
   into all of the education courses. Specific course examples are E325 - Internet research,
   E328 - Software integration and WEB page creation, E339 and E340 - Desktop
   publishing and presentations on software, Q400 - Using science probes and Internet
   research, P250 - Using computer simulations and integrating the Internet into projects,
   P253 and Q254 - developing WEB pages and using sophisticated software presentations,
   and X401 - Teacher utility. Also, a Computer Camp for K-6 teachers is team-taught with
the IPFW faculty and the FWCS’ Washington Center Magnet School.

8. SOE Counseling Clinic serves school-age children and their families. Clients are
   recommended to the clinic by K-12 teachers, who are also stakeholders (W. Utesch).

9. Representatives from subject matter areas are invited to and attend the Unit Assessment
   Task Force meetings on a monthly basis.

10. Ms. Kay Wells, Director of Secondary Education, EACS, is a participating member of the
    IPFW SOE UAS Task Force, which meets on a weekly basis. EACS teachers and
    administrators are actively partnering with the IPFW SOE in a mentoring program for our
    pre-service teacher candidates and assist, along with SOE faculty, in the assessment of
    teacher candidate portfolios.

* Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.

C. A description of stakeholders’ continued involvement in monitoring and modifying the UAS Plan

1. The SOE has established an ongoing involvement of many stakeholders through regularly
   planned meetings of standing, ad hoc, and advisory committees and councils.  

2. The SOE will present the UAS Plan to the Faculty Academic Affairs Committee in March
   of each year for monitoring and possible modifications of the UAS Plan.

3. The SOE will present the UAS Plan to the Teacher Education Council annually for
   monitoring and possible modification.

4. The SOE will present the UAS Plan annually to the Dean's Community Advisory Council
   for monitoring and possible modification.

5. Feedback is solicited from school corporations on a regular basis through:
   a. INTASC Standards Student Self-assessment at the conclusion of student teaching.  
   b. Educational Administration questionnaires to Superintendents and Principals
   c. Questionnaires sent to hiring officials in school corporations
   d. Counselor Education Program (CEP) uses an informal feedback process that
      incorporates comments from adjunct faculty in the CEP.

6. Ms. Kay Wells, EACS, will continue to meet weekly with the IPFW SOE UAS Task
   Force. EACS teachers and administrators will continue to partner with the IPFW SOE in a
   mentoring program for pre-service teacher candidates and will continue to assist in the
   assessment of candidate portfolios every semester.

* Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.

THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE
DURING THE NEXT VISIT:

1 Rosters are in dean's office; records go back to 1982. These lists are representative of our
   stakeholders and are not all-inclusive.
2 Evidence available in the SOE.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
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 developmental standards for each licensure area.

A. A description of how and where the conceptual framework incorporates the INTASC principles and the IPSB standards

1. The SOE faculty revised the Conceptual Framework, which was then unanimously approved at a SOE faculty meeting February 9, 2000.¹
2. The Assessment Committee created a matrix, which cross-references the Conceptual Framework with the INTASC and IPSB Standards.²


B. A description of how and where the INTASC principles and the IPSB standards are incorporated into the programs(s)

1. Currently all SOE Teacher Education faculty, both full-time and associate, reference the INTASC standards in their course syllabi.
2. Applicable SOE faculty reference IPSB standards to their course objectives and to course assignments.
3. The University’s North Central Program Assessment System cross-references the following undergraduate programs with either INTASC or IPSB, or both as indicated:³
   a. Early Childhood - INTASC and IPSB Early Childhood Standards,
   b. Elementary Education – INTASC,
   c. Secondary Education – INTASC.
4. The North Central Program Assessment System cross-references graduate programs for Elementary Education (Middle Childhood) and Secondary Education with INTASC principles.
5. Educational Administration cross-references program goals to the IPSB standards.
6. Counselor Education cross-references Council for Accredited Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP) standards.
7. All SOE Teacher Education programs incorporate INTASC and IPSB standards, through student portfolios at program checkpoints and upon completion of the various programs.
8. The Counselor Education and the School Administration programs incorporate IPSB Standards through student portfolios at program checkpoints and upon completion of the various programs.


C. A description of the mechanisms used by the unit to assures that all IPSB standards are included in all programs

1. The Dean directs the SOE faculty to incorporate the IPSB standards in all programs. Department chairs review all course syllabi to verify that references to IPSB standards are included in course instruction.
2. We have engaged the A&S faculty in addressing the IPSB standards.
3. All SOE faculty are involved in portfolio assessment. Data from this assessment has been used to verify that all IPSB standards have been included in all programs.


THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE
DURING THE NEXT VISIT:

1 Conceptual Framework: A Learning and Leadership Model attached to report.
2 Evidence available in the SOE.
3 Ibid.
CRITERION 3: The UAS includes 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.

A. A description of how candidates are informed of the INTASC principles and IPSB standards they are expected to achieve during the course of the teacher education program within which they are enrolled.

1. As of the Fall of 2001 all students in professional education courses and all faculty received a copy of Guidelines for Preparing A Portfolio for Students Receiving Certification to Teach in Indiana from the School of Education Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) (Portfolio Guidelines) Fall 2001. The Portfolio Guidelines also include the SOE Mission Statement, the SOE Conceptual Framework, IPSB standards, and INTASC principles.1


3. INTASC principles are referenced in all SOE Teacher Education program course syllabi.2 All faculty, full-time and associate, are required to explain the standards, the relationship of the standards to the course, and the relationship of the standards to teacher certification of the students at the beginning of the course.

4. Collaborative efforts are on-going with the A&S faculty to incorporate INTASC principles and IPSB standards in all relevant courses. The Dean of the SOE and the Dean of the School of A&S are working to ensure collaboration. At the Teacher Education Council meeting, February 22, 2001, the IPSB standards and INTASC principles were stressed. The Dean shared, at the request of the Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the Portfolio Guidelines with all IPFW Deans at the September 19, 2001, meeting of the Academic Officer Committee.

5. The North Central IPFW Campus Assessment System, initiated in Fall of 1999 for the undergraduate and graduate education programs, requires that Program Goals be based on INTASC principles and IPSB standards; both are cross-referenced with the Program Goals. Selected course work is checked each semester to assess Program Goals; recommendation for changes in courses or programs are put forward, based on that assessment.3


7. The Student Teaching Handbook for preservice teacher education candidates has been revised to be more clearly aligned with the INTASC and IPSB standards. Students complete a self-assessment of their competencies based on INTASC standards; cooperating teachers also assess the extent to which students have fulfilled INTASC
standards.

8. A new two-credit course, provisionally called F300, Invitation to Teaching, introduces students to the new state and national standards as well as to the assessment procedures for teachers. The new course was first offered on a trial basis, in Spring of 2002. The students are introduced to the portfolio process and given the opportunity to start on them by reflecting on their current field experiences, which are integrated into this course. All students in this course work with model teachers from EACS during their field experience. Their model teachers will continue to keep in contact with the students throughout their teacher certification years.

9. IPSB and INTASC standards have been posted on the SOE’s website; they are periodically included in the SOE newsletter to all students and alumni.


B. A description of the multiple forms of performance assessment that comprise the UAS Plan

1. The SOE currently employs the following Formative Assessments:
   a. PPST
   b. Grades
   c. In-class assignments
   d. Field experience evaluations are performed by cooperating teachers and IPFW faculty supervisors during all internship experiences
   e. Portfolios
   f. Case studies

2. The SOE currently employs the following Summative Assessments:
   a. NTE specialty tests
   b. Grades
   c. Student Teaching Evaluations
   d. Cumulative GPA and/or minimum grades
   e. Portfolios

3. Portfolios, which assess candidates’ performance, are utilized in Counselor Education and School Administration programs.

4. Portfolios are currently evaluated during the practicum for the Early Childhood two-year program, at the end of T.E.A.M.s I and II and Student Teaching in the Elementary program, and at the end of Student Teaching in the Secondary program. In Fall of 2002, portfolios in the proposed new program – in the Early Childhood (EC), Middle Childhood (MC), Early Adolescent (EA), and Adolescent/Young Adult (AYA) programs – will be collected and evaluated at several points in the respective programs, in addition to the final check at the twelfth week of Student Teaching.
   a. Early Childhood checkpoints:
      1.) After F300, initiated in Spring of 2002
      2.) In P249, Growth and Development in Early Childhood, in Block 1
      3.) After T.E.A.M. I
4.) In E336, Play as Development, in Block 3
5.) After Student Teaching

b. Middle Childhood checkpoints:
   1) After F300, initiated in Spring of 2002
   2) In P249, Growth and Development in Early Childhood, Block I
   3) After T.E.A.M. I and T.E.A.M. II
   4) After Student Teaching

c. Early Adolescent and Adolescent/Young Adult:
   1) After F300, initiated in Spring of 2002
   2) In P250, General Educational Psychology
   3) After the Methods course
   4) After Student Teaching


C. A delineation of points in the program at which summative decisions are made, the processes through which decisions are made, and the kinds of information used in those decisions

1. The following lists show the order in which summative decisions are made:

   With the current certification programs, both Elementary and Secondary Education require:
   a. Admission to IPFW
   b. IPFW Placement test scores (English, math, reading)
   c. PPST (minimum scores required in each area) These scores, required for admittance to the programs, are set at the state levels required for certification at the completion of a program.
   d. Admission to Teacher Education which requires a 2.50 GPA on at least 45 credits and successful completion of the following courses: COM 114, ENG W131, and EDUC W200, and after Spring 2002, F300. Additionally, Elementary candidates need to have completed half of each category of General Education requirements with a 2.0 GPA in each; Secondary candidates need to have completed 15 credits in their area of certification with a 2.0 GPA and 45 credits overall.

   Only Elementary Education candidates:
   e. Registration for T.E.A.M. I
   f. Criminal History Check #1

   Both Elementary and Secondary Education candidates:
   g. Application for Student Teaching (one year in advance)
   h. Praxis II specialty tests (minimum scores required in each licensing area)
   i. Criminal History Check (#1 for Secondary, #2 for Elementary)
   j. Informal internal GPA and course audit for graduation eligibility
   k. Portfolio assessment by faculty using portfolio assessment rubrics
With the new certification programs introduced in Fall 2002, all certification areas will require:

a. Admission to IPFW
b. IPFW Placement test scores (English, math, reading)
c. PPST (Minimum scores required in each area)
d. Admission to Teacher Education which requires a 2.50 GPA on a least 45 credits and successful completion of the following courses: COM 114, ENG W131, and EDUC W200 and, after Spring 2002, F300. Additionally, Early Childhood and Middle Childhood candidates need to have completed half of each category of General Education requirements; Early Adolescent and Adolescent/Young Adult candidates need to have completed 15 credits in their area of certification and 45 credits overall.

Only Early Childhood and Middle Childhood candidates:

e. Registration for T.E.A.M. I
f. Criminal History Check #1

All candidates:

g. Application for Student Teaching (one year in advance)
h. Praxis II specialty tests (minimum scores required in each licensing area)
i. Criminal History Check (#1 for EA and AYA, #2 for EC and MC)
j. Informal internal GPA and course audit for graduation eligibility
k. Portfolio assessment by faculty using portfolio assessment rubrics

2. Educational Administration and Counselor Education summative decision points:
   a. Review of GPA and successful completion of courses with a “B” average as a continual part of the student advising and registration for courses process.
   b. Portfolios are assessed at the completion of the course requirements.5


D. A delineation of how the program assures that candidates have met the IPSB standards

1. The Counselor Education Program and the School Administration Program have developed a matrix aligning the IPSB standards with course requirements. Portfolios in both programs reflect artifacts that are related to IPSB standards.

2. All education programs cross-reference IPSB standards with specific courses.6

3. Portfolios are required for all candidates in Teacher Education, Counselor Education, and School Administration programs. Portfolios are used as one of the measures of assessment in individual courses, as checkpoints in Teacher Education programs, and as exit assessment in all programs. The portfolio assessment rubric is based on the SOE Mission Statement,
the SOE Conceptual Framework and INTASC Standards, which have all been cross-referenced with IPSB Standards.  

4. When students have successfully passed the final portfolio checkpoint, they will have met all IPSB standards.


E. A description of the rubrics used to judge teacher candidates’ performance at each summative decision point

1. In all Teacher Education programs, application to Student Teaching has several questions that are reflective in nature. Student Teacher applicants have an interview with their advisor, student teaching coordinator and Director of Field Services, at which time an audit of their program occurs.  
2. The Portfolio Guidelines define “artifacts,” provide a list of possible artifacts, along with exemplars of reflective analysis of artifacts, and rubrics detailing how the exit portfolio will be assessed. The rubrics describe the quality expected for students’ artifacts, reflective analyses, and writing.
3. The Counselor Education program has completed their rubrics and has developed a process to judge candidates’ performance.

❖ Self-Assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.

F. A description of how raters are trained in the use of rubrics for summative decision points

1. Training in the design, implementation, and rating of rubrics was conducted for all SOE faculty in a Spring (2000) Retreat at Pokagon State Park.  
2. Professional development continues. Rubrics have been reassessed and revised for the Elementary program every semester since Fall of 2000. A consultant presented a program on rubrics which university supervisors of teacher candidates attended, along with all SOE faculty and relevant A&S faculty.  
3. The Portfolio Guidelines introduced a new rubric based on the INTASC principles in Fall of 2001. It was tested for interrater reliability at a scheduled Portfolio Day, November 16, 2001, when the entire SOE faculty assessed student portfolios. Prior to Portfolio Day, partnership teachers and administrators from EACS had a two-hour training session in portfolio assessment, led by four faculty from the SOE who had been involved in developing the UAS and Portfolio Guidelines.
4. Teacher mentors and administrators from EACS who were chosen to work with students in the new F300 course, first offered in Spring of 2002, joined in the Portfolio Day assessment in Spring of 2002. These teachers and administrators had been introduced to portfolios by the Education Specialist teaching the F300 course. They received another one-hour training session prior to Portfolio Day.

G. Evidence that the summative decision point performance assessments provide qualitative discriminations among (and within) candidate performance

1. Students in the Teacher Education programs are monitored by SOE faculty at summative checkpoints. As of Fall 2001, summative decision point performance assessment mainly applies to 1) the entrance of Elementary and Secondary preservice teachers into the Professional Education sequence for their respective programs, and 2) the exit portfolio presented at the completion of Student Teaching. Proof of the first is in the waiver requests from students in the elementary education program who did not meet the requirements for admission to Teacher Education and T.E.A.M. I. The rigorous appeal process shows how this policy is strictly enforced. Evidence of qualitative discriminations among and within student performance with portfolios can be seen in the faculty assessments of the portfolios.

2. At the close of each Portfolio Day assessment, evaluators participated in a discussion on the process and, specifically, on how well the rubrics allow for qualitative discrimination among and within candidate performances.

3. Counselor Education has comprehensive exit interviews based on portfolios and checklists.

4. The Educational Administration program reviews checklists and assesses portfolios upon completion of the Capstone Course (A695).

H. A description of how evaluations of individual candidates and resulting formative or summative decisions are recorded

1. Student academic files contain documentation that includes letters of admission to IPFW, grades, program-specific check sheets, PPST scores, and applications to T.E.A.M., Teacher Education and Student Teaching, as well as an advising log sheet and faculty assessment of portfolios.

2. Program specific documentation is contained in the candidate files for Counselor Education and School Administration.

3. A Data Manager has been employed (Fall 2001) to develop a comprehensive database of all our students and record multiple assessment results.

I. A description of how candidates are provided ongoing feedback regarding their progress

1. Candidates in all Teacher Education programs receive ongoing feedback from course instructors, grades, advising, formal test scores (IPFW Placement Tests for reading, English,
and math; and PPST), field experience evaluations, portfolio assessment at the various checkpoints, and student teaching evaluations.

2. The advising process for Educational Administration and Counselor Education programs provides continuous feedback regarding progress in programs.

3. All external placement programs including field experiences in all Teacher Education licensing areas, the Counselor Education internship, and the School Administration Practicum require and include evaluative feedback processes.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

J. A description of how the multiple performance assessments of an individual are aggregated to make a final summative decision regarding candidacy

1. The Counselor Education faculty meet once per year to review student performance assessments to determine a final, summative decision.

2. The Associate Dean validates eligibility of all candidates for completion of all program requirements and submits candidates’ names to the Dean.¹⁵

3. The exit portfolio checkpoint is in itself an aggregated summative decision regarding candidacy. Students are assessed at each previous checkpoint as partial requirement to move to the next. The admission of the student to the next phase of the program is always an aggregated summative judgment of the student’s readiness to go forward.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

K. Evidence of the consistency of judgments (measure of reliability and interrater agreement) resulting from the use of the summative decision point rubrics

There has been ongoing revision of procedures used to assess the portfolios to achieve greater consistency of results. All SOE faculty met in Fall 2001 and Spring 2002 to assess portfolios (all-day session), based on the new Portfolio Guidelines rubric. At the beginning of that process all faculty reviewed the portfolios and results were analyzed for reliability and interrater agreement. This process will be repeated every semester as new faculty and student mentors are integrated into the portfolio assessing process.¹⁶

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

L. Evidence of the validity of decisions resulting from the use of the summative decision point rubrics

1. Alumni surveys are distributed routinely and analyzed.

2. Successful employment of candidates in program areas is documented.

3. The number of students successful in the induction phase will be recorded when the induction program is implemented.
4. A newly developed rubric for assessing preservice teachers has been written into the Portfolio Guidelines first used in Fall 2001. It will be tested for reliability and interrater agreement each time it is implemented. Each department will meet annually to affirm the validity of the rubrics.


THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE DURING THE NEXT VISIT:

1 Guidelines for Preparing A Portfolio for Students Receiving Certification to Teach in Indiana from the School of Education Indiana University Purdue University Fort Wayne (IPFW) attached.
2 Evidence available in the SOE.
3 North Central Assessment System goals available for all programs in the SOE.
4 Evidence available in the SOE.
5 Ibid.
6 Ibid.
7 Ibid.
8 Ibid.
9 Ibid.
10 Ibid.
11 Ibid.
12 Ibid.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
15 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
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.

A. A delineation of the percent (proportion) of candidates who passed, passed with remediation, or failed each standard at each summative decision point

1. Data is currently available for PPST which specifies scores that determine if candidates are accepted into the Teacher Education Program.¹
2. Meetings are occurring between the SOE and the Department of Transitional Studies to develop a remediation program specific to the SOE and the PPST test.
   a. Remediation services include the Writing Center, and retaking courses (i.e., Math 109 & 113).²
   b. Commercially prepared study guides are available for the PPST and the NTE specialty tests in the SOE Curriculum Laboratory and Helmke Library.
3. Counselor Education has a remediation process for their comprehensive examination.
4. Portfolios of Teacher Education candidates are assessed at various checkpoints and near the completion of Student Teaching using a rubric in the Portfolio Guidelines. A delineation of the percent of candidates who pass each checkpoint will be gathered by the Data Manager and reported at the end of each semester. The development of the portfolio assessment process proceeded as follows:
   a. The Portfolio Guidelines were developed by a Portfolio Committee in August of 2001;
   b. Stakeholders in EACS, administrators and teachers, were given an in-service on portfolio assessment, October 15, 2001, at the EACS administrative building;
   c. The first Portfolio Day was held to assess portfolios completed by the student teachers of Fall 2001. All SOE faculty, faculty from the A&S, and teachers and administrators from EACS participated in the assessment on November 16, 2001;
   d. The second Portfolio Day was held April 19, 2002. Again all stakeholders participated: SOE faculty, A&S faculty, administrators and teachers from EACS. The EACS participants arrived an hour early for training in portfolio assessment;
   e. The Portfolio Guidelines will again be revised in Summer 2002 based on our assessment experiences during the 2001-2002 school year.


B. A description of procedures to assure that all IPSB standards have been appropriately, adequately, and cumulatively assessed across the multiple assessment points

1. It is planned to convert the current Ad Hoc UAS Task Force into a full-standing SOE Faculty Committee to monitor "B". They have, thus far, met 56 times.
2. A description of the assessment system summary is provided in chart form.³
3. The Data Manager will create a database to verify that teacher candidates have successfully completed the multiple assessment points.
4. Hiring of the Data Manager was provided by the awarding of a Title II Grant in June 2001 to the SOE.⁴


C. A delineation of the percent (proportion) of the candidates who successfully completed the State required licensing exams
IPFW had a 96% pass rate of teacher candidates taking state required licensing exams for the 2000-2001 school year. Data is extracted from the year 2001 Title II Report on institutional pass rates. The pass rate will be reported on an annual basis.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

D. A delineation of the percent (proportion) of the candidates who entered and successfully completed an induction program in two years

1. The IPSB Induction Program is not yet in place; however, we are in the process of establishing stronger relationships with area administrators so that feedback on entry level candidates will occur on a regular basis.
2. The unit will rely upon the IPSB to provide data to monitor the progress of candidates who have completed and those who do not successfully complete the induction program.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

E. Descriptions of how aggregated individual candidate assessments are used to evaluate the quality of courses and the curricula

1. The data used from the Title II report is provided to the SOE faculty and to the School of A&S faculty for their analysis. The analysis of the above data is used in part to assist in the evaluation of the quality of courses and curriculum.
2. The North Central Assessment System assesses student work in all courses that are part of the professional education sequence of the elementary and secondary programs to indicate whether or not program goals have been met. Program goals have been aligned with the INTASC standards. Given this feedback, courses and programs are evaluated and changed when indicated.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

*THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE DURING THE NEXT VISIT:*

1 Evidence available in the Licensing and Advising Center.
2 Evidence available in IPFW Bulletins.
3 SOE Assessment System Summary Chart attached.
4 Grant acceptance letter attached.
CRITERION 5: The UAS uses aggregated assessments from individual candidates and other sources to refine and revise the conceptual framework and programs.

A. A descriptive flowchart and time line showing how data from candidate assessments are reviewed systematically under the new program

*The following “flowchart” is geared to the new programs to be implemented in Fall of 2002.*

SOE Student Checkpoints

1st Checkpoint in Semester 4/5: Admission to Teacher Education (Block 1) - Evaluated by: F300 instructor, Academic Advisors and Dean of the SOE.

1. Pass PPST
2. 2.50 Cum. GPA including all coursework taken from previously attended institutions
3. Completion of 45 credit hours
4. C or better in: ENG W131, COM 114, EDUC W200, EDUC F300, MA 101 (EC & MC) or a Quantitative Reasoning course (EA & AYA)
5. 1st portfolio checkpoint (initial establishment of a portfolio in F300)

2nd Checkpoint in Semester 5/6: Admission to Professional Education (Blocks 2 and 3) - Evaluated by: Academic Advisor and Portfolio Assessors.

1. Student has been admitted to Teacher Education
2. Junior Status (60 credits completed, including at least half in each General Education area)
3. Minimum 2.00 GPA in each General Education area
4. 2.50 Cum. GPA
5. 2nd portfolio checkpoint (scoring assessment) in P249 for EC & MC, in P250 for EA & AYA
6. Completion of, or enrollment in, Block 1

3rd Checkpoint in Semester 6/7: Admission to Student Teaching - Evaluated by: Academic Advisor and Director of Field Services.

1. Complete a Limited Criminal History check
2. Complete an application for Student Teaching
3. Make appointment with Director of Field Services
4. Complete all methods courses
5. 3rd portfolio checkpoint (scoring assessment) in Blocks 2 and 3 for EC & MC and Methods for EA & AYA

4th Checkpoint in Semester 8/9: Final Assessment - Evaluated by: Portfolio Assessors, Academic Advisors and Dean of the SOE.
1. 4th portfolio checkpoint (scoring assessment)
2. Completion of Student Teaching and all course requirements

5th Checkpoint: Verification for Completion of Degree/Certification

1. Apply for graduation/license

Systematic Review of Candidate Assessment Data

1. Identify patterns.
2. Redesign individual courses or make program changes as needed.
3. Identify remediation resources.
4. Assess scores on licensing exams: measure program quality and needs.
5. Track growth regarding understanding and integration of INTASC principles, SOE Conceptual Framework, and NCATE and content standards.


B. Evidence that data collected on candidate performances and evaluative assessments gathered from candidates are used to make decisions on curriculum and program practices

1. Assessment information is monitored and analyzed by the UAS Task Force. The Task Force will develop a report with documentation and recommendations and forward the report to the SOE Academic Affairs Committee and to the Dean of the SOE for review and recommendations. Student data will be forwarded to the Student Affairs Committee of the SOE and the Dean.
2. This process is implemented by a timeline established by the UAS Task Force.
3. Data, including portfolio and other measures of assessments from selected students, are analyzed as a part of our IPFW North Central Assessment process. Curriculum and program practices are modified as deemed appropriate.¹


C. Examples of changes in the program, including General Education, Professional Education, and fieldwork, that resulted directly from analyses of candidate performances and evaluative assessments

1. A new course has been developed F300, Invitation to Teaching, to address issues resulting from the implementation of the UAS.²
2. The Conceptual Framework in place in 1999 has been completely revised and unanimously approved (February 9, 2000) as an essential part of the Teacher Education program as well as the Counselor Education and School Administration programs.
3. A “Change Document Form” is under review to assist the SOE in recording changes in programs and processes resulting from the UAS.
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2 Ibid.
CRITERION 6: The unit ensures that its assessment system is continuously managed.

A. An identification of the person in charge of overseeing the UAS Plan

The Dean, or Dean's designee, is charged with preparing annual UAS reports. A UAS Task Force comprised of SOE faculty, staff, and stakeholders was formed on August 15, 2000 and charged with preparation of this report. The Associate Dean, Dr. J.R. Cochren, oversees the full implementation of the UAS Plan.


B. A description of the implementation of the UAS Plan

1. Several ad hoc committees were formed in the Spring of 1999 as a first step in developing the UAS Plan. The Middle Childhood group generated a status study report.\(^1\)
2. The ad hoc Conceptual Framework Committee hosted a series of faculty work sessions to develop the current Conceptual Framework.
3. An ad hoc PPST committee developed recommendations relative to the revised PPST scores.\(^2\)
4. The SOE faculty has attended statewide seminars on educational reform sponsored by the IPSB, IU Dean's Council, AACTE, NCATE and IACTE.
5. As of August 1999, a UAS Task Force was established by the Dean. This Task Force meets weekly to develop and implement the UAS Plan. As of 5-20-02, this Task Force has met 56 times.\(^3\) It is chaired by the Associate Dean.
6. Consultation occurred with Butler University faculty, H. Ramanathan and A. Hochman between 10/16/99 and 11/18/99,\(^4\) with regard to assessment and rubric development.
7. A UAS planning workshop for IPFW SOE faculty, staff and stakeholders was conducted by H. Ramanathan (11/19/99) at an all-day retreat.
8. A retreat was held on May 5, 2000 to work with the faculty on rubric development at Pokagon State Park.
9. The Associate Dean reports the progress of the UAS Plan to the faculty at regularly scheduled faculty meetings.
10. In July, 2001 the SOE received an IPSB grant of $122,000 to assist in the implementation of the F300 course, establish a partnership with EACS, and establish and pay the salaries for an Education Specialist and Data Manager.
11. In May 2002, the SOE was notified that it has been awarded an additional grant, not less than $85,000, for the academic year 2002-2003 to continue the implementation of the UAS Plan.


C. A description of procedures for data management including its collection, recording, storage, and retrieval

The database consists of achievement data linked to standards and program goals serving formative and summative purposes. Formative and summative decisions are made about candidate's qualifications and progress. This data provides evidence of program effectiveness and provides a guide for program revisions.

The Data Manager oversees, designs, and inputs the data system that includes the following:

1. Collecting
   a. This process includes the following multiple collection points:
b. Praxis Exams, GPA Scores, Program Completion Rates, and Portfolio Checkpoints

2. Recording and storing
   a. Data is recorded and stored using Access software on the university mainframe, via a dedicated server from a unit controlled PC.

3. Retrieval
   a. The Data Manager has developed access policies to ensure security and confidentiality.
   b. A restricted number of individuals with "read-only" access have been identified to allow easy and frequent access while maintaining security and confidentiality.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: FullyImplemented.**

D. A delineation of how data is secured and confidentiality maintained along with a clarification of who has access

   The data is secured within designated offices in the SOE following the security processes that applies to confidential records. The following people have access to this data: Dean, Associate Dean, Director of Licensing, Coordinator of Advising, the Graduate/Undergraduate Recorder, and the Data Manager.³

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

E. A description of the role of the UAS overseer in relation to monitoring, reviewing, and revision of conceptual framework(s), program(s), and curricula

   1. The current SOE Policy Handbook states that the Dean will file the annual assessment report.⁶
   2. The Associate Dean, with the collaboration of the UAS Task Force and the Dean, will monitor, review, and oversee recommendations of revisions of the conceptual framework, programs, and curricula. According to SOE policies, the Academic Affairs Committee is charged with the responsibility of program and curricula development.

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

F. A description of how UAS management links to the wider, institutional assessment plans

   This information is included in the Dean’s annual assessment reports that are compiled on each program in the SOE and forwarded to the campus Assessment Committee, NCATE, and IPSB.⁷

- **Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented.**

---

**THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE DURING THE NEXT VISIT:**

1. Evidence available in the SOE.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Data created by the Data Manager will be available.
6. Evidence available in the SOE.
7. Annual assessment reports are available in the SOE.
CRITERION 7: The UAS provides for review and revision of the assessment system.

The following timeline has been established for reviewing and revising the UAS Plan and curricula when applicable:

A. ACADEMIC YEAR TIMELINE for REVIEW and REVISION of the UAS Plan:

1. August – UAS Task Force has initial meeting to examine retroactively and proactively academic year UAS requirements for all programs.
2. October – UAS Task Force reports revisions if applicable to SOE faculty and other appropriate committees.
3. January and May - Data Manager submits report to UAS Task Force on the following assessment evaluations:
   a. Practicum
   b. Student Teaching
   c. T.E.A.M.
   d. Portfolio Assessments
4. June – The UAS Task Force and Data Manager review all components of the UAS Plan and determine revisions to be implemented, if applicable.
5. July – The UAS Task Force submits an annual report to the Dean, SOE faculty, and appropriate stakeholders.
6. In addition, the following timelines are in place for assessment purposes:
   a. There is a formal review each Fall of the curriculum in the Educational Administration and Counselor Education programs so that the Dean may file the annual report with the campus Assessment Committee.
   b. The Teacher Education program completes a response that is linked to the campus and North Central Performance Assessment plan.
   c. The UAS Plan is submitted to the Academic Affairs Committee annually for their review.


B. A description of how stakeholder input is assured

1. Stakeholders are invited to participate in the UAS Task Force's regular meetings. Kay Wells, EACS, is a permanent and integral member of the SOE's UAS Task Force that meets weekly.
2. Members of the A&S's faculty are invited to attend IPSB and NCATE meetings.\(^1\)
3. The Dean's Community Advisory Committee will review and provide input for the UAS Plan.\(^2\)
4. The SOE faculty is provided a copy of the UAS Annual Plan.


C. A description of information to be used for the review

1. The UAS Task Force will utilize data acquired from the SOE Student Checkpoints.\(^3\)
2. Title II report data will also be used for assessment review.

D. A description of criteria used for decisions about effectiveness of the UAS Plan and the need for revisions

The UAS Task Force will use SOE Student Assessment Checkpoints regarding decisions about the effectiveness of the UAS Plan and the need for possible revisions. When completely implemented, evidence for assessment will be provided.

Self-assessment using rubrics: Fully Implemented

THE BOARD OF EXAMINERS (BOE) WILL FIND THE FOLLOWING EVIDENCE DURING THE NEXT VISIT:

1. Evidence available in the SOE.
2. Evidence in minutes of Advisory meetings.
4. Ibid.