

How, Who, When Program Assessment Data Are Collected, Analyzed, Monitored and Reported for Program Improvement

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes | How results are reported and monitored |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| Entry/Foundations Benchmark | | | | | | |
| Application to Teacher Education collected during the Entry Workshop. Information Systems Coordinator creates Involvement in university's requirement tracking system. | Compare number of students who apply to number who are admitted and complete the program. | Identifies number of candidates who apply by 1) program and 2) site; information is important for assessing recruitment and retention. | Inform admission, retention & recruiting policies | Annually aggregated in June by Information Systems Coordinator and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Decision to explore having the PRAXIS II requirement be completed before student teaching. | Shared in State and National Annual Reports and with stakeholders for review and advice. |
| Information Systems Coordinator identifies and reports candidates' Graceland GPA from candidates' academic record. | If GPA is below 2.75, candidate develops plan of improvement monitored by advisor. | Formative data to assess candidate's GPA status in relation to admission into Teacher Ed program. | Inform admission and resulting policies. | Candidate data are aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator and analyzed by Teacher Ed Committee and other stakeholders. | Created a Student Support Services to assist candidates with low GPA. Students are now referred to support services by advisors. | Teacher Ed Committee examines each record to assure that candidate meets requirements; EPP and other stakeholders examine evidence to assess program effectiveness. |
| Teacher candidates request faculty to complete Recommendation form; data from the form are collected in Chalk & Wire and completion of requirement is noted by the Information Systems Coordinator in the university's requirement tracking system. | Candidates rated low on two or more references must develop a plan for improvement; monitored by advisor. | Track level of performance of candidates with low ratings on entry into program. | Alerts EPP of candidates who might be cause for concern in relation to Professional Dispositions. | Candidates: prior to admission to program. Stakeholders: evaluate as part of the Disposition Report. | Developed a plan to assess candidate professional dispositions across the program. | Teacher ed Committee examines content to assure that candidate has appropriate dispositions to help students learn. Stakeholders compare responses from Recommendation form with data collected on dispositions across programs and sites. |
| Multicultural Entry/Foundations Survey data are collected online by instructors of the course during the Entry Workshop from survey completed by teacher candidate. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Faculty will change content in courses in event that some areas are weak. | Compare Entry/Foundations Survey results with Professional Survey results to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. | Inform program changes based on level of growth. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Increase attention to content knowledge in areas of weaknesses (differs by site and program). Content of the Multicultural Survey was revised based on analysis of program reports. | Stakeholders examine differences between Entry/Foundations and Professional responses to the Multicultural Survey to identify strengths and areas for improvement, as well as look for consistency over time. Information provides stakeholders opportunity to brainstorm ideas for improvement. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes | How results are reported and monitored |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Entry/Foundations Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| Technology Entry/Foundations Survey data are collected by instructors of the course during the Entry Workshop from survey completed by teacher candidate. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Faculty will change content in courses in event that some areas are weak. | Compare Entry/Foundations Survey results with Professional Survey results to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. | Inform program changes based on level of growth. | Annually aggregated in June by Director of Assessment and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Changed content of survey to align with ISTE-T standards. | Stakeholders examine differences between Entry/Foundations and Professional responses to the Technology Survey to identify strengths and areas for improvement, as well as look for consistency over time. Information provides stakeholders opportunity to brainstorm ideas for improvement. |
| Professional Dispositions: evaluated by Faculty, on request, with the Recommendation form and by course instructors using the Course Disposition rubric (same criteria as the Recommendation form); collected by Cooperating Teachers and University Supervisors during Practicum and Student Teaching using the Clinical Disposition rubric (expanded version of the Course Disposition rubric); and collected from teacher candidates with a mid- and final-self assessment during Student Teaching using the Clinical Disposition rubric. Data are uploaded into Chalk & Wire. | Encourages candidate to develop professional dispositions. Provides faculty opportunity to educate and encourage candidates to develop professional dispositions. | Levels of performance and mean (with standard deviation) of participants on Conceptual Framework and ITASC standards (2, 3, 6, 9, 10) associated with professional dispositions. | Catalyst for direct attention to education in and development of professional dispositions. | | Positive candidate response has strengthened unit commitment to continue to assess dispositions. Some course instructors now, also, assessing dispositions. | Shared in program assessment reports. Stakeholders examine disposition report to assess level of consistency in data over time and across programs and sites. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes | How results are reported and monitored |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Entry/Foundations Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| <p>Review #1 (Entry/Foundations Benchmark)</p> <p>Core course instructors evaluate teacher candidates using the Signature Assessment rubric. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire.</p> | <p>Inform program of candidate progress towards meeting requirements & understanding standards.</p> | <p>Collected data in 2014-15 with the Signature Assessment Rubric</p> | <p>Teacher candidates who earn an Emerging or below will receive support and counseling, and possibly a concerns form.</p> | <p>Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment; analyzed and addressed each semester by course instructors and by other stakeholders in August</p> | <p>On average, teacher candidates achieved a Basic level of performance; there were several who also received a score of Emerging. However, Independence candidates consistently achieved at a Proficient level of performance while teacher candidates on the IHCC and NCMC campuses consistently earned lower than a 3.5 level of performance.</p> | <p>Shared in EPP program assessment reports to identify quality of teacher candidates in the early stages of their education. Stakeholders look for consistency of data over time, across programs and sites as well as method of assessing reliability of data.</p> |
| <p>Admittance to Teacher Education identified and collected by the Information Systems Coordinator from teacher candidate's tracking record.</p> | <p>Faculty advise candidates who fail to meet requirements; and assist where possible.</p> | <p>Compare numbers who apply to numbers admitted and completed.</p> | <p>Inform admission, retention & recruiting policies; identify events that delay or prevent admittance</p> | <p>Annually aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders</p> | <p>Initiated CBASE workshops because it has consistently been the reason for delay in admittance.</p> | <p>Required for Annual Reports. Stakeholders evaluate evidence in relation to number of applicants across programs and sites.</p> |
| <p>C-BASE scores collected from individual candidates' reports that are sent to the institution by the CBASE Assessment Resource Center (ARC) after each CBASE administration. Data are collected in the university's database.</p> | <p>Candidates must achieve 235 or above on the English, Math, Social Studies and Science tests or sub-categories of the test, or retake the test. Faculty provides intervention assistance as needed.</p> | <p>Inform program on level of content knowledge on entry into program and identifies students who fail to have the content knowledge needed to be effective teachers.</p> | <p>Encourages unit to consider strategies to assist candidates to achieve passing scores; encourages course instructors to target areas of weakness.</p> | | <p>After piloting the social studies and science tests in 2013-14 with no requirement to meet a cut-off score, the EPP chose to require that students meet the 235 cut-off score beginning Fall 2015 in order to encourage them to do their very best.</p> | <p>CBASE report is shared with stakeholders as information and opportunity to brainstorm ideas for assessing and potentially improving students' level of content knowledge on entry into the program. Data are sorted and examined by program and site.</p> |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes | How results are reported and monitored |
|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Entry/Foundations Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| Professional ePortfolio created during the Entry Workshop; no program data collected other than Entry Workshop grade recorded by the instructor of the course. | The purpose of the Professional ePortfolio (introduced during the Entry Workshop) is to encourage teacher candidates to highlight their personal educational journey/ experience; may want to share with potential employer or to collect resources for use in the classroom. | EPP program data are not collected. The ePortfolio is shared with at least two other teacher candidates and the instructors of the Entry Workshop. | The portfolio may eventually morph into a Benchmark requirement as evidence of candidate learning. | Course instructors and two other students give feedback on ePortfolio when submitted. Grade is posted each semester by instructor of course. | NA | Currently the Professional ePortfolio is not shared widely because it is not used as Program Assessment data. The EPP has discussed providing opportunity for candidates to share their ePortfolio with stakeholders once it has been more fully developed, towards the end of their program. |
| Methods Benchmark | | | | | | |
| Academic Record (GPA & grades) collected by Information Systems Coordinator from teacher candidates' Graceland academic record. | Candidates must satisfactorily complete an incomplete; implement a plan of improvement if GPA falls below a 2.75; retake Education classes with a grade below a C. Advisors advise candidates as needed. | Average GPA in each course | Plan for program improvement in courses with low performance. | Annually aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Increased required GPA from 2.5 to 2.75 in order to identify potential candidates with high quality content knowledge for helping students learn. | Teacher Ed Committee examines each record to assure that candidate meets requirements; EPP and other stakeholders examine evidence to assess program effectiveness. |
| Practicum Journal Reflections completed by teacher candidate each week; submitted to University Supervisor for feedback. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire. Program Assessment data are not aggregated. | University supervisor guide and advise candidates on ways to improve their skills for purpose of student learning after evaluating their ability to reflect and by responding to the content of their reflections. | Currently not aggregating or presenting as a report for stakeholder analysis. | University supervisor discusses performance with candidate and shares, as needed, with administration; may result in recommendations for program improvement. | University Supervisors give feedback when submitted; data are not aggregated for program assessment by stakeholders | Revised the Practicum Journal rubric to incorporate the new InTASC standards. | University supervisor shares results of evaluation with candidate, cooperating teacher and EPP as needed. Data are not currently included in Program Assessment Reports. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes | How results are reported and monitored |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|---|
| Methods Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| Practicum Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation completed by the Cooperating Teacher using the rubric, Practicum Evaluation by Cooperating Teacher, after observing teacher candidate in the classroom. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire | Candidate reflects on performance and makes appropriate changes for optimal student learning based on cooperating teacher evaluation; faculty respond to concerns identified in evaluation. | Levels of performance and mean (with standard deviation) rated by cooperating teachers on selected InTASC standards and the Conceptual Framework; also correlated with national, State, diversity, and technology standards | Inform program changes in event of recurring weaknesses in performance. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | The EPP evaluated purpose and location of Practicum in the curriculum to optimize candidate's educational experience for student learning. | Stakeholders annually evaluate as program data and make appropriate recommendations for improvement. Stakeholders look for consistency over time, across programs and sites. |
| Practicum University Supervisor Final Evaluation is completed at the end of the Practicum using the Practicum Evaluation by University Supervisor rubric. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire. Data are not currently used for Program Assessment. | Candidate reflects on University supervisor's final evaluation of student work samples, lesson plans, journals, cooperating teacher's evaluation, and timesheet; supervisor feedback encourages candidate improvement, where needed. | Not currently aggregated as program data. | | University Supervisors complete rubric in Chalk & Wire; data are not aggregated for program assessment by stakeholders | EPP is currently exploring location of Practicum in the curriculum in order to increase value for candidates educational experience. | As gatekeeper of Practicum experience, university supervisor shares perceptions and concerns, as appropriate, with Director of Field Experience in relation to teacher candidate performance and cooperating teacher influence. If concerns warrant the action, concerns are shared with Teacher Education Committee. |
| (To be implemented Fall 2015) Review #1 (Methods Benchmark) Core course instructors evaluate teacher candidate using the Signature Assessment rubric. | Inform program of candidate progress towards meeting requirements & understanding standards to facilitate student learning. | Not currently collecting program data. In process of developing the Signature Assignment and Assessment Rubric | Candidates who receive an Emerging or below will receive support and counseling. | Will be annually aggregated by Director of Assessment; analyzed and addressed each semester by course instructors and by other stakeholders in August | NA | Will inform stakeholders on level of candidate performance in relation to key concepts covered during the Methods Benchmark. Will be able to compare results of Signature Assessments from Entry/Foundations Benchmark with Signature Assessments from Methods Benchmark. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes. | How results are reported and monitored. |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Professional Benchmark | | | | | | |
| Academic Record (GPA & grades) collected by Information Systems Coordinator from teacher candidates' Graceland academic record. | Candidates must satisfactorily complete an incomplete; implement a plan of improvement if GPA falls below a 2.75; retake Education classes with a grade below a C. Advisors & Director of TE advise candidates as needed. | Average GPA in each course | Plan for program improvement in courses with low performance. | Annually aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | The EPP is sensitive to the need to counsel candidates out of the program before student teaching if there is any question about success in the classroom. Newest proposal is to require passage of the PRAXIS II prior to student teaching. | Teacher Ed Committee examines each record to assure that candidate meets requirements; EPP and other stakeholders examine evidence to assess program effectiveness. |
| Multicultural Professional Survey data are collected at the end of student teaching from survey completed by student teacher prior to exiting student teaching. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Faculty will change content in courses in event that some areas are weak. | Compare Entry/Foundations Survey results with Professional Survey results to identify areas of strength and weaknesses. | Inform program changes based on level of growth. | | Increase attention to content knowledge in areas of weaknesses (differs by site and program). Content of the Multicultural Survey was a revised based on analysis of program reports. | Stakeholders examine differences between Entry/Foundations and Professional responses to the Multicultural Survey to identify strengths and areas for improvement, as well as look for consistency over time. Information provides stakeholders opportunity to brainstorm ideas for improvement. |
| Technology Professional Survey data are collected at the end of student teaching from survey completed by student teacher prior to exiting student teaching. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | | | | | Changed content of survey to align with ISTE-T standards | Stakeholders examine differences between Entry/Foundations and Professional responses to the Technology Survey to identify strengths and areas for improvement, as well as look for consistency over time. Information provides stakeholders opportunity to brainstorm ideas for improvement. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes. | How results are reported and monitored. |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|---|
| Professional Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| Data are collected from the Student Teachers Required Artifact Evaluation completed by the University Supervisor by the end of student teaching. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Student teacher's analysis of the University Supervisor's evaluation of the Required Artifacts provides him with information for improving lessons, performance and assessment in relation to helping students learn; faculty support performance improvement. | Data inform the EPP on how well student teachers are able to design and implements lessons and assessments for optimal student learning. | Consistent weaknesses facilitate attention to changes in EPP. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Some school districts in Missouri are refusing to allow video-taping in the classroom which requires the EPP to consider how teacher candidates might self assess skills differently. | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Provides stakeholders with opportunity to brainstorm ideas for improvement. |
| Data are collected from the Student Teacher Cooperating Teacher Final Evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Candidates reflect on ability to effectively help students learn based on cooperating teacher evaluation. Faculty respond to concerns identified on evaluation. | Levels of performance and mean (with standard deviation) rated by cooperating teacher on appropriate InTASC standards and the Conceptual Framework; also correlated with national, State, diversity, and tech technology | Inform program changes in event of recurring weaknesses in performance. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Changed rubric used to collect evaluation data based on comments made by cooperating teachers and evaluation of rubric by EPP faculty in effort to find best way to evaluate candidate performance for optimal student learning | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Results can be compared with University Supervisor and Student Teacher Self-Evaluation results. |
| Data are collected from the Student Teacher University Supervisor Final Evaluation at the end of the student teaching experience. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Candidates reflect on ability to effectively help students learn based on university supervisor final evaluation. Faculty respond to concerns identified on evaluation. | | Inform program changes in event of recurring weaknesses in performance. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Changed rubric used to collect evaluation data based on evaluation of rubric by EPP faculty in effort to find best way to evaluate candidate performance for optimal student learning | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Results can be compared with Student Teacher Self Evaluation and Cooperating Teacher results. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes. | How results are reported and monitored. |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Professional Benchmark continued | | | | | | |
| Data are collected from the Student Teacher's Self-Evaluation at the end of student teaching. Data are located in Chalk & Wire. | Encourages candidate to reflect on ability to effectively help students learn; faculty can identify areas of strength and weaknesses to facilitate program/EPP change. | Levels of performance and mean (with standard deviation) on InTASC standards and Conceptual Framework; also correlated with national, State, diversity, and technology standards. | Inform program of changes needed in event of recurring weaknesses in performance in relation to standards. | Annually aggregated by Director of Assessment in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Changed rubric used to collect evaluation data based on evaluation of rubric by EPP faculty in effort to find best way to evaluate candidate performance for optimal student learning | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Results can be compared with University Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher results. |
| The Student Teacher completes the Program Evaluation at the end of student teaching. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire. | Faculty use data to strengthen program to prepare teacher candidates who genuinely care about their students, collaborate effectively, constantly reflect for improvement of student learning, and possess successful leadership skills. | | Data are analyzed to identify strengths and weaknesses in EPP's presentation and content of the program | | Noted weakness in candidate preparation to work with parents and community; commitment to greater emphasis in courses and in student teaching. | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Results can be compared with Cooperating Teachers' Program Report to note level of consistency. |
| The Cooperating Teacher completes the Program Evaluation at the end of student teaching. Data are collected in Chalk & Wire. | The EPP uses data to strengthen program. | | | | Noted weakness in candidate preparation to work with parents and community; commitment to greater emphasis in courses and in student teaching. Also noted communication with unit as area of weakness. Improved communication system. | Report is shared with stakeholders annually which provides them with the opportunity to scrutinize results for consistency over time, across program and sites. Results can be compared with Student Teachers' Program Report to note level of consistency. |

| How Program Assessment data are Collected and Who is Responsible | How assessment event is analyzed to improve performance | Purpose of collecting the data | How data are used to initiate change in program | When and by who data are aggregated and analyzed | Program changes initiated based on data outcomes. | How results are reported and monitored. |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alumni Benchmark | | | | | | |
| The Information Systems Coordinator disperses the Alumni Survey through Survey Monkey to First and Third Year graduates. Survey Monkey provides opportunity to aggregate and report data. | Make appropriate changes in EPP in preparation of teachers for helping students optimally learn. | Levels of performance and mean (with standard deviation) on criteria required by the State of Iowa and additional criteria identified by the EPP. , | Data are shared with stakeholders to identify strengths and weaknesses in the EPP's presentation and content the program. | Annually aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | Giving attention to need for increased time in schools for secondary education candidates. | Report is shared with stakeholders who note consistency of response over time, across program and sites. Look for consistency between qualitative (comments) and quantitative responses. Can also compare Employer and Alumni responses since the questions are virtually the same. |
| The Information Systems Coordinator disperses the Employer Survey through Survey Monkey to employers of First and Third Year graduates. Survey Monkey provides opportunity to aggregate and report data. | Make appropriate changes in preparation of teachers for helping students optimally learn, based on weaknesses identified by employers of first and third year teachers. | | | Annually aggregated by Information Systems Coordinator in June and analyzed in August by stakeholders | While many employers rate Graceland teachers as exceptionally effective teachers, there are some GSOE graduates who fail to "measure up". For this reason, the EPP is increasing rigor and relevance of the program (e.g., content knowledge, time in the classroom) to better prepare all candidates for helping students learn. | |
| The EPP collects questions and concerns or suggestions shared by teacher candidates and alumni as well as the EPP's responses to the questions and concerns or suggestions. | Faculty respond to issues and requests for information when presented by candidate or teacher; information is disseminated to appropriate committee for response. | Emails, notes, letters, phone, personal contact | Data are discussed in meetings and changes are considered and changes made, where appropriate. | Faculty analyze personal issues and requests as soon as possible. Other information is evaluated in August in conjunction with the alumni survey responses. | Increased emphasis on preparing candidates to improve writing skills. | Data are not aggregated or averaged for program assessment but information does provide opportunity to brainstorm for possible solutions when appropriate. |