Program Assessment Plan
Exceptional Education Department

Exceptional Education: Childhood Education Program
(Initial Certification Program)
Exceptional Education: Childhood Education Initial Program

Program Assessment Plan

Table of Contents:

COMPILING DATA
Overview of Program assessments/artifacts........................................................................3-12
   Listed by program.........................................................................................................4
   Listed by course...........................................................................................................5
   Assessments for Unit Evaluation..................................................................................6
   Artifact components ....................................................................................................7
   Artifact sample............................................................................................................8-9
   Artifact housing and collection logistics ....................................................................10
   TaskStream syllabus statement.....................................................................................11-12
Transition points by program..........................................................................................13-14

PLAN FOR DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS
Graphic organizer for using data to improve program.....................................................17
Plan for discussion and analysis......................................................................................18
How data is shared..........................................................................................................18
Plan to ensure fairness, consistency, accuracy and avoidance of bias.............................19

USING DATA TO IMPROVE PROGRAM
Use of assessment results to improve candidate & program performance.....................21-23
   Content knowledge......................................................................................................21
   Student learning...........................................................................................................22
   Professional & pedagogical knowledge, skill, & dispositions....................................23
   Program improvement and evidence table.................................................................24

Program improvement plan tasks..................................................................................25-30
Template for meeting agendas.......................................................................................31
COMPILING DATA
List of Assessments
by Program in Department

NOTE: These do not include some additional unit-wide assessments administered via Dean's office, Academic Affairs, etc. See List of Unit Assessments in this document.
# List of Program Assessments

**by Course***

(Initial, undergraduate program)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Licensure Assessment</th>
<th>Name of Assessment</th>
<th>Type or Form of Assessment</th>
<th>When the Assessment is Administered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Licensure Assessment</td>
<td>New York State Teacher Certification Exam (NYSTCE) Students with Disabilities Content Specialty Tests (CSTs)</td>
<td>State licensure test</td>
<td>Prior to student teaching semester; After completion of content area courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2 | Assessment of content knowledge | Individualized Education Plan (IEP) | Task Stream Portfolio and Independent Product/Rubric | EXE 364 Educating Students with Severe Disabilities |

| 3 | Assessment of candidate ability to plan instruction | Lesson Plan | Task Stream Portfolio/Rubric | EXE 420 Student Teaching in Special Education |

| 4 | Assessment of student teaching | Cooperating Teacher Evaluation form | Rating checklist | EXE 420 Practicum in Special Education |

| 5 | Assessment of candidate effect on student learning | Management Plan | Task Stream Portfolio/Rubric and Case study | EXE 362 Behavior Management |

| 6 | Additional (required) | Student Assessment Survey | Assessment survey | EXE 365 Educational Evaluation for Special Education |

| 7 | Additional (optional) | Disposition Evaluation (part of Cooperating Teacher Evaluation form) | Rating checklist | EXE 420 Practicum in Special Education |

| 8 | Additional (optional) | Family Inventory | Task Stream Portfolio/Rubric | EXE 364 Educating Students with Severe Disabilities |

NOTE: These do not include some additional unit wide assessments administered via Dean's office, Academic Affairs, etc. Additional assessments may include candidate exit survey, alumni survey, course evaluations, etc.
### Assessments for Unit Evaluation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Candidate Dispositions Evaluation</td>
<td>Transition points 2 and 4 (entry into clinical practice in Block 1 &amp; at time of program completion - e.g., during Student Teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Candidate Pedagogical Knowledge and Skill Evaluation</td>
<td>Transition point 4 (at the time of program completion - e.g., student teaching)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate Exit Survey</td>
<td>Transition point 4 (at program completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Survey</td>
<td>Transition point 5 (after program completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Survey</td>
<td>Transition point 5 (after program completion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This list may be modified upon notification by the Teacher Education Unit.

Additional assessments may be required.
Components Included in Each Artifact/Assessment:

1. Assignment description and rationale
   a. Embed program standards (e.g., SPA standards, National Board Professional Teaching Standards, http://www.nbpts.org/ etc.) targeted for evaluation
   b. Embed conceptual framework (CLoP TRoDD)
   c. Assignment description/summary that infuses language of targeted CEC standards
   d. Rationale for assignment
   e. Grading criteria for assignment
   f. May use own scoring criteria but must provide a “conversion chart” to illustrate NCATE’s ranking of “unacceptable, acceptable, target.”

2. Assignment rubric
   a. Corresponds directly to components of the assignment description
   b. Includes performance descriptions for each component of assignment (description for “unacceptable, acceptable, and target” performance for each component within assignment; likely to have multiple components/rows).
   c. Program standards infused into descriptions within cells on rubric (uses the language and key ideas of the specific standard).
   d. Designed to allow data to be disaggregated by individual program standard.
   e. Each component aligns to one or more areas of conceptual framework (CLoP TRoDD)
      i. Components are represented using the following format within the rubric:
         \[
         CF=\text{content} \quad CF=\text{pedagogy} \quad CF=\text{technology} \\
         CF=\text{learner} \quad CF=\text{reflection} \quad CF=\text{diversity} \quad CF=\text{dispositions}
         \]

3. Assignment data table
   a. Corresponds and aligns directly with assignment rubric
   b. Data reported by program for total number and percent of candidates demonstrating “unacceptable, acceptable, and target” performance
      i. Met criteria= acceptable or target
      ii. Did not meet criteria= unacceptable
   c. Data reported out on a separate data table for each individual program (e.g., initial undergraduate, adolescent special education; childhood special education, etc.)

NOTE: Beginning Spring 2009, all assignment descriptions, rubrics, and data tables will be available via TaskStream.
SAMPLE ASSESSMENT COMPONENTS

Sample Assessment- Standards

DEPARTMENT OF EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATION
BUFFALO STATE COLLEGE
Graduate Programs (Early Childhood, Childhood, Adolescent)
Variable 5: Assessment of Candidate’s Effect on Student Learning

Artifact: Masters Project - Data Driven Information
Course: EXE 690
CEC Standards:
- CC855: Interprets information from formal and informal assessments appropriately
- CC857: Reports accurate assessment results to all stakeholders using effective communication skills
- CC858: Evaluates instruction and monitors progress of individuals with exceptional learning needs
- CC859: Develops or modifies individualized assessment strategies
- CC851: Creates and maintain accurate records in a timely fashion

Sample Assessment- Assignment Rationale & Description

Rationale
The Master’s Project is a culminating assignment completed at the end of each teacher candidate’s program of study. Several components of the Master’s Project serve as the NCATE Variable 5 (Assessment of Candidate’s Effect on Student Learning) artifact. These components provide documentation on the teacher candidate’s ability to assess student learning performance and regularly monitor the progress of all learners in diverse and exceptional learning needs. The components of the Master’s Project used as artifacts for Variable 5 (Assessment of Candidate’s Effect on Student Learning Master’s Project Rubric) are identified in the Variable 5: Assessment of Candidate’s Effect on Student Learning Master’s Project Rubric.

These components assess the graduate level teacher certification candidate’s ability to develop and implement pedagogically sound interventions (i.e., content that focuses on specific learning, teaching, or behavior modification strategies) and to empirically appraise the impact of the intervention on student performance using the assessment technology to progress monitoring measures. This provides evidence of a teacher candidate’s ability to use and implement principles of measurement theory and practices addressing issues of validity, reliability, bias, interpretation, and implications of data results. Through this artifact, teacher candidates also demonstrate their ability to regularly monitor and report the progress of students by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting student learning performance data using various assessment and computer-based technologies to assist with interpretation. The content of each project must align and focus on learners within the graduate student’s specific program of study (i.e., Early Childhood, Childhood, Adolescent).

Note that the language of the SPA standards 8 and 9 is also embedded into this rationale.

TEU Conceptual Framework embedded into assignment rationale/description

Description
The Department of Exceptional Education’s M.A. program requires every graduate level teacher certification candidate to complete a high quality Master’s Project. The project is a document developed and written by each teacher candidate as a proposal for their educational intervention, process, or goal. The teacher candidates then develop or find an appropriate educational intervention and conduct an in-depth study to examine the impact of their intervention on student learning. During the second semester, teacher candidates conduct the study. As they conduct the study and implement their intervention, they are required to monitor the progress of students by collecting, analyzing, and interpreting student performance data. They are required to attend to issues of validity, reliability, and bias. The candidates report, orally and in writing, the results and their interpretation of the findings based on student learning performance measures collected. During each phase of the project students submit a draft version that is evaluated by the instructor. For each component, teacher candidates are provided the opportunity to revise their documents incorporating instructor feedback.
Sample Assessment - Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Title of Candidate's Effect on Student Learning Master's Project Rubric for Adolescent Program</th>
<th>Standard 8 Overall Rating</th>
<th>Standard 9 Overall Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Name:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Unacceptable</strong></td>
<td><strong>Acceptable</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Project Component</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ORGANIZATION</strong> (CC567, CC580)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATA TABLE/GRAPHS</strong> (CC576, CC581)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERPRETATION/IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING/PERFORMANCE</strong> (CC555, CC556)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STANDARD OVERALL RATING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the same program standards are aligned again.

Sample Assessment - Data Reporting table

| Buffalo State College Assessment #6 Assessment of Candidate’s Effect on Student Learning Master’s Project Rubric Data Reporting Table |
|---|---|---|---|
| Use separate reporting table for each program major (EC, Child, Adlt) | | | |
| **Total# of Students** | **EC** | **Child** | **Adlt** |
| **Master’s Project Component** | **Unacceptable** | **Acceptable** | **Target** |
| **ORGANIZATION** (CC567, CC580) | | | |
| **DATA TABLE/GRAPHS** (CC576, CC581) | | | |
| **INTERPRETATION/IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING/PERFORMANCE** (CC555, CC556) | | | |
| **STANDARD OVERALL RATING** | | | |

Once again, you see the alignment of conceptual framework and program (e.g., SPA) standards!

Note that we report the program standards “met” and “not met” overall.
Artifact housing & collection logistics

Location of artifacts/assessments:

TaskStream: All artifacts/assessments that aligned with specific courses are uploaded to TaskStream (copied/pasted) with the assistance of the Teacher Education Unit TaskStream Coordinator and Local TaskStream Coordinator within the Exceptional Education Department. Rubrics are created using TaskStream’s cell format. All candidates and department faculty are provided with a TaskStream account number that allows them to access scoring and grading occurs within the TaskStream cells. TaskStream training is offered each semester or on an as-needed basis as identified by students and faculty.

Department Copies: Each department will have an archival copy of each assessment stored in hard copy and electronic form. These will be replaced as needed based on revisions and updates to the assessments as monitored by the department assessment committee and/or NCATE program point person.

Process and Timing of data collection:

- Assessment data will be collected EVERY semester the target course is offered (including summer sessions).
- Faculty will score assessments posted by candidates on TaskStream at the end of each semester (or earlier). See policy & procedure manual updated November 2008.
- All assessments must be scored before final semester grades are due however scoring assessments at any point in the semester is acceptable.
- NCATE program point person will work with Teacher Education Unit Assessment Coordinator to run data reports within one week after final semester grades are due and deliver to department Assessment Committee for analysis the following semester.

***PLEASE NOTE***

For accuracy of data reporting, faculty scoring MUST be completed DURING THE SEMESTER it is assigned and submitted. Scoring assessments/artifacts after the close of the semester will result in inaccurate data results and misrepresentation of overall student performance within the program.
TASKSTREAM SYLLABUS STATEMENT

Draft 1/3/09

Each semester faculty will provide students with the TaskStream statement as part of their syllabus. Students are expected to enroll in TaskStream as part of their course requirements.

Exceptional Education Department

USE OF TASKSTREAM

The Teacher Education Unit has adopted the TaskStream instructional design and assessment system. The Exceptional Education Department uses the TaskStream assessment data to ensure that our courses and programs help you achieve or exceed the minimum competencies required of CEC and NCATE accredited teachers. The Department routinely conducts training sessions on how to use TaskStream. Contact your professor or advisor for more information.

PLEASE NOTE: Most classes have at least one TaskStream related assignment. These assignments MUST be submitted to the TaskStream system; submitting them to your professor in hard copy or via email attachment is not acceptable. If you fail to submit a TaskStream-required assignment, you will receive a grade of “I” (Incomplete) in the course. If the assignment is submitted to TaskStream by the middle of the following semester, you will then receive your grade for the course. However, if you fail to submit the assignment by the deadline (see Buffalo State calendar for actual date), the “I” grade will automatically revert to an “E.”

The college provides TaskStream free of charge for Exceptional Education students. You do NOT have to pay for your TaskStream account yourself. As a student, you will fall into one of three categories. Read the following carefully and see which one applies to you:

1. You’ve previously had a TaskStream account, but it has expired. IN THIS CASE, YOU WILL RENEW YOUR ACCOUNT BY INPUTTING THIS CODE (CJSS2H-6Z8TJ4). DO THIS: Log onto TaskStream (http://www.taskstream.com) and click on the option for “Subscribe/Renew Today” (upper left); you want to click the “radio button” for “Renew my TaskStream subscription.” Then, under “Option 2,” “Enter Your TaskStream Key Code,” which is: CJSS2H-6Z8TJ4.

   You signed up for your TaskStream account at the beginning of the Fall 2008 semester, using the code the college gave you. DO NOT SIGN UP FOR ANOTHER ACCOUNT AS THE ACCOUNT YOU ALREADY HAVE IS STILL ACTIVE!!

2. This is the first time you’ve signed up for TaskStream. DO THIS: Log onto TaskStream (http://www.taskstream.com) and click on the option for “Subscribe/Renew Today” (upper left); you want to click the “radio button” for “Create a new TaskStream subscription.” Then, under “Option 2,” “Enter Your TaskStream Key Code,” which is: CJSS2H-6Z8TJ4. You will then have to
provide some personal information. Don’t lose your TaskStream username and password!!! For convenience, many students use their **Buff State usernames and passwords**.

**IN ADDITION to getting and activating an account, you must “Enroll” in your program.** TaskStream is not smart enough to automatically know which Exceptional Education program you’re in. You have to tell it by **self-enrolling**. If you do not self-enroll, your current courses will not show up as options when you go to submit work. **Ninety-Nine percent of the problems students have with TaskStream are due to the fact that the students did not self-enroll!!** To enroll, you will need to insert a specific program code. The codes (which ARE case-sensitive) are:

Undergraduate Exceptional Education Program: **UGEXE**

These self-enroll codes are applicable ONLY to courses taken in the department of Exceptional Education (i.e., “EXE” course prefix). If you’re a dual major ExEd/EIEd student, you will need the Elementary Education and Reading Department self-enroll code for their courses (i.e., “EDU” course prefix).

To enter your code, you first log onto TaskStream. In the larger “middle” screen, near the top, you’ll see “If you have a self-enrollment code, click here” followed by a yellow “Self-Enroll” button--click on that. At the resultant screen, enter your code. You’ll know you’ve done this correctly when you click on “My Programs” (at the left) and your respective program shows up in the listing.

If you experience difficulty signing up for your TaskStream account, contact the TaskStream help staff via email at help@TaskStream.com or by phone at 1-800-311-5656. The quality of TaskStream phone support is extraordinary (i.e., you’ll get a truly helpful human being on the phone within 30 seconds), so don’t be afraid to call. **However, please be aware that TaskStream support is not allowed to provide you with the account key code or your department's enroll codes (the ones provided immediately above).** They can walk you through the process of entering the codes, but they cannot GIVE you the codes. There is a handout called "Self Enrolling in TaskStream, Spring 2009" that your professor can provide that addresses this process. If, for some other reason, your subscription and/or self-enrollment problem is not resolved, contact the Exceptional Education Department TaskStream Coordinator, Dr. Sharon Raimondi at raimonsl@yahoo.com.
Transition Points for Assessment and Evaluation

In addition to and in conjunction with the specific artifacts/assessments previously listed, the Exceptional Education Department considers several transition points when assessing candidates’ progression through the program.

The following table illustrates the transition point assessments for the initial exceptional education program (exceptional education-childhood education).
INITIAL PROGRAM- UNDERGRADUATE TRANSITION POINTS with ASSESSMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>Entry to Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Exit from Clinical Practice</th>
<th>Program Completion</th>
<th>After Program Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Initial Teacher Education Program: Exceptional Education/Childhood Education | **ENTERING FRESHMAN**  
(1) successfully completing 12 credit hours of coursework at Buffalo State,  
(2) successfully completing ENG 101 and ENG 102,  
(3) earning grades of C or better in two general education core courses,  
(4) completing the mathematics basic skills competency requirement, and  
(5) earning a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.6. | **MIDPOINT:**  
*EXE 362- Management Plan  
*EXE 364- IEP Assessment  
*EXE 364- Family Intervention Plan  
*EXE 366- Student Assessment Project  
*UNIT ASSESSMENT-Unit Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions I  
Successful completion of courses required for the major (EXE 100, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 366, 367, 368; EDU 211, 310, 311, 312; and EDF 202, 203, 302). Cumulative GPA at or above 2.0. No less than a “C” grade, excluding an “E” grade in EXE 365, 366, 367, or 368; or EDU 310, 311, or 312. | Grade of “C” or Better. Acceptable or Target performance on key assessments (e.g., EXE 420- Lesson Planning, Cooperating Teacher Evaluation) | **UNIT ASSESSMENT-Unit Evaluation of Candidate Dispositions II**  
**UNIT ASSESSMENT-Unit Evaluation of Candidate Pedagogical Knowledge and Skill**  
**UNIT ASSESSMENT-Candidate Exit Survey**  
Cumulative GPA of 2.5 or higher  
Completion of all courses in the major.  
Minimum of 120 total credit hours  
Must pass *NYSTCE Students With Disabilities Content Specialty Test*, ATS-W, LAST, as well as mandated required seminars (Fire & Arson, Child Abuse, |  
*UNIT ASSESSMENT-Employer Survey* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDECLARED or CHANGE of MAJOR</th>
<th>Philosophy Statement</th>
<th>Drug &amp; Alcohol Awareness, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) successfully completing ENG 101 and 102, (2) earning grades of C or better in two core courses, (3) passing the mathematics basic skills competency requirement, and (4) earning a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unit-wide Assessments/Artifacts*
PLAN FOR DISCUSSION
AND ANALYSIS
This is a graphic representation of our department level assessment process.

This illustrates how each component of our program drives the assessment process.

We begin with “teaching” from which assessments/artifacts have been developed. We collect data based on the artifacts and analyze the data. Following the analysis we reflect on the results and refine our program which ultimately impacts the teaching of our candidates.
Plan for Discussion and Analysis

- Data collected each semester (including summer) and collated by department NCATE point person (see timeline in this document).
- NCATE point person disseminates data to department Assessment Committee for evaluation and analysis.
- Department Assessment Committee disseminates data to Dean’s office as well as Teacher Education Unit via Teacher Education Council and/or Teacher Education Unit Assessment Coordinator. This may include specific program assessment data in addition to unit-wide assessment data (e.g., common assessments).
- Program and candidate areas of need are identified based on outcome data.
- We will establish and maintain a department level advisory panel made up of stakeholders (e.g., teacher candidates, alumni, community partners, etc.). Information will be shared and discussed annually.
- Assessment Committee brings areas of need to faculty (via retreats and monthly faculty meetings for discussion and planning). Needs are also discussed via annual report to education program coordinator and department chair.
- Program improvement plan (action steps) created. This involves tasks and timelines for one academic year.
- Program improvement plan (action steps) implemented and revised as needed.

How Data is Shared

The assessment committee and NCATE point person are standing parts of the agenda for the following:

- Biannual department retreats
- Annual committee reports and department reports shared with Dean’s office
- Monthly Chair’s advisory panel meetings
- Monthly faculty meetings
- Ongoing NCATE assessment training (per semester) for adjunct and community partners (as needed). Participants are given assessments/artifacts and results are shared.
- Annual report electronic newsletter and/or factsheet shared with stakeholders (e.g., teacher candidates, community partners, alumni, etc.) and discussed at annual advisory council meeting.
- Data sharing and candidate/program decision making is evidenced by:
  - Numerous minutes available to all faculty found on the Exceptional Education ANGEL faculty resource repository website. All minutes are disseminated within one month of meetings.
  - Curriculum Committee Actions as evidenced by number of course revisions, new course proposals, program revisions, and new program proposals submitted to College Senate Curriculum Committee.
  - Personnel actions/decisions as evidenced by Professional and Welfare Committee Actions.
Plan to Ensure Fairness, Consistency, Accuracy, and Avoidance of Bias in Assessment

- The department faculty work to ensure that assessment instruments and administration procedures are implemented with fairness, consistency, accuracy, and avoidance of bias.

  • Assessments are designed, developed, reviewed, and refined by two levels of department personnel: Assessment Committee and All Faculty.
    ▪ Assessment assignment descriptions designed using parallel forms including assignment description, rationale, program standards, and conceptual framework.
    ▪ Assessment rubrics designed to ensure objectivity in scoring while reducing subjective evaluation.
    ▪ Scoring procedures shared with teacher candidates.
    ▪ Assessment administration schedule designed to consider background and experience of teacher candidates given their place in the program (e.g., scope and sequence).
    ▪ Assessments closely evaluated for bias in language and experiential assumptions.
    ▪ Assessments reviewed annually.
      • Assessments revised on as needed basis

  • Inter-rater reliability training implemented
    ▪ A minimum of once per year, faculty assemble to review assessment procedures to ensure consistent evaluation across reviewers.
    ▪ Adjunct faculty are trained annually to ensure consistent carryover between full and part-time faculty members.
USING DATA TO IMPROVE PROGRAM
USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE & PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS:

CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: (FOCUS ON CONTENT, LEARNER, PEDAGOGY, REFLECTION)

✓ Evaluated purpose and outcomes for each assessment.

✓ Aligned CEC Common Core and Individualized General Core knowledge & skills to all assessments, rubrics, and data reporting tables.

✓ Aligned Buffalo State’s Conceptual Framework to CEC Standards and all components of assessments.

✓ Establishment of “exemplar” bank of assessments.

✓ Developed standard assessments across all programs (i.e., IEP & Lesson Plan).

✓ Formal mentoring process between adjunct and tenured, full-time faculty.

✓ Developing inter-rater reliability training protocol to ensure fidelity in administration and evaluation across faculty.
USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE & PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS:

STUDENT LEARNING: (FOCUSES ON CONTENT, LEARNER, PEDAGOGY, REFLECTION, DIVERSITY)

✓ Revised lesson plan and other assessment artifacts.

✓ Formal process for dissemination of program requirements and changes to all faculty and students.

✓ Hiring of new faculty with target expertise (e.g., transition, severe disabilities, early childhood, etc.).

✓ Practicum requirement revised, disseminated and state-level loophole closed via “fail-safe” planning.

✓ Re-institution of formal Student Teaching Supervisor training/procedure manual.

✓ Annual research symposium established for sharing effective interventions for increased “student learning outcomes”.
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USE OF ASSESSMENT RESULTS TO IMPROVE CANDIDATE & PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

**SUMMARY OF IMPROVEMENTS:**

**PROFESSIONAL & PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, SKILL & DISPOSITIONS:** (FOCUSSES ON CONTENT, LEARNER, PEDAGOGY, TECHNOLOGY, DISPOSITIONS, DIVERSITY, REFLECTION)

- Incorporated detailed listing of CEC Standards knowledge and skills into all assessments.

- Revised Conceptual Framework to make suitable for graduate programs and advanced candidates.

- Writing requirement instituted across all courses.

- Professional writing workshop instituted on annual basis.

- Collaboration with other IHE in nationwide study targeting evaluation of dispositions.

- Ongoing development of disposition evaluation instrument.

- Course and program revisions begun: Will update, clarify and enhance current courses and programming.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHANGES</th>
<th>EVIDENCE THAT REQUIRED CHANGE</th>
<th>STATUS OF CHANGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Candidate writing skills improvement plan: 1) Initiated professional writing requirement across all graduate courses. 2) Designed and offered professional writing workshops/seminars.</td>
<td>NYSTCE writing performance on constructed response was one of weak areas.</td>
<td>• Held two professional writing workshops with additional workshops scheduled for future semesters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Overt Assessment of CEC Standards Revised rubrics and assignment descriptions:  -detailed CEC standard components added to increase sensitivity  -matched rubrics to assignment descriptions  -increased use of language of standards in rubric guidelines  -clarified scoring procedures | Evaluation of assignments and assessments in preparation for reporting NCATE assessment data. | • Revisions complete.  
• Implemented one to two semesters.  
• In process of surveying faculty for assessment/artifact feedback. |
| Disposition evaluation form revision | Faculty and cooperating teacher feedback prompted re-evaluation of form. Reported concerns about extensive nature of piloted disposition forms. Data too broad. Identified need to summarize and focus. | • Assessment committee evaluating various documents for department wide use (as of Fall 2008) |
| Ongoing program evaluation plan: Developed conceptual model for ongoing program evaluation. | Needed graphic to be able communicate assessment process with entire Exceptional Education faculty. | • Developed graphic and shared with faculty. |
| Continuation of department level Assessment Committee targeting. Increased meetings from monthly to tri-monthly. Noted that undergraduate programs are underrepresented on Assessment Committee. | Preparation of SPA report and reviewer feedback. | • Tri-monthly meetings completed. Back to monthly meetings.  
• Faculty will nominate new member of Assessment Committee to represent undergraduate program (Spring 2009) |
Department Assessment Committee

Program Improvement Plan Tasks

Academic Year 2007-2008
Committee Members: Sharon Raimondi (Chair), Kevin Miller, Sarita Samora, Sharon Cramer, Theresa Janczak, Shannon Gormley Budin, and Colleen Wilkinson (student representative).

The committee met on the following dates: 9/11/07, 9/24/07, 10/16/07, 10/23/07, 11/6/07, 11/20/07, 2/12/08, 2/26/08, 3/18/08, 4/1/08, 4/29/08, and additional meetings to prepare the NCATE report and to prepare for the NCATE visit.

Committee Activities

The major emphasis for this committee was to complete the rejoinder for the NCATE report and to prepare for the accreditation review in April. Below are specific activities that helped us prepare for this report. Our action plan for the academic year follows.

Tuesday, September 25

Task 1 (Assessment area 1) – examine CST and Improve Instruction/Preparation

Childhood – undergraduate - Standards 1 and 2

a. Report aggregated licensure data by subtest
b. Report frequency & percentage of candidates who passed each subtest.
c. **ERROR:** said we included as evidence of standard 3, but we did not. (Shannon note)
d. Disseminate State testing faculty resources to improve candidate preparedness for CST.

Tuesday, September 25

Task 2 (Assessment area 2) – examine IEP and Improve Assessment Tool

Childhood – undergraduate – Standards 1, 2, 6

a. Incorporate standards within rubric by elements being measured.
b. Data report table should match/align to rubric
c. Examine standard alignment and match between narrative, rubric, and data report table.
d. Appears assistive technology component is addressed in this assessment & that strategies to enhance communication is included
e. Should consider use for Standard 7
f. Should consider use for Standard 8

Tuesday, October 16

Task 3 (area 3) – examine Lesson Plans  Revise Assessment

Childhood – undergraduate – Standards 3, 4, 7

a. Incorporate the standards within the rubric by the elements being measured.
b. Data report should exactly match rubric...all three elements in rubric should be represented in data table.
c. Be sure standards area aligned and match narrative, rubric & data report.
d. Unclear if they have to consistently implement the plan...Require them to implement plan (or make clearer).

Tuesday, October 23

Task 4 (areas 4 and 6) – examine Student Teaching Evaluation (Cooperating Teacher Survey)- Revise Instrument and syllabus expectations/instruction to align with components of evaluation.

Childhood – undergraduate – Standards 4, 5, 9

a. Questions how final data report determined for 1\textsuperscript{st} data table given the numerous elements under each standard.
b. How are “acceptable” and other ratings determined?
c. Should consider including as evidence of Standard 6.
d. Should consider use for Standard 7
e. Should consider use for Standard 8
f. Should consider use for Standard 10

Tuesday, October 23

Task 5 (area 5) – examine Management Plan- Revise Instrument

Childhood - Undergraduate – Standards 5, 6

a. Although narrative description measures specific Standard 5 items, the rubric is too general.
b. Develop levels of performance that reflect quality of candidate performance vs. how often they do something.
c. Integrate standards into the rubric.
d. Report data by element and the standard.
e. Appears assistive technology component is addressed in this assessment & that strategies to enhance communication is included

Tuesday, November 6

Task 6 (area 6) – examine Assessment Survey—Revise Instrument; Examine Instructional Format (e.g., BLOCK)

Childhood – Undergraduate – Standard 8

a. Doesn’t truly measure “knowledge and skills” of assessment
b. Unclear how assessment is formally and systematically addressed...although informal assessment addressed.
c. Curriculum Committee to complete Block 2 course revision to assist with instructional time and to re-examine course expectations, literature, and overall course update.

Task 7 (area 7) – examine Dispositions—Develop instrument and/or policy and procedure for evaluation.

Childhood - Undergraduate – Standards 5, 6

a. CEC standards need to be incorporated into assessment
b. Continue to examine alternative assessments for dispositions.

Tuesday, November 27

Task 8 (area 8) – examine EBI Survey

Childhood - Undergraduate – Standards 4, 5, 7

a. Weakest and consider Replacing.
Summary of activities:

- The committee revised artifacts for the undergraduate (initial) program to address the comments from the NCATE report.

- The committee redesigned lesson plan formats, lesson plan evaluation forms, cooperating teacher-reporting forms and developed a rubric to evaluate lesson plans.

- The committee conducted 2 workshops to train faculty and students on the use of Task Stream. In Fall 2007 and Spring 2008, students in Block I were trained. No other faculty requested training for their classes.

Status of Goals for the 2007-2008 Academic Year

- Prepare the rejoinder for the NCATE assessment report – completed.

- Continue with the training of the faculty and students in the use of the electronic portfolio – ongoing.

- Align graduate courses with CEC, NCATE, and INTASC standards – completed.

- Develop a system to maintain data on students at both the undergraduate and graduate level. For any given year, these data will include, but not be limited to: (a) number of students who apply to the program, (b) demographic data regarding students (e.g., gender, ethnicity, age, disability status, or major), (c) the number of students accepted/rejected, (d) the number of students who complete the program, (e) the number of students who leave (voluntary leave, asked to leave or fail) the program, (f) the number of students enrolled in various programs and/or seeking extensions (e.g., early childhood, childhood, or adolescence), and (g) the percentage of students employed upon program completion. The committee will develop a system to collect data on employment (date hired, length of employment, areas served), and extent to which areas of high need are served – not completed.

- Develop a system to analyze data regarding progress and performance of students enrolled in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. This committee will develop a system to provide...
feedback and recommendations to the Department on a yearly basis. Implications, trends, and recommendations will be reported: specifically, benchmark and performance data - not completed.

- The assessment committee will review the benchmarks to assess student progress at different points in the undergraduate and undergraduate program (e.g., entry, midpoint, prior to student teaching, and exit) and as appropriate, these benchmarks will be adjusted to meet accreditation standards and/or state and federal standards - ongoing.

- The assessment committee will develop a system gather and analyze data regarding performance of students enrolled in both the undergraduate and graduate programs. This includes, but is not limited to examining individual and cohort data to determine (a) overall performance of student currently enrolled in the program, (b) overall performance of students who graduate from the program, (c) measures of competence (e.g., successful completion of state and national exams) and (d) impact on the field (impact on improving results for children with disabilities) - not completed.

Goals for the 2008-2009 Academic Year

- Revise and revisit NCATE artifacts. Activities may include the following items listed below:
  - Revisit the artifacts developed for the undergraduate and graduate programs. Obtain faculty feedback as to the appropriateness and ease of use for each artifact and corresponding rubric.
  - Continue to investigate method to evaluate student dispositions at both the undergraduate and graduate level.
  - The assessment committee will review the benchmarks to assess student progress at different points in the undergraduate and undergraduate program (e.g., entry, midpoint, prior to student teaching, and exit) and as appropriate, these benchmarks will be adjusted to meet accreditation standards and/or state and federal standards.
  - Develop interrater reliability for selected rating forms

- Investigate and implement strategies to improve the writing skills of students enrolled in the Exceptional Education program

- Investigate alternative ways to evaluate courses offered by the Exceptional Education Department

- Develop a site on TaskStream for all graduate programs.

- Continue with the training of the faculty and students in the use of the electronic portfolio.
MEETING AGENDA TEMPLATE

To ensure ongoing data analysis and program revision, the following items must appear on Assessment Committee Agenda’s throughout the academic year.

PLEASE INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING HEADERS/TOPICS ON EACH AGENDA TO ENSURE COVERAGE OF TOPICS AT ALL MEETINGS:

1. What data were:
   a. compiled?
   b. summarized?
   c. analyzed?

2. To who were data disseminated? (e.g., program faculty, teacher candidates, unit, stakeholders, etc.). When?

3. Action steps/plans to use data to improve program.

4. What were the results of previous data dissemination and analysis?

Note:

Minutes* must be taken at all meetings. They will be disseminated to department faculty and housed on the department repository on ANGEL or other electronic site to be determined (e.g., TaskStream).

*It is advised that faculty maintain minutes at all relevant meetings to reflect data planning, analysis, and sharing among all stakeholders.