

Evidence of Reliability and Validity of Data

Content Validity:

- The assessment system is aligned with standards:
 - Council for Accreditation of Educator Programs (CAEP)
 - InTASC, Specialty Professional Associations (SPA)
 - Pritchey-Smith (diversity)
 - ISTE-T (technology)
 - Iowa Teaching
 - Iowa Core
 - Education Preparation Program (EPP) Conceptual Framework.
- Iowa Department of Education requires all Iowa teacher education programs to use the State-designed Employer and Graduate surveys; criteria are aligned with InTASC standards. The EPP added four additional criteria; three are aligned with CAEP standards and the fourth is aligned with InTASC.

Convergent Validity: (multiple persons involved)

- Designing/Revising rubrics is a collaborative process. Those involved use researched guidelines (e.g., faculty who attended the CAEP Fall and Spring conferences returned home with guidelines on how to develop reliable and valid rubrics; the Director of Assessment attended webinars focused on development of evaluation tools including rubrics) to assist them in developing reliable, valid rubrics; rubrics are founded on InTASC and SPA standards. A committee of faculty members meet together to design the rubrics. Once developed rubrics are shared with evaluators (e.g., cooperating teachers) for feedback. The original creators make appropriate changes based on feedback and tag rubrics with correlated standards. The Information Systems Coordinator formats the rubric for ease of use and makes it available to evaluators, teacher candidates, and all faculty.
- Specialty Professional Associations (SPA) examined the rubrics; recommended changes were incorporated into the rubrics.
- The EPP sent rubrics to CAEP for evaluation; (the EPP will make changes in the rubrics based on CAEP recommendations once they are received).
- Faculty of Oral Roberts University provided support and resources during development of the ePortfolio Assessment System.
- Geoff Irving, Director of Chalk & Wire, provided support to EPP during planning, implementation and evaluation of the ePortfolio Assessment System.
- Thelma Seyferth, Director of Research and Systems Analysis, reviewed content of rubrics and provided suggestions used by the EPP to design InTASC rubrics.

Fairness:

- Faculty Handbook, Teacher Education Handbook, Practicum Handbook and Student Teaching Handbook identify policies and procedures.
- Faculty members review policies and procedures at faculty meetings or in faculty retreats.
- Course designated leaders and the Director of Assessment examine syllabi to assure that course objectives and assessment tools are aligned with standards and policy is noted for revisions if requirements are not met.
- All instructors of a course collaborate to identify the Signature Assessment assignment and the Signature Assessment tool.
- Secondary Education faculty discuss expectations related to implementation of Conceptual Framework and standards, (as well as assist in designing the assessment tools).
- Candidates revise required artifacts if they do not meet acceptable or above requirements.

Reliability: (consistency in interpretation of criteria)

- All EPP faculty are expected to evaluate a student teacher (video-taped) using the student teaching rubric; results are aggregated and analyzed for reliability. Evaluators examine results and collaborate on interpretation of criteria to assure consistency.
- All Cooperating teachers are expected to evaluate the same video evaluated by EPP faculty of a student teacher using the same student teaching rubric; results are aggregated and analyzed for reliability.
- University supervisors meet with cooperating teachers prior to the beginning of student teaching to review expectations and resources and to resolve potential questions or issues.
- Cooperating teachers are expected to participate in the Cooperating Teacher Online Workshop prior to the beginning of student teaching. University supervisor and cooperating teacher compare scores on evaluation rubric after observing a student teacher together (rater agreement).

Relevance:

- Program assessment events were intentionally and purposefully selected to measure candidates' and completers' knowledge, performance, and dispositions as follows:
 - **Knowledge:** *How well are candidates prepared in knowledge of students' developmental level, issues related to diversity, the content that they will be expected to teach and knowledge of how to teach?*
 - CBASE
 - PRAXIS II
 - Course Signature Assessments
 - Technology and Multicultural Surveys
 - Practicum – both SPA and InTASC (Standard 4)
 - Student Teaching – both SPA and InTASC (standard 4)
 - Iowa Department of Education's Employer and Graduate Surveys.
 - **Performance:** *How well are candidates prepared to plan, communicate, use a variety of strategies and tools for assessment, and motivate students to learn?*
 - Practicum
 - Student Teaching (Cooperating Teacher and University evaluations)
 - Iowa Department of Education's Employer and Graduate Surveys.
 - **Dispositions:** *How well are candidates prepared to care, collaborate, reflect and lead to facilitate high quality student learning, relate effectively with parents, school personnel and the community, and maintain high quality ethics and integrity?*
 - Faculty Recommendation
 - Cooperating Teacher and University Supervisor Evaluations
 - Candidate Self Evaluations
 - Iowa Department of Education's Employer and Graduate Surveys.
- The EPP intentionally and purposefully uses assessment instruments for stakeholders' evaluation of the EPP program: Candidates, Cooperating Teachers, Graduates, Employers.
- The EPP intentionally and purposefully completes reliability assessments to ensure that data collected are trustworthy.

Verifiability

- Each submitted report includes a description of the item of evidence, an explanation of how the quality of the evidence is assured, an identification of the criteria of success and why/how it was selected. EPP faculty and other stakeholders examine and discuss the reported evidence with subsequent recommendations for program change as appropriate. This information is gathered annually in a Change Chart that identifies changes recommended, implemented and identifies subsequent results. This Assessment Handbook also includes a chart that identifies the program assessment event; 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, and how results are reported and monitored.
- Data reports are evaluated by EPP faculty and administration, employers, graduates of the program, current candidates in both the advanced and initial programs, and institutional representatives.

Representativeness (samples):

Because the number of candidates and graduates are relatively small in number, the EPP makes it a practice to assess all candidates, rather than a representative sample of candidates. The one exception occurs, not intentionally, when gathering data from alumni and their employers. The challenge is not only in locating teachers and their employers but, also, in persuading them to complete and return the survey. For this reason, the unit is aware that data collected may be biased; however, data do identify both positive and negative evaluations of the EPP program which encourages the EPP to accept results as relatively reliable.

Cumulativeness: the EPP intentionally triangulates collection for program assessment as follows:

- **Dispositions:**

Data are collected across the program, beginning with faculty evaluation of a student prior to acceptance into the teacher education program (Recommendation form); evaluation by core course instructors; evaluation by the Practicum Cooperating Teacher; evaluation by the Cooperating Teacher, University Supervisor, and candidate during student teaching. The same rubric is used for course evaluations and Faculty Recommendations, but is expanded to identify InTASC disposition criteria for the Practicum and Student Teacher assessments.

- **Content Knowledge:**

- All core course instructors use the same Signature Assessment Rubric (aligned with national, state, and local standards) to assess students in their respective courses;
- GPA, ACT/SAT scores, CBASE and PRAXIS II scores are examined to identify correlation between outcomes and subsequent performance.
- Assessment data aligned with SPA standards are collected from Cooperating Teachers during the Practicum and from University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers during student teaching.
- Assessment data aligned with InTASC standards are collected from Cooperating Teachers during the Practicum and from University Supervisors and Cooperating Teachers during student teaching.
- Both Entry/Foundations and Professional data are collected from the Technology Survey and the Multicultural Survey which allows for comparison of data over time.

- **Performance:**

- Program data aligned with the InTASC and SPA standards are collected from Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and practicing teachers during the Practicum and student teaching.
- Program data aligned with the InTASC standards are collected from employers and alumni with the Iowa Employers' Survey and the Iowa Alumni Survey every first and third year after graduation from the EPP. The same standards are used as criteria for both surveys so that outcome data can be compared.
- Admissions selection requires that candidates have a minimum 2.75 grade point, "pass" their entrance examination (CBASE), complete their Graduation Plan; "pass" their Clinical Lab and the Entry Workshop, and provide three professional/faculty references. The EPP also identifies students' ACT/SAT scores and uses GPA to compare results with levels of performance on the CBASE. Outcome results indicate that there is a correlation between ACT/SAT scores, GPA and levels of performance on the CBASE. For this reason, the EPP is exploring the possibility of using ACT/SAT scores and GPA to target students who may need interventions prior to completing their CBASE test and possibly cautioning students on their selection of teaching as a career.
- Candidate progress is monitored by collecting disposition data throughout the program, collecting CBASE levels of performance at the beginning of the program and PRAXIS II levels of performance towards the end of the program, requiring candidates to complete both the Entry/Foundations and Professional Multicultural and Technology surveys, collecting performance data during the junior level Practicum and again during the Professional student teaching experience, collecting Signature Assessment data using the same rubric during the Foundation and Methods Benchmarks.
- Completer achievement is monitored by collecting data from graduates/alumni and their employers the first and third year after graduation; identifying and maintaining contact with graduates who have not completed their required PRAXIS II examination; attempting to collect data on student performance in schools where graduates are teaching.

- The EPP is constantly evaluating the effectiveness of programs, advising, structure for completing tasks, administrative and teaching effectiveness, professional development, use of the budget, marketing and retention, meeting accreditation standards, etc.
 - Faculty and staff meet every Wednesday for an hour and a half to consider issues and make decisions related to the operation of the EPP (evidence located in minutes of meetings).
 - Advisory Board meetings occur three times a year in order to share information about the program and gather “advice” from stakeholders (evidence located in minutes of meetings).
 - Student teachers, Cooperating Teachers, graduates/alumni and employers evaluate the program annually. Data results are reviewed for potential program change.
 - Individual Committees meet at least once a month but often two or three times a month to make decisions related to meeting requirements of national, state, and local standards and requirements (evidence located in minutes of meetings).
 - The Teacher Education Committee meets at least once a month to review and make decisions related to teacher candidate progress in the program.
 - The Dean of the GSOE meets with faculty members annually to review goals and performance (evidence is located in the Vice President of Academic Affairs’ office)
 - The Dean of the GSOE submits three-four reports a year to the Vice President of Academic Affairs on status of professional development, use of budget, marketing and retention, etc. This information is then provided to the Board of Trustees.

- **CAEP Standards:**

The EPP either provides outcome data for CAEP standards or has a plan to respond to standards for which there is no data at this time:

Standard 1

- All program assessment rubrics are tagged with CAEP, InTASC, Iowa Teaching, and the Conceptual Framework standards.
- Outcome data from the Alumni and Employer Surveys (2014-15) identify outcomes on how well graduates use research and evidence to measure P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice. Outcome data from the Student Teaching Required Artifact Unit Lesson Plans will identify (to be implemented Fall 2015) how well student teachers use research and evidence to measure P-12 students’ progress and their own professional practice.
- SPA data are collected from candidates’ student teaching practice (2013-2015) and will be collected from their Practicum and the Signature Assessments (2015-16).
- The Alumni and Employer Surveys ask how well the EPP prepared teachers to focus on and how well the teacher focused on college- and career-ready standards in lessons.
- All syllabus grids identify alignment of course content with ISTE-T standards; the Student Teaching Required Artifact Unit Lesson Plans requires student teachers to identify how technology is incorporated into Lesson plans. The Alumni and Employer Surveys ask teachers and their employers how well their EPP prepared them to use technology to enhance instruction and how well they performed.

Standard 2

- The Director of Field Experience regularly attends collaborative events for schools and universities to consider issues related to student teaching.
- The Graceland Agreement form outlines expectations and guidelines for placement of student teachers into general education school classrooms. The Graceland Agreement form outlines expectations and guidelines for placement of student teachers in Professional Development School classrooms.
- The EPP provides a summary of feedback from teacher candidates and employers after completing mock interviews.
- The EPP provides evidence that faculty and adjuncts meet together to assure course content in multiple sections of the same course are presented with consistency.

Standard 3

- The EPP analyzes evidence that teacher candidates are required to meet (and identifies the level at which they meet) rigorous admission standards including a GPA cohort average of 3.0 and successful completion of the entrance examination (CBASE).
- The EPP provides evidence that teacher candidates meet expectations of performance in relation to professional dispositions when evaluated in multiple different circumstances across the program by multiple evaluators.
- The EPP created two separate charts to demonstrate how elementary and secondary education candidates progress in an organized way toward licensure.
- The EPP provides evidence that teacher candidates meet requirements in their career area and uses PRAXIS II scores as evidence.

Standard 4

- The EPP provides evidence that student teachers meet the EPP's standards (but there is no evidence that students are learning from the student teacher).
- The Pre- and Post-Assessment (one of the Student Teaching Required Artifacts) provide evidence that student teachers meet the EPP's expectations but there is no evidence that students are learning from their student teacher.
- The report notes that the EPP collects data from Employers and Alumni every 1st and 3rd after graduation but that the "n" is too low to assure reliability of the evidence. There is no mention of student learning or level of satisfaction of employers and alumni in relation to the EPP.
- The Iowa Department of Education identifies length of employment in public schools and employer satisfaction of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd year Graceland graduates .
- The Student teacher Program evaluation provides evidence that student teachers are pleased with Graceland's teacher education program.

Standard 5

- The EPP presents a chart that identifies the schedule for collecting, aggregating, reporting, and analyzing data to identify potential program changes. In addition, the EPP presents a Change Chart that tracks events, changes implemented, and results of changes implemented that initiate additional need for changes. The chart also identifies how evidence is shared with stakeholders so that they can assist with program evaluation, improvement, and identification of models of excellence.
- The EPP also provides a chart that identifies how program assessment events are correlated with the five CAEP standards.
- The EPP includes a document that identifies how the EPP assures reliability and validity of assessment data in relation to: Content Validity, Convergent Validity, Stakeholder Interest, Fairness, Reliability, Relevance, Verifiability, Cumulativeness, Establishment of Benchmarks, Vulnerability to Manipulation, and Actionability.
- The EPP provides an annual calendar that outlines its schedule for collecting, aggregating, reporting, and analyzing data.

Stakeholder Interests:

Answers questions as to why/how information from data reports are of interest to individual stakeholders (employers, school personnel, completers, perspective candidates, candidates, program faculty, etc.)

- **Standardized test data** (CBASE, ACT/SAT, GPA, PRAXIS II) –
 - What level of content knowledge is expected of entry level students?
 - How do entry level students compare with other candidates who become effective P-12 teachers?
 - How do completers' performance on the PRAXIS II exams compare with other completers who are effective P-12 teachers?
- **Multicultural and Technology Surveys**
 - What level of knowledge and experience in technology and multicultural issues do completers bring with them into the classroom?
 - What do candidates need to know about technology and multicultural issues in order to be effective teachers –i.e., help students learn?
 - How well does the GSOE program prepare candidates in relation to multicultural and technology standards?

- **Dispositions**
 - What professional skills are expected of teacher candidates and completers?
 - How well prepared are GSOE teacher candidates in relation to professional dispositions associated with the EPP's conceptual framework?
 - How confident can an employer and/or school personnel be that Graceland prepares teachers with exemplary personal and professional ethics and integrity who are known for their ability to care, collaborate, reflect and lead?
- **Signature Assessments**
 - What level and rigor of content and pedagogical knowledge are students/candidates expected to achieve in their core courses?
 - How proficient are candidates by the end of Entry/Foundations Benchmark, Methods Benchmark and Professional Benchmark in content and pedagogical knowledge? In relation to InTASC and SPA standards?
- **Practicum**
 - What criteria are assessed during the practicum and are the result reliable? Is this sufficient? How rigorous are the expectations?
 - How much clinical practice have completers had; when, with whom, and where? Is it sufficient?
 - How well did candidates perform during their practicum? Are there areas of concern that appear repeatedly?
- **Student Teaching** (evaluation by cooperating teacher and university supervisor)
 - How much clinical practice have completers had, when, with whom, and where? Is it sufficient?
 - How well did candidates perform during their student teaching? Are there areas of concern that appear repeatedly?
 - What criteria are assessed during student teaching and are the results reliable? Are there sufficient and useful criteria to determine level of preparedness of the completer? How rigorous are the expectations?
- **Student Teaching** (Required Artifacts)
 - What criteria are assessed in the Student Teaching Required Artifacts and are the results reliable? Are there sufficient and useful criteria to determine level of preparedness of the completer? What are the expectations and how rigorous are they?
 - How well did candidates perform in the Required Artifacts (creating unit lesson plans; assessing student learning; reflecting, and making appropriate changes)? Are there areas of concern that appear repeatedly?
- **Program Evaluation**
 - What are the strengths of the program? Weaknesses? Over time?
 - How does the program rate in relation to the Conceptual Framework? Diversity? Use of technology? Meeting Iowa Teaching standards? Iowa Core Standards? InTASC standards? SPA standards? CAEP standards?
 - How well does the program prepare candidates in relation to content knowledge? Opportunities for and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice? Professional dispositions?
 - How satisfied are evaluators (i.e., cooperating teachers and student teachers) with EPP communication?
- **Employer and Alumni Surveys**
 - What are the strengths of the program? Weaknesses? Over time?
 - How does the program rate in relation to preparing teachers who care, collaborate, reflect and lead; to meet the requirements of the InTASC standards; to use technology; to network with parents; to identify research evidence in relation to student learning; to focus on college- and career-ready standards?

Benchmarks: established “best practices”

- **GPA:** average of 2.75 or above
- **CBASE:** 235 or above in all subjects (English, math, social studies, science) or sub-categories of the subject. By 2016-17 performance on nationally normed ability/achievement should be in top 50% of the distribution; in top 40% of the distribution from 2018-19; in top 33% of the distribution by 2020.
- **PRAXIS II:** 80% pass rate on content test and on pedagogy test; consistent with or above State norms.
- **Multicultural Professional-Survey:** rating of three (3) or above – “Working Knowledge and Understanding” on the Professional-Survey.
- **Technology Professional-Survey:** rating of three (3) or above – “Regularly” [do the activity]- on the Professional-Survey.
- **Dispositions:** rating of Proficient (7/8 on a scale from 1-10; 4 on a scale from 1-5) or above by the end of the program (student teaching).
- **Signature Assessment:** rating of Proficient (4 on a scale from 1-5) or above.
- **Practicum:** rating of Emerging (2 on a scale from 1-5) or above with no more than two Emerging. If any item is at the Novice level, the teacher candidate must improve the item.
- **Student Teaching:** rating of Basic (3 on a scale from 1-5) or above.
- **Student Teaching Required Artifacts:** rating must be Basic (3 on a scale from 1-5) or above or candidate will need to revise the product and resubmit.
- **Program Evaluations** (Cooperating Teacher, Student Teacher): an average rating of Proficient (4 on a scale from 1-5) or above.
- **Employer Survey:** rating of “Very Well” (4 on a scale from 1-4) to the questions of “How well is your teacher prepared to...” And “How well does your new teacher perform...”
- **Alumni Survey:** rating of “Very Well” (4 on a scale from 1-4) to the questions of “How well did your preparation program prepare you to...” and “How well do you perform...”

Vulnerability: program assessment data are triangulated as follows:

- The CBASE performance is compared with ACE/SAT scores, GPA, and PRAXIS II results. Scores can be compared by site and program.
- Multicultural and Technology Surveys include both an Entry/Foundations - and Professional response. Outcomes can be compared by site and program.
- Signature Assignments will be completed in every core course by all candidates. Outcomes can be compared by candidate over time, between courses, between cohorts over time, by site and program.
- Practicum candidates are evaluated by cooperating teachers and university supervisors on different tasks (Cooperating Teachers assess candidate performance; University Supervisor assesses candidate journal reflections, lesson reflections, student work samples, timesheet, and monitors lesson plans and Cooperating Teacher evaluations plus gives the final grade).
- Student Teachers are evaluated, using the same rubric, by Cooperating Teachers, University Supervisors, and self-assessed by student teacher. Outcomes are compared by site and program.
- Student Teaching Required Artifacts are evaluated by University Supervisors and can be compared by site and program.
- Cooperating Teacher and Student Teacher Program Surveys focus on basically the same questions so outcomes can be compared.
- Employer Survey and Alumni Surveys focus on basically the same questions so outcomes can be compared.

Actionability

- Because the assessment tools collect data based on observable/measurable behavior, the outcomes provide specific guidance for potential improvement in the program.
- All data can be disaggregated by program and site.
- Data reports are evaluated, interpreted, with recommended program response, by multiple stakeholders (e.g., candidates, alumni, school personnel, faculty and others) annually.