



**INDIANA UNIVERSITY
KOKOMO**

DIVISION OF EDUCATION

Assessment Report

AY 2006-2007

I. Summary of the Assessment Plan

- a. The IU Kokomo Initial Teacher Education Program is based upon our conceptual framework (see Attachment A) that was created and designed using standards from the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), the Division of Professional Standards, and other current teacher education documents and best practices in the belief that the prospective teacher education candidate develops, over time, from a novice to a skilled educator. The successful teacher must master both a body of content knowledge and effective teaching skills. The conceptual framework uses Bloom's Taxonomy as a way of depicting the higher level of thinking required as the candidate moves through the program, grounded in the standards every step of the way.
- b. The IU Kokomo Division of Education implemented the redesigned M.S. in Education program and admitted the first cohort of new program students in the Fall of 2007. The conceptual framework for the redesigned M.S. in Education program is fully aligned with and grounded in National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and Indiana Department of Education Division of Professional Standard (DPS) Standards for Mentors (see Attachment B). More specifically, this program is guided by seven Metastandards, which are further defined by thirty-two Components (i.e. knowledge, skills and dispositions). However, since this is the first semester the program has been active, there are no data to report for the previous year.

II. Program Goals and Outcomes

- a. Integrating the Initial Program Conceptual Framework along with the metastandards for each program – Early Childhood Metastandards, Elementary Metastandards, and Secondary Metastandards – has allowed the division to create rubrics that evaluate candidates' learning outcomes across the individual program benchmarks (see Attachment C).

III. Assessment Methods

- a. The specific benchmarks are specified within the Benchmark Sequence Documents for each program – Early Childhood Benchmark Sequence Document, Elementary Benchmark Sequence Document, and Secondary Benchmark Sequence Document (see Attachment D).

- b. Candidates in all programs are evaluated using a variety of assessment methods across the benchmark sequence. These *curriculum maps* are referred to in the division as alignment matrices – Early Childhood Alignment Matrix, Elementary Alignment Matrix, and Secondary Alignment Matrix (see Attachment E). Although all standards have been aligned to courses within the program that is not the only means for assessing candidates’ attainment of these standards.

Early Childhood (P – 3) Program

Purpose of Evaluation	Frequency of Evaluation	Evaluator
Field Experience Assessment (Dispositions)	8 x within program	Host teachers
Completion of academic coursework aligned with standards (GPA)	10x within program	Faculty
Field Experience Assessment (Metastandards and Dispositions)	6 x within program	Host Teachers
Formative and Summative e-Portfolio Review (Metastandards Rubrics)	2 x within program	Faculty Host Teachers
Clinical Practice (Metastandards and Dispositions)	2 x within program (Student teaching: midterm and final)	Host Teachers and University Supervisors

Elementary (K – 6) Program

Purpose of Evaluation	Frequency of Evaluation	Evaluator
Field Experience Assessment (Dispositions)	8 x within program	Host teachers
Completion of academic coursework aligned with standards (GPA)	10x within program	Faculty
Field Experience Assessment (Metastandards and Dispositions)	6 x within program	Host Teachers
Formative and Summative e-Portfolio Review (Metastandards Rubrics)	2 x within program	Faculty Host Teachers
Clinical Practice (Metastandards and Dispositions)	2 x within program (Student teaching: midterm and final)	Host Teachers and University Supervisors

Secondary (5 – 12) Program

Purpose of Evaluation	Frequency of Evaluation	Evaluator
Field Experience Assessment (Dispositions)	8 x within program	Host teachers
Completion of academic coursework aligned with standards (GPA)	10x within program	Faculty
Field Experience Assessment (Metastandards and Dispositions)	6 x within program	Host Teachers
Formative and Summative e-Portfolio Review (Metastandards Rubrics)	2 x within program	Faculty Host Teachers
Clinical Practice (Metastandards and Dispositions)	2 x within program (Student teaching: midterm and final)	Host Teachers and University Supervisors

IV. Description of Assessment Results

- a. As this is the first semester for the Advanced program, no candidates have met benchmarks, nor have there have been any assessments accomplished outside of the individual course curriculum. These will be assessed at the end of the semester.
- b. At the conclusion of each semester the Division of Education Teacher Education Program (TEP) convenes a TEP Benchmark Meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to review the performance and progress of all TEP candidates, where relevant knowledge, skills, and dispositions are concerned. Benchmark meetings also allow Division of Education faculty to monitor candidate growth relative to the DPS Standards and INTASC Principles which guide the initial TEP. Benchmark meetings also provide a vehicle for informing candidates of their program performance, progress and current status. Additionally, benchmark meetings allow faculty to monitor and analyze candidate performance data, as well as to analyze data in the aggregate in order to inform decisions regarding program level strengths and weaknesses, as well as any required changes or improvements.
- c. It is the responsibility of the Associate Dean to schedule and organize all initial TEP benchmark meetings. The Associate Dean is responsible for soliciting from Division faculty, staff and advisors data systematically collected throughout the semester, aggregated and analyzed – relative to candidate performance – and preparing data reports (which include, but are not limited to, memos for record, transcripts, course specific performance issues, field evaluations, advising recommendations, PRAXIS exam scores and summaries) for discussion and action.
- d. Once each semester, the performance and progress of each active initial program teacher candidate is reviewed in a formal benchmark meeting. As a result of that review, candidate program status is designated as follows:

- ***In Good Standing***: The candidate has met all relevant TEP requirements, as outlined in the Metastandards Rubric, Dispositional Criteria checklist, Benchmark Document, and other TEP evaluation instruments. Candidates are informed of their status in writing and a copy of the letter is placed in their permanent records.
 - ***In Good Standing with Area(s) of Concern***: The candidate has met all relevant TEP requirements, as outlined in the Metastandards Rubric, Dispositional Criteria checklist, Benchmark Document, and other TEP evaluation instruments; however, there are some areas that the Benchmark Committee has determine *may* interfere with the candidates ability to successfully complete the program. Candidates are informed of their status in writing and a copy of the letter is placed in their permanent records. This notification will include the reasons why the candidate has received this designation; actions, requirements, and/or remedial experiences which the candidate should undertake to address specific issues and/or weaknesses; and a reasonable and specific date by which these issues must be satisfactorily resolved.
 - ***Not in Good Standing***: The candidate has failed to meet one or more program requirements. Candidates judged not in good standing are notified in writing of their status. This notification will include the reasons why the candidate has received this designation actions, requirements, and/or remedial experiences which the candidate should undertake to address specific issues and/or weaknesses; and a reasonable and specific date by which these issues must be satisfactorily resolved.
- e. Candidates whose program status remains *not in good standing* for more than two semesters, or who demonstrate continuous lack of progress or poor performance, risk dismissal from the TEP. Candidates reserve the right to appeal a Benchmark Committee decision and may do so by submitting a formal letter to that effect to the Dean of Education.

Benchmark Results Spring 2007 semester.

Early Childhood Delineation Chart Spring 2007	Percentage Pass	Good Standing	Good Standing (with concerns)	Not in Good Standing	Total
Benchmark 6	100.00%	2	0	0	2
Benchmark 4	100.00%	6	0	0	6

Elementary Delineation Chart Spring 2007		Percentage Pass	Good Standing	Good Standing (with concerns)	Not in Good Standing	Total
Benchmark 6	92.00%	23	0	2	25	
Benchmark 5	95.00%	5	14	1	20	
Benchmark 4	100.00%	15	0	0	15	
Benchmark 3	100.00%	10	0	0	10	

Secondary Delineation Chart Spring 2007		Percentage Pass	Good Standing	Good Standing (with concerns)	Not in Good Standing	Total
Benchmark 6	100.00%	6	0	0	6	
Benchmark 5	100.00%	3	0	0	3	
Benchmark 4					0	
Benchmark 3	100.00%	15	3	0	18	

V. Using Assessment for Program Improvement

- a. Every year the Division holds a Program Improvement Meeting (PI). At each PI Meeting the faculty review data in term of courses, field evaluations, utilization and training of stakeholders, and overall curricular and programmatic matters.

DIVISION OF EDUCATION
PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT (PI)
AUGUST 27, 2007

1. Portfolio Reviews and Calendars
2. Recap Data Collection AY 2007-2008
3. Diversity
 - a. Division Diversity Statement
4. Method for Clarifying Metastandard Rubric Expectations
 - a. Benchmark Sequence Documents
 - b. Host Teacher Training
 - c. Field Experience and Clinical Practice
5. New Conceptual Framework and Graphic
 - a. The faculty were presented with a draft of the new conceptual framework and graphic and this was discussed earlier in the meeting in reference to the Diversity statement and policy of the Division.

- b. What is essential to note is that from reviewing the data systematically, program changes do not always result in curricular changes. For example, as we reviewed the data from Spring Semester 2006, we realized that we needed a more sophisticated system for collecting the data because the timeliness and accuracy of the data collection system fell short of what was needed to gain a thorough understanding of the candidates' knowledge, skills and dispositions. Therefore a new method – online digital rubrics – was created. The following semester, it was found that the Metastandards alone were not sufficient to gain adequate information concerning the candidates' ability to meet standards, therefore Components were included in the rubric to add a richer, more robust data set for analysis. Overall, numerous changes have been accomplished utilizing the data to inform the change process.

VI. Dissemination of Results

- a. Additionally, as we serve an 11 county region, this electronic form, a Division e-portal so to speak, will be utilized to allow stakeholders to view data, make comments and ask questions, all which will be brought to the faculty. The data will be presented as a *PowerPoint* presentation in one part, and in another part, an online survey asking questions that pertain to the presentation of results, the clarity of the metastandards rubric, the analysis and utilization of the data, and specific open ended questions directed toward program improvement.