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What we’ve done to prepare...

Charge: The development of an expanded assessment system

What we had:

- Guiding Principles
- Admission documents
- Field experience and work sample evaluations
Our goals:

To do a better job of...

- Verifying that each graduate has the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach/counsel/administrate
- Evaluating program effectiveness
- Identifying areas for program improvement
We updated our conceptual framework:

Diversity and Inclusiveness

Preparing professionals to meet our diverse communities’ lifelong educational needs

Evidence-informed Decision Making

Research-based Practices and Professional Standards

Impact on Learning and Development
We developed an assessment plan

Evaluation Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 What do data from state licensure tests reveal about candidates’ content knowledge?</th>
<th>1.1.1 What are the overall pass rates for PSU candidates’ on the Praxis II?</th>
<th>Comparison of scores to “passing score” % who meet or exceed passing score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2 What are the pass rates for PSU candidates’ on the ORELA Multiple Subjects Tests?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comparison of scores to “passing score” % who meet or exceed passing score</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We developed new assessment tools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Written personal statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midpoint(s)</td>
<td>Work samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Field experience evals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>Exit survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up</td>
<td>Follow-up surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer surveys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We purchased a data system
We generated reports
We partnered with an independent evaluator

**EDUVENTURES Custom Reports**

- Principal interviews
- GTEP 2007-08 evaluation
- IAL/CAL 2007-08 evaluation
- Cooperating teacher interviews
We’ve learned a lot

Strengths

Areas for improvement

Action steps
What we’ve learned

Evidence:

- Licensure tests
- Field exper. evals
- Principal surveys

Finding:

Our candidates have the **content knowledge** they need to teach in their subject areas.
What we’ve learned

However, BTP found:
15% disagreed that they had the necessary content knowledge

(Spring 2007 Exit Survey)

Adjustments to structure and content of two courses to give more instruction in content and how to teach it.
What we’ve learned

Evidence:
- Course syllabi
- Work samples
- Follow-up surveys
- Principal interviews

Finding:
Our candidates learn about diversity…but they want still more.
What we’ve learned

**IAL found:**
16% disagreed that program sufficiently reflects “Ensure all learners succeed” (an increase).
(2008 Exit Survey)

Added an equity audit and a culture component to the problem-based learning project.
What we’ve learned

*Cultural Background and Family History project*

CI Master’s–ECE found: On their projects, 0% failed to demonstrate their knowledge of how to create relationships with families that support, empower, and involve them in their children’s learning.

(Cultural Background and Family History project)

Reviewed all course syllabi to ensure it was taught and redesigned key assignment to assess this aspect as well.
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What we’ve learned

Evidence:
- Exit surveys
- Follow-up surveys
- Field experience survey

Finding:
Lower ratings on preparation to use technology and technology support
What we’ve learned

GSE:
Lower ratings on technology

SPED Self-assessment:
Lower ratings on technology

Lib/Media:
Instruction not always explicit; some enter without prerequisite skills

- 135% increase in GSE technology expenditures
- Adaptive technology added to content of SPED 536
- Made required course more robust and added electives
What we’ve learned

Evidence:

Four small explorations 2008-2009

- 2 GTEP Cohorts
- 2 SPED Cohorts

Finding:

Our candidates have an impact on student learning (K-12).
What we’ve learned

*How we know:*

Work samples: Candidates understand basic concepts related to assessment of student learning and apply them

*Data on Learning Gains, Interpretation of Data, Uses of Data, etc.*
What we’ve learned

**How we know:**

Work samples: University supervisors observe instruction and rate student learning gains from *noticeable* to *noteworthy.*
What we’ve learned

How we know:

Work samples: Candidates report learning gains for every student.
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Spring 2009, GTEP Secondary Cohort

Learning Gains: 2009 GTEP Secondary

Percentage Gain

Students: N=347 (54 students had scores for two outcomes)
What we have learned:
We’re getting better at what we do!
Benefits we discovered along the way

- More discussion about courses and field experiences
- More alignment of content within and between cohorts
- Clearer expectations to supervisors, cooperating teachers, and candidates