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# Purpose of Assessment Handbook

The purpose of CUA’s Teacher Education Assessment Handbook is to provide for candidates, Program Coordinators, faculty, and other stakeholders a description of outcome assessment practices effected in all CUA teacher education programs to ensure a full and systematic implementation of the system. Furthermore, this document provides guidelines for the teacher education faculty’s strategic planning, budgetary, and academic initiatives by methodically coordinating teaching, learning, and assessment activities on programmatic and Educator Preparation Program (unit) levels. Data collected in CUA’s Educator Preparation Program (EPP) assessment system serve as a foundation for data-based decision-making, policy recommendations, suggestions for program improvement and curricular renewal, as well as reporting obligations.

This document delineates CUA’s EPP assessment system, which is based on CUA’s vision, mission, strategic plan, and program goals and lists key assessments that are aligned with CUA’s conceptual framework, professional, and InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards. Furthermore, this handbook describes assessment processes and procedures, more specifically; it provides an overview of assessment data collection, use, and documentation; i.e., how and when performance-based assessment data are collected by whom from what source, and how the collected data are analyzed, aggregated, and disaggregated for the purposes of improving candidate performance and program effectiveness. This handbook also outlines the EPP’s committee structure and how the various committees review data for improving candidate learning and program operations. Likewise, this document depicts CUA’s information technology, LiveText, used for collecting data; the method of monitoring data collection from candidates and faculty members; and the assurance of fairness, accuracy, and consistency along with the elimination of bias in candidate assessment. This document concludes with the description of procedures for handling candidate complaints and an inventory of program assessment tools.

# Overview of The Catholic University of America

The Catholic University of America (CUA) is a private institution located in the nation’s capital, Washington, D.C. With an enrollment of 3,144 graduate and 3,694 undergraduate students, CUA is unique in its position as the national university of the Catholic Church and the only higher education institution founded by the U.S. Bishops.

*University History*

The decision to found CUA was made by the United States bishops on December 2, 1884. Pope Leo XIII gave the decision his formal approbation on April 10, 1887. A certificate of incorporation was registered in the District of Columbia on April 21, 1887. After papal approval of the University’s first constitution was given on March 7, 1889, the doors of Caldwell Hall were opened to thirty-seven students of the sacred sciences on November 13, 1889.

Established as a graduate research-oriented institution, CUA was considered unique among Catholic institutions of higher education of the day because it evolved from the bishops’ realization that the American Catholic Church should actively participate in the then novel intellectual enterprise of graduate research-oriented education. CUA became the principal channel through which the modern university movement entered the American Catholic community. CUA’s expansion into the arts and sciences began with the opening, in 1895, of what were called at the time the “faculties for the laity.” Instruction in law was included. Within 15 years of CUA’s 1889 opening, the offering of undergraduate programs was approved by the Board and supported by the faculty. Today CUA offers 51 doctoral, 78 master's, 12 joint master’s, and 73 baccalaureate programs. CUA also offers first professional degrees in law, theology, and architecture, joint master’s programs in law and other academic disciplines and joint master’s programs in library and information science and other academic disciplines. CUA remains the only university within the United States to offer both civil and ecclesiastical degrees.

A structural evolution led to a comprehensive academic reorganization in 1930. In that year the College and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences were established. Since that time, additions and reorganizations have resulted in a complex of 12 faculties or schools: Architecture and Planning, Arts and Sciences, Business and Economics, Cannon Law, Engineering, Law, Music, Nursing, Philosophy, Professional Studies, Social Service, and Theology and Religious Studies.

*University Vision and Mission*

As a Catholic university, CUA desires to cultivate and impart an understanding of the Christian faith within the context of all forms of human inquiry and values. Through its academic programs, CUA seeks to educate men and women who can represent their respective fields and professions with distinction and who are shaped by the learning and values inherent in its academic and Catholic traditions. As a member of the American academic community, CUA accepts the standards and procedures of academic institutions and strives to achieve distinction within the academic world.

The mission of The Catholic University of America is to discover, preserve and impart truth in all its forms through scholarship, research, and teaching so as to serve the needs of society, the nation, and the Church. As a university, it has a responsibility to seek the truth with singular determination and to be an intellectual center of the highest quality. As a Catholic university, it is a place where the relation between revealed truth and human truth is examined in depth and with authority. The University is comprehensive in the scope of its academic disciplines and fosters an academic culture that gives primacy in its educational programs to the integration of Catholic values and fundamental scholarship as well as to the examination of the relationship between faith and reason. The Catholic University of America is convinced that faith is consistent with reason and that theology and other religious studies themselves profit from the broader context of purposeful critical inquiry, experimentation, and reflection. As a community of service, the University makes an indispensable contribution to the Church, to society at large, and to the local community. (http://www.cua.edu/mission)

# Overview of CUA’s Educator Preparation Provider and Its Organizational Structure

CUA’s Educator Preparation Provider (EPP), accredited by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) (formerly known as NCATE) since 1975, is comprised programs offered at the Department of Education and the Department of Library and Information Science, both housed in the School of Arts and Sciences, and the Benjamin T. Rome School of Music.The Department of Education is the EPP’s governing unit for all programs that prepare teachers and other professional school personnel. Hereafter in the document, ‘EPP’ will refer to the professional education unit composed of programs at the Department of Education, the Department of Library and Information Science, and the Benjamin T. Rome School of Music; ‘the governing unit’ will refer specifically to the Department of Education. The governing unit coordinates Educator Preparation Programs through the Council of Teacher Education (described in detail in Section 5), and the Director of Teacher Education is the Certification Officer for all professional, state approved programs.

The EPP offers programs at two levels – initial and advanced. At both levels the reflective-practitioner conceptual framework (described in Section 4) undergirds the preparation of teachers and other professional personnel.

CUA’s EPP offers the following teacher education programs on the undergraduate and graduate levels:

**A. Department of Education**

Undergraduate Level

* Early Childhood Education (Initial)
* Elementary Education (Initial)
* Secondary Education (Initial)
	+ English, Mathematics and Social Studies

Graduate Level (Graduate Teacher Certification [GTCP] and Master’s [MA])

* Secondary Education (Initial)
	+ English, Mathematics and Social Studies
* Early Childhood Special Education (Initial)
* Special Education (Initial)

**B. Department of Information and Library Science**

Graduate Level (Graduate Teacher Certification [GTCP] and Master’s [MA])

* School Library/Media Specialist (Advanced)

**C. Benjamin T. Rome School of Music**

Undergraduate Level

* General-Choral Music Education (Initial)
* Instrumental Music Education (Initial)
* Combined General-Choral and Instrumental Music Education (Initial)

The Department of Education offers *initial* *undergraduate* teacher education programs in early childhood education, elementary education, and secondary education (as a joint program with English, history/social studies, and math). The department offers *initial graduate* teacher education programs in secondary education (English, social studies, and math), early childhood special education, and special education.

The Catholic University of America is accredited by the Middle States Commission on Higher Education; the EPP is accredited by CAEP, and all its teacher education programs are state approved and have been reviewed by CAEP’s Specialized Professional Associations. The following programs have received national recognition: elementary education, special education, and secondary mathematics education. The following reports are recognized with conditions: early childhood special education, secondary English education, and secondary social studies. The early childhood program report was submitted to NAEYC in March 2014.

The Department of Library and Information Science offers an *advanced graduate* program for school library media specialists. The Department of Library and Information Science has been continuously accredited by both CAEP and the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC), and the school library media program has been recognized by the American Library Association (ALA) since 1948.

The Benjamin T. Rome School of Music offers *initial undergraduate* programs in general-choral music education, instrumental music education, and combined general-choral and instrumental music education. The Benjamin T. Rome School of Music has been continuously accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (a CAEP affiliate) for over 50 years.

All programs are offered on campus with the exception of the school library media program, which offers classes both on and off campus, at the Library of Congress, Richmond, and Northern Virginia (including Loudoun County and Fairfax). The school library media program is also offered in a blended format, through distance learning technologies.

The Director of Teacher Education is responsible for the assessment system at the Department of Education, and the Unit Head, who also serves as the Chairperson of the Department of Education, directs, with input from the Director of Teacher, the unit assessment system of all teacher education and school personnel preparation programs at all three constituents of the unit.

# Conceptual Framework

The next section provides an abbreviated, 4-page description of CUA’s conceptual framework and includes the conceptual framework standards, evidence of CUA’s conceptual framework describing CUA’s shared vision, coherence, professional commitments and dispositions, commitment to addressing diversity of student needs, and commitment to technology.

CUA uses its conceptual framework to scaffold candidates’ reflection as they analyze their thoughts and actions in order to improve their practice. Through the use of visual representation, the framework increases candidates’ conceptual understanding of complex pedagogical challenges and dilemmas and organize their ideas about responding in a morally defensible manner. Faculty use the conceptual framework to operationalize assessment of previously identified knowledge, skills, and dispositions through the use of multiple assessments at various transition points in the assessment system.

*4.a. History of the Conceptual Framework*

The Educator Preparation Program’s first conceptual framework was developed in 1989 to help university educators design consistent and coherent teacher education programs and to help candidates understand the deeper issues of social justice and equity embedded in the technical questions of day-to-day teaching. The framework was built on the fundamental interrelationships between educational theories, meaningful interaction with P-12 students, and personal reflection throughout the teacher education program and was framed around the theme of *Reflective Practitioner*. Course assignments and field experiences starting at the beginning of each program and culminating as a capstone experience during the student teaching semester were planned around this philosophical approach to teacher education, requiring gradually richer understanding and application of the reflective framework. By the end of each program the capstone experience included a large action research project based on research and current best practices and reflection as well as the standard semester-long student teaching duties. One of the major goals was to help candidates infuse the technical aspects of teaching with moral considerations so that candidates would think beyond the “how to” of teaching to examine the goals, consequences, and values of their words and actions from multiple viewpoints.

Faculty members decided to revisit the conceptual framework in 2003 based on feedback from candidates and new faculty. Professors reported that many candidates were only developing a superficial understanding of the framework. While the dedication to meaningful interaction with P-12 students and personal reflection were evident in individual courses, faculty identified integration between courses and programs as the next area for improvement. While originally designed to be an ongoing, iterative, and integrated process, documents and diagrams conveyed a static, compartmentalized process. The updated conceptual framework continues to serve as the cornerstone of education programs and as a guide to a moral approach to teacher preparation and learning. The updated conceptual framework was written with the candidates, rather than the faculty, as the target audience, and each teacher education program, course, and key assessment has been reviewed to see how they present together a scaffolded, developmentally appropriate course of study. Faculty members in and out of the teacher education programs were consulted to ensure the resulting document represents the perspective of the Educator Preparation Provider as a whole. The essence of the original three-pronged approach to reflective practice remains, but the new model has been received enthusiastically as being readily accessible to all educators, from novice candidates to master teachers.

*4.b. Components*

The Educator Preparation Program’s conceptual framework is seen as a mechanism to allow educators at all experience levels to move fluidly between philosophy, theory, practice, and personal reflection. To accomplish this task, the framework introduces three components to guide reflections and decision-making. One component consists of the elements of the learning environment (see Figure 1). These elements are designed to help educators systematically analyze the complexities of each teaching and learning experience. Originally based on Schwab’s (1973) four commonplaces of teacher, student, content and context, the new model expands the model to include eight elements: diversity of student needs, the educator’s personal educational beliefs, stakeholders, collaborative practice, instructional strategies, discipline knowledge, assessment, and classroom structures. Candidates are guided through exercises that address these elements individually and then in concert. Key features of this component include the role of the learner as the central figure in every teaching/learning experience and the interactive nature of the elements (for example, it is meaningless to consider assessment without considering the needs of the learner and the nature of the discipline knowledge being assessed, just as stakeholder expectations and personal beliefs shape the classroom structures used). Echoing Bronfenbrenner’s work (1989), candidates are expected to consider the learning environments as embedded within larger social structures as well (see Figure 2).



**Figure 1: Eight Elements of the Learning Environment**

It is tempting for educators, especially teacher education candidates, to focus on the day-to-day technical aspects of teaching. At this level, all challenges are viewed as problems to be solved with whatever tools are currently available. While it is important not to minimize the importance of these daily challenges that all educators face, the conceptual framework is designed to help educators move beyond the surface level of teacher-as-technician to see the larger systematic impact classroom practice has on individual students and society in general.
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**Figure 2: Global Perspectives of Education**

The second component of the reflective practitioner framework builds on the work of Berlak and Berlak (1981) to describe and define fundamental educational essential questions, or dilemmas, that lie under the surface of classroom challenges. Reflective practitioners need to stop to consider how one’s perspective on these key questions can both inform and limit the options that seem reasonable in a given situation. Using this component of the framework, educators can explore a broader range of possible solutions for a given situation by recognizing that there are multiple, morally defensible positions. This process helps candidates address two of the most challenging elements of the learning environment: the impact of their own philosophy on their classroom choices and the possibly competing needs and values of the other stakeholders in the learning community. When considering options to best meet the needs of a non-English speaking P-12 student, for example, the answers to large questions of curriculum (e.g., who decides what is worth knowing?), control (e.g. who sets the standards?) and society (e.g. what role should schools play in enculturation?) shape the strategies that seem reasonable. Not only do these essential educational questions impact decisions on a practical level, they also help situate ongoing classroom concerns in larger philosophical questions.

 To continue that process of considering larger philosophical issues, the third component of the three-prong approach to reflective practice consists of an iterative reflective decision-making process (see Figure 3). Reflective practitioners must consider their decisions on three different levels (Van Mannen, 1977), or modes of reflection as CUA call them. The philosophical mode prompts the educator to consider the role that education should play in society in general and in the life of the particular child. Each decision should be examined for consistency and efficacy in supporting those larger goals. The descriptive mode addresses the technical issues of how educational decisions are carried out. Educators must strive to assess their own practice and to look for new methods to meet the needs of individual learners. The interpretative mode encourages the reflective practitioner to consider the explicit and hidden messages sent to students and all stakeholders by classroom decisions. Are expectations uniformly high? Are the knowledge, skills and cultural traditions children bring to class valued or marginalized? Are parents seen as partners or obstacles? These types of questions move the reflective practitioner back to the larger philosophical questions to begin the process again. While it does not matter if the initial question is descriptive, interpretive, or philosophical, the model prompts the educator to see the process as ongoing and interrelated.

**Figure 3: Modes of Reflection**

# Philosophical Mode

***Why*** are things the way they are, and what ought to be?

# Interpretative Mode

***How*** is it understood by all stakeholders?

# Descriptive Mode

***What*** happens? What could happen?
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 Through the recent revision process, the Educator Preparation Program has renewed its commitment to reflective practice at the Educator Preparation Program level. By taking the time to talk about what larger goals the Educator Preparation Program has for itself and its candidates, the Educator Preparation Program is once again actively modeling the iterative process of reflective practice. Scoring guides at all levels have been revised to explicitly call out the role of meaningful reflection in key assignments. The new CUA Conceptual Framework Standards have become an essential part of the student teaching mentoring and evaluation process also. The action research project remains the capstone artifact of the student teaching experience, but it has been revised to allow more time at the end of the semester for reflecting on candidates’ personal growth during the student teaching experience. A new requirement, the electronic portfolio, required of education program completers, creates an opportunity for the candidates to review the entire program and to reflect on how the course of study as a whole prepares them for the tasks ahead using relevant professional standards. Courses and assignments have been aligned with one another to provide a coherent and scaffolded learning program and have been aligned with SPA and the revised CUA conceptual framework standards.

**4.c. CUA Conceptual Framework Standards**

Key assessments in all programs are aligned with CUA’s conceptual framework standards, and candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions related to these standards are assessed regularly and systematically in LiveText.

CUA 1. ELEMENTS OF THE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

CUA 1.1 Demonstrates understanding of all eight elements of the learning environment

CUA 1.2 Uses the elements while observing and analyzing the teaching/learning process

CUA 1A Personal educational beliefs

CUA 1A.1 Understands the ways one’s own personal education beliefs affect the teaching/learning process

CUA 1B.2 Understands the cultural, historical and philosophical influences on education

CUA 1B. Diversity of Student Needs

CUA 1B.1 Understands the intellectual, emotional, social, and physical development as well as cultural and spiritual needs of students

CUA 1B.2 Understands the impact of a student’s interest, prior knowledge, exceptionalities and learning style on his/her learning

CUA 1C Stakeholders

CUA 1C.1 Understands the roles and impact of various stakeholders on the educational enterprise

CUA 1C.2 Communicates intelligently and sensitively with students, parents, colleagues, and other stakeholders

CUA 1C.3 Understands institutional and legal factors, which affect each situation

CUA 1D Collaborative practice

CUA 1D.1 Uses effective communication skills in collaboration with stakeholders to meet each individual child’s unique needs

CUA 1D.2 Able to access and share various resources (colleagues, educational research, and best practices)

CUA 1E Discipline knowledge

CUA 1E.1 Possesses well developed understanding of content knowledge

CUA 1E.2 Possesses sufficiently broad liberal arts knowledge to allow development of cross-disciplinary thematic units

CUA 1F Instructional strategies

CUA 1F .1 Links subject matter to students’ interest and prior knowledge

CUA 1F .2 Plans instruction within broadly conceived, integrated units

CUA 1F .3 Understands a wide variety of effective teaching strategies including various materials and technologies

CUA 1F .4 Implements a wide variety of effective teaching strategies

CUA 1F .5 Differentiates instructional strategies to meet the needs of individual students

CUA 1G Classroom structures

CUA 1G.1 Creates and maintains a positive learning environments in and out of the classroom using preventive measures whenever possible

CUA 1G.2 Uses classroom management and instructional techniques to increase/maintain high motivation in learners

CUA 1G.3 Understands institutional and legal factors which affect each situation

CUA 1H Assessment

CUA 1H.1 Understands the different types of assessments for classroom use (formative vs. summative, informal vs. formal)

CUA 1H.2 Uses appropriate assessment and applies its outcome to improve instruction

CUA 1H.3 Understands the nature, purpose and results of standardized assessment and can communicate it to others

CUA 2. EDUCATIONAL DILEMMAS

CUA 2.1 Understands how student learning is affected by various types of educational dilemmas

CUA 2.2 Understands how different personal educational beliefs can result in multiple, defensible solution strategies for educational dilemmas

CUA 2.3 Describes observed educational phenomena in terms of educational dilemmas

CUA 3. THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS

CUA 3.1 Asks morally oriented questions about the worth, values, purpose, goals and outcomes of learning and instruction using the philosophical component of the decision making process

CUA 3.2 Analyzes a situation from several different perspectives and ponders the meaning and impact of various courses of action using the interpretive component of the decision making process

CUA 3.3 Considers various instructional and management options to improve student learning using the descriptive component of the decision making process

CUA 3.4 Understands and uses the different components of the decision making process in, on, and for reflection

CUA 3.5 Uses the complete decision making process to address educational problems and dilemmas in the learning environment

CUA 3.6 Articulates educational decisions based on educational values and philosophy, curriculum and learning theories, research findings, student or societal needs

***4.d. Evidence of CUA’s Conceptual Framework***

The following paragraphs state how the Educator Preparation Program’s vision is shared, and how the conceptual framework provides coherence in program delivery including curriculum, instruction, field experiences, and assessment. The conceptual framework also showcases the Educator Preparation Program’s professional commitment to teaching candidates the necessary knowledge, skills, and dispositions to impact diverse P-12 students’ learning through the use of technology. The alignment of candidate proficiencies with professional and institutional standards is also included in the conceptual framework document.

*Shared Vision*

As the conceptual framework states, the Educator Preparation Program strives to prepare candidates to become self-directed teachers who use their knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach diverse P-12 students and use their reflective skills to improve their own practice. In order to be successful, CUA candidates are taught to actively, persistently, and carefully confront moral and ethical issues and dilemmas in schools to provide the highest quality of education for all students in a global and diverse world.

CUA’s revised conceptual framework, consistent with CUA’s vision, more coherently articulates the core values of scholarship, excellence, integrity, respect, confidence, and personal faith (USCCB, 1995) that CUA candidates are expected to exemplify. The conceptual framework is supported by a knowledge base that is rooted in research and best practices regarding human development, educational foundations, exceptionality, content knowledge expertise, instructional strategies, assessment, and collaboration.

The EPP has an overall conceptual framework for the teacher education programs in the Department of Education, the Department of Library and Information Services, and the Benjamin T. Rome School of Music. The conceptual framework is shared with stakeholders including faculty in Arts & Sciences as well as the professional community. Faculty from these supporting branches play an active role in mentoring and providing feedback to candidates including, but not limited to, joint supervision of student teachers in specialty content areas.

In particular, ongoing professional development school relationships with a number of local area -schools (described in detail in Standard 3) have provided opportunities for extended conversations about the role of reflection and its impact on classroom practices. These discussions have fostered a shared philosophical base as well. By sharing the Educator Preparation Program’s conceptual framework with the P-12 professional community, CUA has been able to enrich its own understanding of the role of the framework by incorporating feedback from practicing teachers. Sharing the vision enriches the field experiences of CUA candidates and contributes to the reflective practice of the larger educational community of which it is a part.

*Coherence*

 Because all stakeholders share the Educator Preparation Program’s vision for preparing CUA candidates, all components of the program including curriculum, instruction, field experiences, and assessment are integrated and coherent. Teacher education candidates are gradually introduced to the conceptual framework at the beginning of their program and continue to study and apply it throughout their studies. Semi-annual orientation sessions are held to introduce or refresh key aspects of the framework in light of upcoming coursework. Graduates share with us that even after graduation they find the conceptual framework to be a scaffold that continues to constantly prompt them to reflect instead of just “surviving” during their induction year. The conceptual framework is weaved into all courses and field experiences. Through carefully designed and scaffolded assignments and experiences faculty not only prompt candidates to reflect, but they also provide qualitative and quantitative feedback on candidates’ gradual understanding and application of the conceptual framework. All undergraduates in the Educator Preparation Program take a core of foundation classes that present the conceptual framework and situate the knowledge within carefully designed key assessments based on meaningful P-12 interactions.

 The Educator Preparation Program’s assessment system was designed to ensure that candidate outcomes closely relate to the conceptual framework (as well as to professional standards), and all key assessments provide meaningful data on candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions. While each school within the Educator Preparation Program maintains its own structure and formal unit assessment system, a concerted effort has been made to allow the creation of parallel assessment milestones. Initiatives for improvement and the results of piloted efforts are discussed at the Council on Teacher Education that is tasked with overseeing the Educator Preparation Program and improving Educator Preparation Program coherence.

*Professional Commitments and Dispositions*

CUA faculty have identified specific professional behaviors, values, and dispositions that are seen as essential in effective educators. When the conceptual framework was revised, faculty reiterated these key dispositions in terms of their roles in reflective practice in order to maintain a clear and consistent message on the importance of these vital, internal teacher characteristics. In keeping with this renewed emphasis, explicit assessment of dispositions is conducted, in addition to the more general field experience evaluations, at multiple points in the candidates’ programs of study. Items in the Educator Preparation Program’s disposition survey are aligned with the components of the conceptual framework. These identified dispositions are regularly discussed, monitored, and assessed by CUA and school-based faculty in courses and field experiences. Candidates also use the disposition survey for self-assessment. If necessary, additional field experiences are assigned to ensure candidates have all needed opportunities to reflect upon and master the requisite characteristics.

*Commitment to Addressing Diversity of Student Needs*

 CUA’s conceptual framework reveals the Educator Preparation Program’s deep commitment to diversity through the design and implementation of a diverse curriculum and field experiences for candidates. One of the most encompassing of the eight components of the learning environment in CUA’s conceptual framework calls for sensitivity to community and cultural norms and the provision and adaptation of instruction based on the diversity of students’ needs in terms of gender, class, ethnicity, SES, race, cultural and linguistic diversity, religious affiliation, giftedness, special needs, learning styles, developmental levels, and motivation. CUA faculty aim to prepare candidates who can teach from multicultural perspectives and consider the issues of equity (one of the identified dilemmas in the conceptual framework) in the teaching-learning process.

Diversity of children’s needs is so vital that this element of the conceptual framework is revisited in essentially all courses and key assessments in one form or another. Candidates are prompted to consider and respond to diversity in lesson plans, tutoring journals, observation papers, and the action research project. The candidates’ approach and commitment to diversity are measured repeatedly in all field experience evaluations. The disposition survey and technology survey also include items related to candidates’ ability to respond to and promote the intellectual, physical, emotional, and social development of all students through adapting instruction to meet their varying needs and abilities. Candidates are expected to exhibit sensitivity, empathy, and respect for individual differences (e.g. class, gender, ethnicity, cultural and linguistic diversity, special needs, etc.). CUA faculty have high expectations for all candidates, model best practices, and discuss the importance of multicultural and non-stereotyping experiences.

Candidates’ ability to teach diverse students is augmented by infusing diversity into the curriculum, providing multiple field experience placements in different grades and P-12 populations (including public, charter, and parochial schools), and by actively recruiting for broader minority representation in faculty, site mentors, and candidate population. CUA’s effort to increase diversity is ongoing and is bolstered by well conceived and thoroughly implemented recruitment plans, which are discussed in further detail in Standard 4.

*Commitment to Technology*

EPP faculty members regard the role of technology as crucial in today’s information age. Candidates are expected to have a thorough understanding of technology concepts and skills and integrate technology within instruction to maximize student learning. Rather than identifying technology as a distinct element in the learning environment, candidates are prompted to consider the appropriate role of technology within the various elements of the conceptual framework. For example, the element of *collaboration* includes discussion of how technology fosters meaningful professional discussion and collaborative practice. In the *instructional strategies* element candidates consider the role of technology in planning and implementing instruction aligned with P-12 standards. When reflecting on *assessment,* candidates are prompted to acknowledge the importance of technology in formative/summative and formal/informal assessments. When candidates address issues of *diversity of student needs*, they think about how technology can be utilized for differentiation for all students and modified to assist students with special needs.

 Technology is also infused within coursework. For example, candidates use a web-based environment called LiveText to submit their assignments, create their own electronic portfolios, design webquests, or locate developmentally appropriate P-12 video clips for their lessons.

 CUA faculty also created a technology survey based on ISTE standards that is used specifically for Educator Preparation Program feedback rather than individual candidate assessment. Faculty collaborate to introduce multiple technological improvements and model current instructional strategies and reflection. In order to support the technology expectations for candidates, the Educator Preparation Program has obtained a Super Smart Classroom and additional software and equipment recently (more detail is provided in Standard 6). Faculty also use Blackboard and new equipment to model best instructional practices and the integration of technology into the teaching-learning process.

# CUA’s Educator Preparation Provider – Organizational Chart

Figure 4 depicts the organizational structure of CUA’s Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) including all committees that are involved in the assessment of candidate performance and program quality. As the organizational chartindicates below, the Chair of the Department of Education is the EPP (unit) Head. The two super committees are the Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee (internal) and the Council on Teacher Education (external). The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) reports to the Chair’s Advisory Committee, and the external Secondary Education Committee report to the Council on Teacher Education. The following paragraphs provide a short description of the hierarchy of the committees.

The Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee is the internal “super committee,” which consists of assigned senior faculty and has an overall supervisory and monitoring role regarding the quality of Educator Preparation Program operations. The Advisory Committee receives reports regularly from the Teacher Education Committee, which includes all Program Coordinators. The committee uses such data to plan resources, particularly faculty, space, and facilities. It also advises the Chair of the Department of Education in regards to faculty load and teaching assignments, policies, and resources and in cases additional resources are needed, it approves changes recommended by all committees for program improvement. The Chair of the Department of Education chairs both the Advisory Committee and the Council on Teacher Education, thus the information from the Council on Teacher Education is shared easily with the Advisory Committee. The Chair and the Director of Teacher Education inform all other committees of the approved program changes as they chair or sit on other committees.

The Council on Teacher Education is the external “super committee” that is attended by all CUA EPP programs representatives, including the Department of Education, Department of Library and Information Science, and the Benjamin T. Rome School of Music as well as members of the professional community, such as principals, cooperating teachers, and school district personnel. The Council on Teacher Education helps coordinate programs housed in different academic units of CUA and facilitates a discussion of data-based suggestions for continuous improvement for all programs.

The Teacher Education Committee, which reports to the Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee, provides a platform for all Program Coordinators and other teacher education faculty to discuss the teaching-learning process in courses and field experiences using performance-based assessment data; review applicant qualifications, candidate progress, and graduate competencies; make data-based recommendations for programmatic improvement; create and implement policies; review teacher education documents; draft reports; and complete accreditation tasks. This committee develops curricular changes and informs education faculty as well as the Advisory Committee in case additional resources are needed. The contact information of Program Coordinators and other members of the Teacher Education Committee can be found in Appendix A.

The sub-committees of the Council on Teacher Education include the Secondary Education Committee and the Advisory Council for Special Education and Early Childhood Special Education Programs.

The Secondary Education Committee consists of the Coordinator of the Secondary Education programs, the Director of Teacher Education, and faculty members functioning as liaisons from the Departments of Drama, English, Mathematics, and History from Arts and Sciences. This committee reviews the secondary English, math, and social studies education programs and proposes recommendations for changes based on candidate performance on key assessments.

The next part, Section 6, includes a detailed description of each committee’s structure, responsibilities, and tasks including areas of review, assigned tasks, types of data reviewed, committee membership, data sharing, committee reporting hierarchy, and assessment schedule.



# Description of Committee Structure, Responsibilities, and Tasks

**I. Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee**

1. **Areas of Review**
* Quality of Educator Preparation Program operations
* Overall supervisory, monitoring, and advisory roles
* Faculty load and teaching assignments
* Policies
* Strategic planning
* Resource management
* Faculty recruitment and reviews
1. **Tasks**
* Assist Chair in maintaining and revising policies and in managing and overseeing implementation of policies
* Advise Chair on strategic planning decisions and assist in revising strategic plan in alignment with:
	+ CUA vision, mission, priorities, CUA strategic plan, and CUA comparison data
	+ Departmental vision, mission, priorities, and resources (technology, budget, personnel, and facilities) based on candidate enrollment, candidate degree progression, completion rates, retention and time-to-degree statistics, diversity, candidate performance assessment and trend data
	+ Community needs
* Review all Department of Education programs in terms of academic assessment (Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and Major Assessment Findings Report), student enrollment, and recruitment, and plan resource allocations, particularly in regards to faculty and facilities
* Provide leadership in guiding the EPP to move towards continuous improvement and target performance on multiple CAEP standards
* Administer faculty searches
* Oversee EPP assessment system:
	+ Determine appropriateness of EPP assessment system and processes
	+ Based on analyzed EPP assessment data, identify areas for EPP improvement and design improvement plans
	+ Monitor the implementation of recommended changes
	+ Approve recommendations made by other committees for improvement of programs and EPP operations and supervise the effectiveness of changes
* Discuss TEC updates regarding problems, resource requirements, and recommendations
* Provide final approval for teacher education documents, such as the EPP Assessment Handbook
* Advise the Chair as requested and ad hoc tasks as needed
1. **Data Reviewed**
* Semester Report (summarized version)
* Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR) (summarized version)
* Major Assessment Findings Report (MAFR) (summarized version)

A detailed description of these reports is included in Section 15. The AKAFR and MAFR reports are posted for the University community (on the website of the Office of *Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment*) and are continuously updated in the repository for the EPP’s review.

* Committee Reports
1. **Committee Membership**
* Chaired by Department Chair
* Assigned senior faculty
1. **Findings Shared with**
* Council on Teacher Education (CTE) (EPP head chairs CTE)
* Education faculty meeting (Coordinators of all teacher education programs attend this meeting)
* Teacher Education Committee (TEC) (Coordinators of all teacher education programs attend TEC)
1. **Committee Informs**
* Education faculty about policy changes (Faculty vote)
* Dean of Arts & Sciences (when changes are requested or occur)
* Provost (when changes are requested or occur)
1. **Assessment Schedule**
* *Semester Report*– every spring
* *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report* – every fall
* *Major Assessment Findings Report* – every five years

**II. Teacher Education Committee (TEC)**

1. **Areas of Review**
* Applicant qualifications (undergraduate and graduate), candidate performance, and graduate competencies
* Courses and field experiences: Candidate admission and performance
* Preparation of Semester Report, Annual Key Assessment Findings Report, and Major Assessment Findings Report
* Licensure applications
* Recommended changes in teacher education programs and EPP assessment system
* Candidate complaints, appeals, documentation of resolution (Department Chair)
* Review of teacher education documents
* Policies
* Accreditation
* Advising assignments (Director of Teacher Education and Department Chair)
1. **Tasks**
* Provide oversight on the curriculum, syllabi, policies and procedures for teacher education programs
* Identify areas for program improvement, develop curricular changes and submit proposals to faculty at the education faculty meeting (or to the Advisory Committee if new or additional resources are required), and implement recommended changes based on program goals, accreditation guidelines, candidate needs, disaggregated candidate performance data, and data from the alumni, employer, and technology surveys
* Review recommended changes to and monitor the successful implementation of EPP assessment system
* Discuss the teaching-learning process with a focus on performance-based assessment data to continue the culture of evidence-based assessment practices and data-based decisions
* Review, update, and enhance procedures for data collection and analysis
* Implement and supervise plans for the accreditation process; prepare for accreditation visit
* Review and approve undergraduate and graduate candidates’ application and transition through each gate in the teacher education programs
* Determine fairness and appropriateness of assessment tools and processes
* Revise all teacher education documents and submit approved and revised teacher education documents to Advisory Committee for final approval
* Update Advisory Committee on strategic plan, problems, and resource requirements
* Develop a plan and budget for the promotion of CUA education programs locally and nationally, sharing these with Enrollment Management and the department Chair
* Coordinate departmental recruitment efforts with CUA’s Enrollment Services, particularly for the recruitment of minority students and to reach Catholic School prospects
* Oversee the development and dissemination of written materials for recruitment and web updating of graduate programs, incorporating financial aid option
* Provide annual update of the multi-year plan course sequence to Curricular Supervision and Assessment Committee
* Prepare the *Semester Report*, *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR),* and *Major Assessment Findings Report (MAFR).* (The office of the Director of Teacher Education with collaboration with each Program Coordinator prepares a report analyzing data on candidate performance-based assessment and self-reported technology skills as well as data on graduates’ performance from the alumni and employer surveys from the LiveText database. The report identifies areas for improvement, and highlights successes and challenges. The AKAFR and MAFR are posted for the University community (on the website of the Office of *Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment*) and are continuously updated in the repository for the EPP’s review.
* Hear appeal cases (only EPP Head, who is Chair of Department of Education)
1. **Data Reviewed**
* Applicant qualifications: PRAXIS Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE/CASE), PRAXIS II, GRE, and MAT)
* Candidate Performance analyzed in Semester Report, Annual Key Assessment Findings Report, and Major Assessment Findings Report:
	+ all key assessments in all programs (see key assessment matrices for all programs in Appendix B)
	+ disposition review
	+ grades
	+ alumni survey
	+ employer survey
	+ technology survey
* Field experiences:
	+ practicum evaluations
	+ student teaching or capstone experiences evaluations
* Licensure applications
1. **Committee Membership**
* Chaired by Director of Teacher Education
* Chair of the Department of Education
* All teacher education Program Coordinators
* Director of Field Experiences
* Additional faculty members who teach teacher education candidates
1. **Findings Shared with**
* Council on Teacher Education
* Secondary Education Committee
* Education faculty
* Curricular Supervision & Assessment Committee (updated multi-year plan course sequence)
1. **Committee Reports to**
* Education Faculty meeting
* Advisory Council (when curricular changes require new resources)
1. **Assessment Schedule**
* *Semester Report*– every spring
* *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report* – every fall
* *Major Assessment Findings Report* – every five years
* At additional meetings when needed

**III. Council on Teacher Education**

1. **Areas of Review**
* Establishment (through collaboration with sub-committees) of collaborative system for program planning, curriculum design, candidate readiness, diverse experiences for candidates, and faculty development linking directly to the assessment and evaluation processes based on the conceptual framework
* Quality of EPP and program operations: Teacher education programs at Department of Education, Department of Library and Information Science, and the Benjamin T. Rome School Music
* Recommendations for program improvement
* Coordination of field experiences within EPP
* Accreditation preparation
* Educator Preparation Program governance, planning, facilities, and ongoing and possible future collaboration among the Department of Library and Information Science, Department of Drama, Benjamin T. Rome School of Music, and the Department of Education
* Examination of resources needed to enhance the EPP operations and support candidates’ success
1. **Tasks**
* Provide perspectives for the design and revision of strategic plans
* Coordinate programs housed in different academic units of CUA
* Advise Chair on issues external to the Department of Education including programmatic challenges across schools and departments, expectations of the Catholic dioceses and state regulations
* Provide feedback on revised teacher education documents (e.g., conceptual framework, EPP Assessment System)
* Review teacher education programs and suggest changes for program improvement based on disaggregated data on candidate performance and data from the alumni, employer, and technology surveys
* Solicit recommendations from Catholic and public school representatives about school needs, issues of teacher quality, supply and demand, critical staffing needs, recruitment and plans for strengthening school-university partnerships, and administrative changes within OSSE and the Archdiocese of Washington
* Inform all stakeholders of changes and issues within CUA
1. **Data Reviewed**
* Semester Report (summarized version)
* Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR) (summarized version)
* Major Assessment Findings Report (MAFR) (summarized version)

The detailed description of these reports is included in Section 15. The AKAFR and MAFR reports are posted for the University community (on the website of the Office of *Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment*) and are continuously updated in the repository for the EPP’s review.

* Field experience placement information
* **Committee Membership**
* Chaired by EPP Head (Chair of Department of Education)
* Director of Teacher Education
* Director of Field Experiences
* Program Coordinators from the Department of Education, Department of Library and Information Science, and the Benjamin T. Rome School Music
* Community representatives
	+ Adjuncts
	+ Candidates
	+ Alumni
	+ Cooperating teachers
	+ Principals
	+ Representative of DC’s Office of the State Superintendent of Education
	+ Representative of Archdiocese of Washington Catholic schools
* **Findings Shared with**
* Teacher Education Committee
* Secondary Education Committee
* **Committee Reports to**
* EPP Head
* **Assessment Schedule**
* *Semester Report*– every spring
* *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report* – every fall
* *Major Assessment Findings Report* – every five years

**Sub-Committees of the Council of Teacher Education**

**IV. Secondary Education Committee:**

1. **Areas of Review**
* Secondary English, Secondary Math, Secondary Social Studies
1. **Task**
* Monitor the successful implementation of the EPP assessment system for the secondary education programs
* Review of secondary education programs and curricular development related to professional standards
* Monitor the successful implementation of the EPP assessment system for the secondary teacher education programs
* Identify areas for program improvement (based on disaggregated data on candidate performance and data from the alumni, employer, and technology surveys), recommendations for enhancement plan, and implementation of recommended changes
1. **Data Reviewed**
* Detailed versions of the Semester Report, Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and Major Assessment Findings Report, including performance-based assessment data on all graduating candidates from each program, such as Action Research Project and Electronic Portfolio, and data from the alumni, employer, and technology surveys
1. **Committee Membership**
* Coordinator of secondary English and social studies teacher education programs
* Coordinator of secondary mathematics teacher education program
* Director of Teacher Education
* Liaison from the Department of Drama
* Liaison from the Department of English
* Liaison from the Department of History
* Faculty representative from the Department of Math
1. **Findings Shared with**
* Teacher Education Committee
* Council on Teacher Education
1. **Committee Reports to**
* Council on Teacher Education
1. **Assessment Schedule**
* *Semester Report*– every spring
* *Annual Key Assessment Findings Report* – every fall
* *Major Assessment Findings Report* – every five years

# Committee Structure Related to the Educator Preparation Program Assessment System

Figure 5 includes a visual representation of the committee structure related to the EPP assessment system.

As the figure indicates, the Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee fulfills the supervisory role in the EPP. All programs are aligned with CUA’s conceptual framework and professional standards, such as NAEYC, ACEI, NCTE, NCTM, NCSS, and CEC. The performance of applicants, candidates, and graduates, as well as the EPP operations are assessed and monitored at various committees, which propose strategies for program and EPP improvement based on analyzed data presented at regular intervals. Education faculty members are informed of changes the Teacher Education Committee plans, and the Advisory Committee has the authority to give final approval of all recommendations, suggested by all the committees in the EPP, which need additional resources. The following section lists the types of data that all committees review. Section 15 includes a detailed description of all reports that EPP faculty and the Office of the Director of Teacher Education prepare.

Every committee plays a unique role in reviewing program and EPP operations data. The paragraphs below elucidate the role each committee plays in the review of applicant qualifications, candidate performance, graduate performance, and EPP operations, the format used for data presentation, frequency of data evaluation, and the type of involvement of committees in the effort of continuous improvement (i.e., suggesting versus approving recommendations for program and EPP enhancement). Section 13 includes a detailed description of all requirements at each transition point (gate) for both undergraduate and graduate applicants or candidates.

*7.a. Committees Reviewing Applicant Qualifications, Candidate Performance, Graduate Competencies, and EPP Operations*

Applicant Qualifications – The Teacher Education Committee (TEC) members review undergraduate applicants and vote on admission every May, at the end of the candidates’ sophomore year. The application packet includes the following sources of information or documents: 1) application form including an essay, 2) GPA [cumulative and education or content depending on the major], 3) licensure test data, 4), recommendations, and 5) faculty evaluation of candidate dispositions. The committee can make three possible decisions: 1) full admission, 2) provisional admission if candidates show promise and meet most requirements, and 3) dismissal. In case of a dismissal, candidates are informed of the appeal process and are sent, if requested, all necessary documents to start the due process. Each candidate is eligible for one provisional and one probationary semester. Section 21 contains more detailed information about this process.

CUA has a rolling admission for graduate students who can start their program in any semester depending on the nature of their program. Graduate applicants’ packets are reviewed by Program Coordinators (in the secondary, special education and early childhood special education programs) who are also TEC members. The data sources are 1) application form, 2) GPA, 3) test scores, 3) undergraduate transcripts, 4) letters of recommendation, and 5) interviews. Graduate Program Coordinators use CUA’s *WebNow*, an online application environment, to review all application materials and make a recommendation to the Chair of the Department regarding the admission decision. The Chair makes a decision and “stamps” each online application packet that is then transferred to the Dean’s Office for the final admission decision and notification of the applicant.

Candidate and Graduate Performance: The Office of the Director of Teacher Education in collaboration with Program Coordinators prepares a detailed report (either the Semester Report, the Annual Key Assessment Findings Report, or the Major Assessment Findings Report [detailed in Section 15] according to the reporting schedule described in Section 11) providing data on all candidates’ performance on key assessments and their self-reported technology skills as well as graduates’ performance based data from the alumni and employer surveys.

The Teacher Education Committee members are presented every semester with a detailed report of analyzed data in a PowerPoint that includes the number of candidates who exceeded or met expectations, or were only acquiring a particular skill (i.e., they did not meet expectations at the time of the evaluation) on all 56 key assessments (eight key assessments in seven programs). Each slide also contains a cohort mean for each area of every key assessment, such as candidate performance on each of the eight areas of lesson plans or on each of the eleven areas of the Action Research Project. Faculty members focus on areas where candidates were still acquiring skills. Discussions ensue when more than one candidates have difficulties in an area of an assignment. TEC members propose strategies for modifying assignments, evaluation procedures, course content, or instructional methodology to increase candidate learning.

Relevant parts of the detailed version of the Semester Report, the Annual Key Assessment Findings Report, or the Major Assessment Findings Report are shared with the Secondary Education Committee. The Secondary Education Committee members review the detailed report containing data on secondary candidates’ performance and self-reported technology skills as well as graduates’ performance based on the alumni and employer surveys every semester. The committee focuses on areas where candidates did not meet expectations and suggest recommendations for program improvement.

Education faculty members review an abbreviated version of all teacher education candidates’ performance and self-reported technology skills as well as graduates’ performance based on the alumni and employer surveys every semester. The data are presented to show an overall mean for each key assessment (without showing the number of candidates on each performance level) for every program; i.e., one mean represents the cohort’s performance in all areas of a key assessment. Faculty members discuss strategies for improvement proposed by the Teacher Education Committee and Secondary Education Committee.

Similarly to the education faculty meeting, members of the Council on Teacher Education view an abbreviated version of all teacher education program data every semester and discuss and propose additional strategies to improve programs.

EPP Operations: The Council on Teacher Education allows members from CUA and the professional community to discuss issues related to the EPP’s operations, such as interdisciplinary and cross-listed courses, field experiences in all three EPP divisions (education, music, and library), accreditation preparation, and technology.

Education faculty members and the Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee view an abbreviated version of the Semester Report, the Annual Key Assessment Findings Report, and the Major Assessment Findings Report and discuss proposed changes recommended by other committees. Senior faculty members of Department of Education Chair’s Advisory Committee discuss all EPP-level issues including the overall quality of EPP operations, program quality, faculty load and teaching assignments, strategic planning, resource and facility management, and faculty recruitment and reviews. The Advisory Committee has the authority of final approval of recommendations (that need additional resources) made by all committees for continuous improvement.



# Candidate Proficiencies Aligned with Professional Standards

CUA’s EPP has designed an elaborate yet succinct EPP assessment system with the goal of measuring candidates’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions and monitoring their performance based on professional and CUA conceptual framework standards. (Please note that DC does not have separate state standards but expects universities to implement SPA standards.) Teacher education course syllabi include information on the purpose of every course and explicit goals for student learning. All course syllabi and key assessments reference the 1) CUA conceptual framework standards, 2) InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards as well as 3) the Specialized Professional Association (SPA) standards allowing faculty to both model appropriate use of standards for course and assignment design and to track the EPP’s coverage of its own standards.

In connection with SPA reports, Program Coordinators ensure the inclusion and updated alignment of CUA conceptual framework, professional, and InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards with course content, syllabi as well as key assessment templates and scoring guides. When reviewing course content and syllabi, Program Coordinators also take into consideration curricular alignment with licensure testing requirements.

# Goals and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

The Department of Education has a student learning assessment plan that includes learning goals for each teacher education candidate. The Goals and Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes documents for both the undergraduate and graduate programs describe the identified goals and selected assessment instruments in each program in detail. Candidates are expected to

* Demonstrate sufficient knowledge of the content they are prepared to teach to help all P-12 students meet standards appropriate to either early childhood, elementary, secondary education, special education, and early childhood special education;
* Apply content-specific pedagogical knowledge and skills to teach their subject matter meaningfully so that all P-12 students can learn. This includes using a broad range of effective instructional strategies and practices, integrating technology and considering the needs of the family, school, and community;
* Focus on P-12 student learning by systematically monitoring student progress and adjusting instruction accordingly;
* Be familiar with the professional dispositions, which CUA and applicable professional associations expect and demonstrate these dispositions in their classroom behaviors and relationships with students, families, colleagues, and communities, and
* Be familiar with CUA’s conceptual framework and use their reflective skills to guide and improve their own practice.

These learning goals are included in education course syllabi, which are aligned with InTASC, Specialized Professional Association (SPA), and conceptual framework standards. Faculty discuss their course syllabi and the content of their courses at the Teacher Education Committee and the Spring Semester Junior Methods meeting, and the administrative assistant of the Chair of the Department of Education posts all course syllabi on CUA’s Course Syllabus Manager at <https://secure.cua.edu/syllabi/login.cfm> for ready access for faculty, staff, and students.

Key assessments are administered in courses, and data from key assessment scoring guides on course assignments and in field experiences are collected at each decision point (gate) in LiveText, analyzed by Program Coordinators, and dis/aggregated by the Director of Teacher Education to be included in the Semester Report, Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and Major Assessment Findings Report, which are shared with various stakeholders. See a list of key assessments in each program in Appendix B. All key assessment templates and scoring guides are available in LiveText.

All key assessments, such the lesson plan, thematic unit, action research paper, and electronic portfolio, specify assessment criteria for each performance level (i.e., exceeding expectations, meeting expectations, and acquiring skill). Candidates must meet minimum expectations on all key assessments at each gate. The grading policy states that a candidate passes a key assessment if the following criteria are met:

* 80% of the items meet expectations (2 points) on the scoring guide,
* The mean is at least 2.00, and
* Critical elements (identified on each scoring guide) meet expectations.

If these conditions are not met, the candidate needs to revise the assignment, and the original scores will remain in the LiveText database.

Key assessments, administered in teacher education courses and aligned with the afore-mentioned goals for student learning as well as InTASC, conceptual framework, and SPA standards, provide candidate performance-based assessment data as evidence of candidates’ ability to attain the above listed CUA learning goals as well as standards delineated in CUA’s conceptual framework, InTASC, and Specialized Professional Associations.

# Use of Information Technologies

CUA’s EPP uses *LiveText,* a web-based tool to collect, analyze, aggregate, and disaggregate systematically all applicant qualifications, candidate performance, graduate competencies, and EPP operations data. LiveText is a suite of web-based tools for (1) creating assignments and scoring guides to assess candidate performance, (2) managing data collection and analysis on individual, course, program and EPP levels, and (3) developing an online exhibit room for accreditation visits. From lesson plans, portfolios, and papers to scoring guides, surveys, and accreditation data reporting, this web-based environment offers a wide range of functions and capabilities to meet the technological expectations set forth by the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP).

Both faculty and candidates receive training and ongoing support for using LiveText from the Director of Teacher Education who is also the LiveText coordinator. Moreover, LiveText provides excellent technical support and customer service using online training materials and video tutorials as well as immediate phone access to their technology support team. The Director of Teacher Education is engaged in professional development in LiveText through regular attendance at LiveText conferences, LiveText professional development opportunities, communication with LiveText members, and an occasional on-campus visit from CUA’s LiveText implementation specialist.

Faculty members also use Blackboard in their courses to post course information, deliver content, support candidate discussions in between classes, assess candidate proficiencies, and post grades.

# Assessment Cycle at CUA

CUA’s assessment cycle is briefly described here based on a document entitled *Student Learning Assessment Plan* (Fall 2011 version) from the website of the Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment at <http://pir.cua.edu/res/docs/learning-plans/Student-Learning-Outcomes-Assessment-Plan-Fall-2011.pdf>.

In CUA’s four-step student learning outcomes cycle, first, faculty members establish distinctly articulated student learning goals that describe the knowledge, skills and competencies that students should demonstrate in order to complete a course, general education requirement, or degree program successfully. Faculty also develop relevant measures to determine whether students achieve course goals. Second, faculty, departments, or schools as well as Campus Life support student learning and achievement of learning goals by offering courses, programs, and experiences for students. Third, faculty assess student learning using assessment instruments identified prior to the course being offered. The cycle ends and begins again with the analysis of assessment data that are used to reflect on student learning and design strategies to enhance learning, teaching, course content, and curriculum development. These data-based decisions impact future distribution of faculty, departmental, school, and university resources.

The EPP’s Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and the Major Assessment Findings Report (described in detail in Section 15) become part of this University-wide assessment plan that is archived and continuously updated on the website of the Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. A detailed description of the University’s conceptual framework for student learning assessment and a current implementation framework is included in the *Student Learning Assessment Plan* referenced above.

Embedded in CUA’s university-wide assessment plan is the EPP’s assessment plan. All assessments are designed, monitored, and revised on a regular basis using a systematic approach. Program Coordinators have the primary responsibility to create assessment instruments (both templates and scoring guides), and most often they involve faculty members having expertise in various areas and teaching the courses in which the key assessments are administered.

Program Coordinators and assisting faculty take into consideration various factors in the design and revision of assessment instruments: 1) alignment with CUA conceptual framework standards, 2) alignment with SPA standards, 3) alignment with InTASC standards, 4) fair and unbiased nature of assessment, 5) alignment between assignment template and scoring guide, and 6) measurement of identified outcomes.

With input from program faculty and approved by appropriate committees, Program Coordinators decide 1) which faculty member administers the key assessment in which course, 2) in which semester the key assessment is administered, 3) how many times the key assessment is administered in one course, and 4) how data are entered in LiveText. Members of the Teacher Education Committee have determined the minimum passing score for each key assessment and the consequences for not meeting expectations on an assignment (described in Section 9).

When data are amassed, the Office of the Director of Teacher Education runs the data analyses and share them with Program Coordinators, who then examine their program-specific data, write their findings, and recommend changes for program improvement. These findings are submitted to the Director of Teacher Education who compiles a report (Semester Report, Annual Key Assessment Findings Report or the Major Assessment Findings Report), which is then shared with multiple stakeholders at the following committees and meetings: Advisory Committee, Teacher Education Committee, Council on Teacher Education, Secondary Education Committee, as well as the education faculty meeting. The hierarchy and description of these committees and the format of the reports are described in detail in Sections 5, 6 and 15.

When the committees review the analyzed data, they consider 1) how previously suggested changes for program improvement were implemented and whether they reflect changes in candidate performance data, 2) what the current data demonstrate about candidate proficiencies and graduate qualifications and whether a particular assessment is an accurate measure of identified and intended professional outcomes, 3) if there are areas for improvement in terms of the fair, consistent, and non-biased nature of each instrument, 4) if the cycle, administration, and nature of assessment can be made more efficient and effective, and 5) what future programmatic changes are needed based on the data to further enhance the quality of each teacher education program.

The annual schedule for the assessment cycle at the Department of Education includes the dates and activities that faculty, program coordinators, and all committees follow. The following table includes in separate columns activities related to data collection and reporting in a given semester.

**Annual Assessment Schedule in CUA’s Teacher Education Programs**

Please note that a detailed description of the types of data collected, parties responsible for data collection, and transition points where data are collected is included in Section 13.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment Cycle** | **Data Collection**  | **Data Analysis and Reporting** |
| **Fall Semester** | **In Fall (To Be Analyzed in the Spring)** | **Related to Data from Previous Semester(s)** |
| August-September | Office of Director of Teacher Education (DOTE) uploads data collection instruments (key assessment templates and scoring guides) in LiveTextOffice of DOTE assigns appropriate faculty to courses where data collection occurs in LiveTextProgram Coordinators check LiveText setup for accuracy |  |
| September | Faculty submit fall syllabi to Department Chair | Faculty receive course evaluations for previous summer semester |
| September  | Seniors submit student teaching application form for next spring semester | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE check data submission from previous summer semester |
| September-October |  | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE prepare Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR) for previous academic year (fall, spring, summer) orMajor Assessment Findings Report (MAFR) every five years |
| October-November |  | Program Coordinators present data at various committees that make data-based recommendations for program improvement* Detailed analysis and recommendations: TEC and SEC discuss candidate performance and propose recommendations for program improvement
 |
| November |  | Program Coordinators present data at various committees that make data-based recommendations for program improvement* Data summary and recommendations: CTE and education faculty discuss candidate performance and propose recommendations for program improvement
 |
| November |  | DOTE presents data to Advisory Committee* Data summary and proposed recommendations: Advisory Committee discusses major trends, gives final approval for recommendations, and makes data-based decisions about resources and directions based on the strategic plan
 |
| November |  | Chair submits AKAFR (or MAFR) to the *Office of Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment* |
| December | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE collect data from 1st semester MA students: 1) scores on CORE/CASE licensure tests, 2) candidate profile form, professional dispositions (candidate self-assessment) and technology skills (candidate self-assessment) in LiveText |  |
| December | Faculty collect key assessment data in fall courses in LiveText (to be analyzed in the spring) |  |
|  | Director of Field Experiences collects alumni data from fall program completers |  |
| December | Candidates complete course and faculty evaluations for fall courses |  |
| **Spring Semester** | **In Spring (To Be Analyzed in the Fall)** | **Related to Data from Previous Semester(s)** |
| December-January | Faculty submit data from fall courses |  |
| January | Office of DOTE uploads data collection instruments (key assessment templates and scoring guides) in LiveTextOffice of DOTE assigns appropriate faculty to courses where data collection occurs in LiveTextProgram Coordinators check LiveText setup for accuracy | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE check data submission from previous summer semester |
| January | Faculty submit spring syllabi to Department Chair | Faculty receive course evaluations for previous fall semester |
| January | Seniors submit student teaching application form for next fall semester |  |
| January-February |  | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE prepare Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR) for previous academic year (fall, spring, summer) |
| February | Faculty submit their Out-of-Classroom Activity Report (OCAR) to the Department Chair |  |
| March |  | Department Chair completes faculty evaluations based on submitted OCAR and course evaluations |
| March-April |  | Program Coordinators present data at various committees that make data-based recommendations for program improvement* Detailed analysis and recommendations: TEC and SEC discuss candidate performance and propose recommendations for program improvement
 |
| April |  | Program Coordinators present data at various committees that make data-based recommendations for program improvement* Data summary and recommendations: CTE and education faculty discuss candidate performance and propose recommendations for program improvement
 |
| April |  | DOTE presents data to Advisory Committee* Data summary and proposed recommendations: Advisory Committee discusses major trends, gives final approval for recommendations, and makes data-based decisions about resources and directions based on the strategic plan
 |
| April 1st | Sophomores submit teacher education application form in LiveText |  |
| May | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE collect data from 1st semester MA students: 1) scores on CORE/CASE licensure test, 2) candidate profile form, professional dispositions (candidate self-assessment) and technology skills (candidate self-assessment) in LiveText | Committee Chairs submit annual committee reports to the Department Chair |
| May | Faculty collect key assessment data in spring courses in LiveText (to be analyzed in the fall) | TEC follows up on suggestions on curricular improvements recommended from previous academic year |
| May | Director of Field Experiences collects alumni data from spring program completers |  |
| May | Candidates complete course and faculty evaluations for spring courses |  |
| May (after grades are due) |  | Teacher Education Committee convenes to review applications and admit applicants |
| **Summer Semester** | **In Summer (To Be Analyzed in the Fall)** | **Related to Data from Previous Semester(s)** |
| May | Faculty submit data from spring courses | Faculty receive course evaluations for previous summer semester |
| May | Office of Director of Teacher Education (DOTE) uploads data collection instruments (key assessment templates and scoring guides) in LiveText Office of DOTE assigns appropriate faculty to courses where data collection occurs in LiveTextProgram Coordinators check LiveText setup for accuracy |  |
| May | Faculty submit summer syllabi to Department Chair | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE check data submission from previous spring semester |
| August | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE collect data from 1st semester MA students: 1) scores on CORE/CASE licensure test, 2) candidate profile form, professional dispositions (candidate self-assessment) and technology skills (candidate self-assessment) in LiveText |  |
| August | Faculty collect key assessment data in summer courses in LiveText (to be analyzed in the fall) |  |
| June-August | Candidates complete course and faculty evaluations for summer courses |  |
| June-August | Program Coordinators and Office of DOTE revise Assessment Handbook every 3 years (next revision is scheduled for 2017) | Director of Field Experiences, Program Coordinators, and Office of Director of Teacher Education collect survey data from employers |
| June-August | Program Coordinators revise key assessment templates and scoring guides (if necessary)  |  |

# Procedures for Data Collection, Analysis, Aggregation, Disaggregation and Use

As stated before, CUA’s teacher education programs use LiveText to collect, analyze, aggregate, disaggregate, and disseminate data on applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduate performance, and unit operations.

Undergraduate candidates are required to purchase LiveText prior to applying to teacher education (mostly during the fall semester of their sophomore year) or by the time they apply to teacher education during the spring semester of their sophomore year. Graduate candidates are required to obtain a LiveText account when they register for the first class in which a key assessment is administered, usually during the first semester of their program. Faculty members, both full-time and adjuncts, create their own accounts using a registration code they receive from the Director of Teacher Education.

All templates of key assignments and their corresponding scoring guides are available in LiveText where candidates access them and submit their completed work. Whenever possible, templates and scoring guides of key assessments, e.g., the observation papers and tutoring journals, are standard across courses and programs enabling faculty to compare performance on various levels and for different cohorts. Candidates upload their key assessments, such as tutoring journals, observation papers, lesson plans, webquests, thematic units, child portfolios, assessment instruments, electronic portfolios, and action research project in LiveText and receive quantitative and qualitative feedback from faculty. Candidates must meet minimum expectations at each gate as they progress through their program of studies. As stated before, the grading policy states that a candidate passes a key assessment if the following criteria are met:

* 80% of the items meet expectations (2 points) on the scoring guide,
* The mean is at least 2.00, and
* Critical elements (identified on each scoring guide) meet expectations.

If these conditions are not met, the candidate needs to revise the assignment, and the original scores will remain in the LiveText database.

LiveText also allows for gathering survey data. Currently, CUA is collecting the following data using forms: alumni survey, candidate profile form, cooperating teacher form, disposition survey, diversity form, employer survey, faculty qualifications, field experience/placement site data, practicum evaluation form, remediation plan for dispositional deficiencies, request for appeal form, secondary candidates’ content area methods course record, all program specific student teaching evaluation forms, teacher education application form, teacher education personal reference form, and technology assessment form. These surveys can be completed without a LiveText account (e.g., by principals and cooperating teachers) by completing a URL that is E-mailed by the LiveText administrator.

Candidates are required to complete the following forms at the beginning of their program: candidate profile form, disposition form (self-assessment), and technology form (self-assessment). The candidate profile form includes personal questions about candidates’ backgrounds, such as BA degree information (for graduate students), program name, expected graduation date, enrollment status, previous institutional information (for transfer students only), completed service learning experiences, scholarship information, participation in honors program, GPA information, employment information, ethnicity, gender, native language, country of origin, family teaching experience, family educational background, etc. CUA asks that candidates complete the disposition survey and technology survey as self-assessment tools for two purposes. First, faculty want to monitor how candidates evaluate their own dispositions and technology knowledge and skill level for possible follow-up. Second, faculty members believe that if candidates complete these forms, they become more aware of faculty expectations for appropriate professional conduct and technology use.

Program Coordinators update their program matrices (see Appendix B) every semester to ensure that the document includes the appropriate information including the name of each key assessment, course where the key assessment is administered, name of the faculty member teaching the course, semester the course is offered, and names of key assessment templates and scoring guides. These program matrices are saved on the Teacher Education Shared Drive to which Program Coordinators and the Office of the Director of Teacher Education have access.

Using these program matrices, the Office of the Director of Teacher Education activates courses in LiveText by downloading courses from the University’s PeopleSoft system called Cardinal Station. The Office of the Director of Teacher Education populates each course with a roster of candidates and assigns the appropriate key assessment templates, scoring guides, and deadlines for each key assessment. Program Coordinators check that the most recent version of each template and scoring guide is attached to courses in their program. In situations when different cohorts complete the same assignment that is evaluated by different program specific assessment instruments, the appropriate templates and scoring guides are attached to each course, and the faculty member teaching the particular course assesses different cohorts using the appropriate program specific scoring guides.

Faculty members are added to the courses they teach or in which they supervise student teachers so that they can enter their own data using scoring guides aligned with professional, InTASC, and CUA conceptual framework standards. Program Coordinators are also added to the courses in their programs so that they can closely monitor data collection and analyze data in all courses relevant to their programs.

A color-coded data monitoring mechanism is built into LiveText allowing program faculty and LiveText administrators to check easily whether data on all key assessments have been entered. (Candidate names in red denote that the assignment has not be submitted, yellow means that assignment is awaiting evaluation, and green denotes that the grading and evaluation have been completed.) At the end of each semester the Office of the Director of Teacher Education as well as Program Coordinators monitor data collection and ensure that 1) program faculty submit scores on each candidate’s key assessments and 2) LiveText databases include data on field experiences forms and surveys. Data collected in LiveText become available to candidates, faculty, Program Coordinators, and system administrators.

Faculty members and Program Coordinators are scheduled to run data analyses in the courses they teach or are added to. Using CUA’s administrative account, the Office of the Director of Teacher Education runs data analyses at scheduled times, aggregate data for EPP and disaggregate data for each program in all courses using various filters, such as

* *Course filters*: course, college, department, semester, location;
* *Assessment filters*: key assessment, assessor, assessment type (formative, summative), scoring type (draft, final), semester or date range;
* *Student profile filters*: gender, academic class, major, concentration, degree program, academic program; and
* *Form-based filters*: using hundreds of categories included in all our surveys, such as practicum or student teaching location, name of institution where graduate student completed undergraduate degree, undergraduate or graduate GPA, native language, etc.

Additional types of analyses in LiveText are the following:

* *Assessment Report*:
	+ Generates report on data collected from assessments completed on documents sent for review
* *Curriculum Mapping Report*:
	+ Generates report demonstrating where each standard is covered; i.e., in which course, assignment template and scoring guide
* *Form Report*:
	+ Generates report on data collected in all forms and surveys, such as the student teaching evaluation form or disposition survey
* *Rubric Statistics Summary Report*:
	+ Generates report demonstrating the number of assignments submitted using each template and scoring guide in a particular timeframe, minimum and maximum scores, mean, and standard deviation. Data can be aggregated for a particular ethnic group and by gender
* *Standards Report*:
	+ Generates report on all sets of standards
* *Standard/Outcome Report*:
	+ Generates report demonstrating what key assessment templates and scoring guides include particular standards, the author of the documents, the source of the scoring guides, and levels of performance included in the scoring guides
* *Standards and Outcomes Alignment Report*:
	+ Generates report demonstrating what standards are aligned in which templates, scoring guides, and courses
* *Student Progress Report*:
	+ Generates report demonstrating each candidate’s performance on all key assessments by standard set, individual standard, date, scoring guide name, element in each scoring guide, assessor, comments, and level of performance

The resulting analyses of assessment reports include the number and percentage of candidates performing at each level of performance (3= exceeding expectations, 2= meeting expectations, and 1= acquiring skill). Faculty members or the LiveText administrator can identify artifacts by their authors in each category.

Once faculty members evaluate candidates’ performance, the LiveText administrator can run inter-rater reliability to get the means, modes, and standard deviations.

Cardinal Station, CUA’s official student information system, collects and maintains institutional and candidate data including but not limited to names, contact information, diversity (race, gender), application information, GPA, transfer credit, program of studies/tracking sheet, unofficial transcripts, advisor, extracurricular activities, graduation status and date, course list, financial information, etc. Cardinal Station now accepts PRAXIS Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE/CASE) scores as well as other tests, such as PRAXIS II, ACT, SAT, MAT, and GRE, which are directly and digitally delivered by ETS. The Office of the Director of Teacher Education harvests these scores for monitoring and reporting purposes.

# Procedures for Assessment of Candidate Performance – Educator Preparation Program Assessment System: Gates and Key Assessments

Introduction

CUA’s EPP assessment system is an integrated and comprehensive system designed to assess candidate success and EPP and program effectiveness. The purpose of this assessment system is to allow CUA’s Department of Education to collect data on (1) applicant qualifications, candidate proficiencies, graduate competencies, faculty performance and effectiveness of EPP operations, as well as (2) curriculum design and instructional methodology for EPP and program improvement and reflection.

 Program Coordinators and the Director of Teacher Education hold orientation sessions for all cohorts in every program each fall. Applicants and candidates are informed of requirements in teacher education including information on admission, continuation, and graduation requirements; licensure tests; submission of assignments and completion of surveys in LiveText; minimum benchmarks on key assessments; licensure application process; provisional and probationary semesters and the appeal process; professional dispositions; TB tests and background checks; absenteeism policy; minimum grade and GPA requirements; academic honesty policy; use of social media in classes and during field experiences; information on Disability Support Services; candidates’ own educational records, and study abroad programs. The orientation handouts and other teacher education documents are uploaded and updated every year on the teacher education website at <http://education.cua.edu/Current%20Students/students.cfm> (under various tabs).

Description

 CUA’s EPP assessment system is designed to incorporate the following eleven features recommended by Ingersoll and Scannell (2002):

1. A description of a comprehensive system of information collection, from candidate admission through completion of the program and into follow-up studies.
2. A description of how assessments provide a close fit with and comprehensively cover the goals and outcomes identified in the conceptual framework.
3. The assessments used to evaluate each major program standard and evidence that multiple assessments provide comprehensive assessment of each standard.
4. A data bank for storage and analysis of data collected throughout candidates’ programs and after graduation.
5. A data management plan for aggregating and analyzing data and preparing reports for candidates, faculty, and administration.
6. Provisions for ensuring that data are used formatively to evaluate candidate progress and program effectiveness.
7. Methods used to ensure appropriate psychometric characteristics of data used for summative decisions about candidates and programs.
8. A description of how the assessment system is monitored and revised as needed.
9. A description of how data about graduates are used to evaluate program elements and the assessment system.
10. A description of how evidence is collected to ensure that rigorous standards are used to identify candidates who will be recommended for the initial certificate.
11. A description of the evidence used to ensure the validity of the distinction between candidates recommended and those not recommended.

 CUA’s EPP assessment system (detailing the six transition points) is included in the next section. It describes the processes of collection, aggregation, disaggregation, and analysis of candidate proficiencies and program operations required by the legacy NCATE standards. The key assessments in the assessment system are aligned with CUA’s conceptual framework standards, InTASC Model Core Teaching standards, and SPA standards; more specifically; ISTE, NAEYC, ACEI, CEC, NCSS, NCTE, NCTM as benchmarks to evaluate performance. CUA’s assessment system includes multiple assessments at multiple points from internal and external sources.

CUA’s assessment system document was created through collaboration with all EPP faculty and the local professional community and is consistently and regularly used as a living document. All parties involved in the teaching-learning process, including candidates, receive a copy of this document as well as information on the appeal process for decisions regarding candidate status in the program. All of these documents are also available in electronic format on the Department of Education website at <http://education.cua.edu> as well as in LiveText.

Once faculty members evaluate artifacts in LiveText, they send their assessment data using a scoring guide and qualitative feedback in the form of a narrative back to their candidates. This feedback becomes accessible to candidates immediately, and faculty members are able to see their candidates’ level of performance in their courses. CUA also makes available information on CUA candidates’ performance to the public in the following ways:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of Data | Website | Required by |
| 1. Impact on P-12 learning and development – Action Research Paper
 | Department of Education | CAEP |
| 1. Title II pass rates
 | CUA General Council | Federal Government |
| 1. Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and Major Assessment Findings Report
 | CUA’s Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment | Middle States Commission on Higher Education |

Besides systematically and regularly gathering and analyzing data on candidate performance, CUA faculty also document candidate concerns and complaints in order to examine the quality of the CUA teacher education programs, courses, and field experiences and make appropriate programmatic changes. During this process the assessment system is continuously monitored, and it is revised along with the Assessment Handbook every three years.

Through the use of gates, the system clearly delineates (1) what data are collected from whom, when, and how, (2) where data can be located and who is responsible for collecting them, (3) what instruments are used for data collection, (4) how data are analyzed and by whom, (5) how data are aggregated and disaggregated, (6) who receives the data report and how often, and (7) who makes decisions and when. The EPP addresses issues related to fairness, accuracy, consistency, and lack of bias in data collection, analysis, and data management (described in Section 20). The following six transition points (Gates 1-6) describe all requirements from application to graduation and beyond. Appendix C lists an alphabetic inventory of all key assessments at each gate.

**Gate 1: Admission to Teacher Education**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| Unit Assessment | **UG:** Application to TE **G:** Application to Graduate School & TE1  | Candidate | UG: LiveText | UG: 1 April of Sophomore YearG: Rolling Admissions | UG: AADOTE, TEC | S,D | UG: AADOTE | Application analysis | UG: TEC | Admissions decision: Full Acceptance / Provisional Acceptance / Denial12 |
| G: Graduate Admission Office/ Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office | G: Graduate Admission Office | G: PC; Chair |
| GPA | UG: Cardinal Station | UG: Cardinal Students | UG: AADOTE | K,S | UG: AADOTE | GPA analysis 2,3,4,5 | TEC |
| G: Transcripts | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office | G: Graduate Admission Office | PC, Graduate Admission Office |
| Disposition SurveyG: Self-assessment only | Candidate and Ed Faculty  | LiveText | UG: AADOTEG: PC | D | AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| UG: PRAXIS Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE/CASE)6 | ETS | UG: Title II report, Candidate Folder | ETS, AADOTE | K, S | AADOTE | CORE/CASE7 | TEC |
| G: GRE or MAT8 | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow |
| Letters of recommendation | Faculty and other9 | UG: LiveText | UG: AADOTE | K, S, D | UG: AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | G: TEC |
| G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | UG: PC |
| Technology survey  | Candidate | LiveText | UG: AADOTEG: PC | K, S, D | AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| Candidate Profile Form  | Candidate | LiveText | UG: AADOTEG: PC | N/A | AADOTE | (Used for disaggregating data only) | N/A |
| Self-report for Security Clearance, if applicable10 | Candidate | Candidate Folder  | UG: DOFE | N/A | UG: DOFE | Yes/No | General Counsel |
| G: DOTE | G: DOTE |
| Program Assessment | G: All Official Transcripts | Candidate | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | G: Graduate Admission Office/Webnow | K, S | G: PC | Transcript review for pre-requisite courses11 | PC |
| G: Interview  | Candidate | G: Candidate Folder  | G: PC | K, D | G: PC | Monitor for deficiencies | PC |
| Key Assessments Submitted | ECE: Observation Paper (251, 261); Tutoring Journals (271)ELE: Observation Paper (251, 261); Tutoring Journals (271)SEC Eng: Observation Paper (251); Tutoring Journals (271)SEC Social Studies: Observation Paper (251); Tutoring Journals (271)SEC Math: Observation Paper (251); Tutoring Journals (271)UG: CORE/CASE Tests | LiveTextCandidate Folder |

1) G: Permission to take content courses as a Special Student does not mean or guarantee admission to a program. Admission as a Provisional student will guarantee admission to a program if the student meets the provisions established. Admission as a GTCP or MA candidate guarantees admission to the respective program. 2) UG: 3.0 min. cumulative GPA/3.0 in major. 3) GTCP and MA: 2.75 min. Undergraduate GPA. 4) SEC GTCP and SEC MA: 3.00 GPA in last 60 credits Undergraduate work; all GTCP and MA 3.0 GPA in all prior graduate work. 5) Courses with grades below C- cannot be counted for licensure. 6) CORE/CASE scores are required for all UG applicants. 7) CORE/CASE minimum scores: Reading: 156; Writing: 162; Math: 150. Contact Dean’s Office for minimum GRE scores. 8) For Master’s applicants only. 9) UG ECE/ELE: Three letters of recommendation from Education faculty. UG SEC: one letter of recommendation from A&S content faculty and two from Education. G: Three letters of recommendation (SPED/ECSE interview comments may count as one). 10) State Boards of Education, including the District of Columbia Board of Education may refuse to grant a teaching license to an applicant convicted, as an adult, of an act of immoral conduct contributing to the delinquency of a child, or of a felony involving moral turpitude or other similar crimes. 11) G: Transcript review to determine if additional coursework is required or if previous coursework might count for licensure. 12) Candidates are allowed to have only one provisional semester before being admitted to TE.

**Gate 2: Continuance in the Teacher Education Program**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| UnitAssessment | GPA | Cardinal Station | Cardinal Station | End of 1st professional semester | UG: AADOTE | K,S | UG: AADOTE | Minimum Grade Check1,2,3 | UG: TEC | Admissions decision: Full Continuance / Probationary Continuance / Denial9 |
| G: AAC | G: AAC | G: TEC & PC |
| Field Experience Evaluation | ECE/ELE: CT  | LiveText | ECE/ELE: DOFE  | K, S, D | ECE/ELE: AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC  |
| SPED, ECSE: PC/PL4 | SPED, ECSE: PC/PL | SPED/ECSE: AADOTE/PC/PL |
| Disposition Survey5  | UG6: DOFE; Education Faculty | LiveText | AADOTE | D | AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies  | TEC & PC/Education Faculty |
| G: Candidate self-assessment; Education Faculty |
| Technology survey5  | G: Candidate | LiveText | AADOTE | K, S, D | AADOTE |  Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| Candidate Profile Form5  | G: Candidate | LiveText | AADOTE | N/A | AADOTE | (Used for disaggregating data only) | N/A |
| Security Clearance5,7  | Candidate | Candidate Folder | UG: DOFE | N/A | UG: DOFE | Yes/No | UG: DOFE |
| G: PC | G: PC | G: PC |
| TB Test5  | Candidate | Candidate Folder | UG: DOFE  | N/A | UG: DOFE | Yes/No | UG: DOFE |
| G: PC | G: PC | G: PC |
| G: PRAXIS Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE/CASE)6 | ETS | G: Title II report, Candidate Folder | ETS, AADOTE | K, S | AADOTE | CORE/CASE | G: TEC |
| Program Assessment | G: Program of Study | PC | Candidate Folder | PC | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Key Assessments Submitted | ECE: Lesson Plans (570 Fall); Observation Paper (555 Fall); Child Portfolio (584 odd Fall)ELE: Lesson Plans (570 Fall)SEC Math: Lesson Plans (586 Fall) ECSE: Planning for All Learners (532 Summer), Language and Literacy Development Case Study (531 Summer), Student Teaching Evaluation I (532 Summer), Child Portfolio Part 2 (525 Summer)SPED: Language and Literacy Development Case Study (531 Summer), Child Portfolio Part 2 (525 Summer), Student Teaching Evaluation I (532 Summer) | LiveText |

1) Courses with grades below C- cannot be counted for licensure. 2) Minimum GPA requirements for continuance in program (G: >= 2.75 overall, UG: >= 3.0 in major, >= 3.0 overall). 3) Graduate students are eligible for dismissal at any point in their course of study if they receive one or more C’s. 4) EDUC 532. 5) Candidates will receive information about these requirements (surveys) in their departmental admission packet. 6) For UG, disposition surveys will be completed only in case of concerns. 7) SPED and ECSE need to obtain clearance before EDUC 532. 8) 9) Candidates are allowed to have only one probationary semester.

**Gate 3: Admittance to Capstone Experience**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| Unit Assessment  | Application for Capstone Experience (and TB Test) | Candidate | LiveText | Prior to Student Teaching | UG/G (SEC): AADOTE | N/A | UG/G (SEC): DOFE | Application analysis | TEC | Admissions decision: Full Continuance / Probationary Continuance / Denial6 |
| G (ECSE, SPED): PC | G (SPED): PC |
| GPA | Cardinal Station | Cardinal Station | UG: AADOTE | K, S | UG: AADOTE | Minimum Grade Check1,2,3 | TEC |
| G: AAC | G: AAC |
| Field Experience Evaluation | ECE/ELE: CT  | LiveText | ECE/ELE: DOFE  | K, S, D | ECE/ELE: DOFE  | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| SPED, ECSE: PC/PL4 | SPED, ECSE: PC/PL | SPED, ECSE: PC/PL |
| Disposition Survey5 | Education Faculty | LiveText | AADOTE | D | PC; AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| PRAXIS II (Content) | ETS | Title II reportCandidate Folder | AADOTE | K | AADOTE | Yes/No | TEC |
| Security Clearance | Candidate | Candidate Folder | UG: DOFE | N/A | UG: DOFE | Yes/No | UG: DOFE |
| G: PC | G: PC | G: PC |
| A&S Junior Audit (UG) | A&S  | Candidate Folder | AADOTE | N/A | N/A | Yes/No | A&S |
| Key Assessments Submitted | ECE: Lesson Plans (351; 571; 574; 577 Spring)ELE: Lesson Plans (351; 571; 574; 577 Spring); Thematic Unit (351/574; 571/577 Spring)SEC Eng: Unit Plan (580 Fall); Instructional Framework (582 Spring); Annotated Bibliography (580 Fall)SEC Social Studies: Unit Plan (585 Fall)SEC Math: Planning, Teaching, and Evaluating a Lesson (479/579 Fall) SPED: Functional Behavior Analysis (635 Spring), Woodcock-Johnson Assessment (533 Summer), Case Law Presentation (535 Fall)ECSE: Formal Assessment Example (e.g., Woodcock-Johnson Assessment) (533 Summer), Functional Behavior Analysis (635 Spring) | LiveText |

1) Courses with grades below C- cannot be counted for licensure. 2) Minimum GPA requirements for continuance in program (G: >= 2.75 overall, UG: >= 3.0 in major, >= 3.0 overall). 3) Graduate students are eligible for dismissal at any point in their course of study if they receive one or more C’s. 4) EDUC 533. 5) Disposition surveys are completed for all candidates. Faculty can submit dispositional forms any time when issues arise. 6) Candidates are allowed to have only one probationary semester during course of study.

**Gate 4: Graduation Requirements (Program Completion)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| Unit Assessment  | CUA Graduation Audit | A&S | Candidate Folder | End of Program | Dean’s Office | N/A | N/A | Yes/No | Dean’s Office | Program Completion Decision8 |
| Field Experience Evaluation(s)1 | CT, US | LiveText | AADOTE | K,S,D | AADOTE | 80% policy2 | TEC |
| Disposition Survey3 | Education Faculty  | LiveText | AADOTE | D | AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| Technology Survey4 | Candidate | LiveText | AADOTE | K,S | AADOTE | Monitor deficiencies | TEC |
| Action Research Project5  | Candidate | LiveText | UG/G(SEC): DOFE | K,S | DOTE | Pass/Fail6 | TEC |
| G(SPED): PF |
| Electronic Portfolio | Candidate | LiveText | UG/G(SEC): DOFE | K,S | DOTE | Pass/Fail | TEC |
| G(SPED): PF |
| Program Assessment | Comprehensive Exam  | UG(SEC): A&S (Results Only) | Candidate Folder  | UG(SEC): PC | K,S | UG(SEC): PC | Pass/Fail | Ed Faculty |
| Research Project7 | G: Candidate | Candidate Folder | G: PC | K,S | G: PC | Pass/Fail | Ed Faculty |
| Key Assessments Submitted | ECE: Action Research Project; Electronic Portfolio; Student Teaching AssessmentELE: Action Research Project; Electronic Portfolio; Student Teaching AssessmentSEC Engl: Action Research Project; Electronic Portfolio; Student Teaching AssessmentSEC Social Studies: Action Research Project; Electronic Portfolio; Student Teaching AssessmentSEC Math: Action Research Project; Electronic Portfolio; Student Teaching AssessmentSPED: Action Research Project (534 Fall), Student Teaching Evaluation (534 Fall)ECSE: Action Research Project (575 Summer), Student Teaching Evaluation II (575 Summer) | LiveText |

1) UG/G (SEC): Student Teaching Evaluation; G(SPED) EDUC 534; G(ECSE) EDUC 575. 2) 80% meeting or exceeding expectations in each subcategory and overall evaluation on relevant scoring guide. 3) Disposition surveys will be completed only in case of concerns. 4) Self-reported Technology Survey not used for individual candidate performance assessment, Educator Preparation Program level feedback only. 5) Action Research Project satisfies the Comprehensive Exam requirement UG ECE/ELE as well as Masters’ candidates. 6) Action Research Project Course Grade based on Scoring Guide, reported to TEC and the Dean’s Office as Pass/Fail in lieu of Comprehensive Exam. 7) Research Papers required for the MA degree and not required for GTCP candidates. 8) Minimum GPA requirements for graduation (G: >= 2.75 overall, UG: >= 3.0 in major, >= 3.0 overall). Courses with grades below C- cannot be counted for licensure. Graduate students may not be able to graduate if they receive one or more C’s in the course of the program. Candidates are allowed to have only one probationary semester during course of study.

**Gate 5: Licensure Requirements**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| Unit Assessment | PRAXIS II score (content and pedagogy) | ETS | Title 2 ReportCandidate Folder | End of program | AADOTE | K,S | AADOTE | Pass/Fail1 | DOTE | Licensing Decision |
| GPA | Cardinal Station | Cardinal Station | AADOTE | K,S | N/A | Minimum Grade Check2 | DOTE |
| DCPS License Application Packet3 | Candidate | OSSE | OSSE | N/A | N/A | Yes/No | OSSE |

1) Subject specific pass rates established by OSSE, check current posting at [www.ets.org](http://www.ets.org) 2) Courses with grades below C- cannot be counted for licensure 3) CUA Office of Teacher Education submits a Program Completion Form for each candidate to OSSE. Check current requirements at OSSE.

**Gate 6: Post Program Review/Induction Year**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Collection** | **Aggregation** | **Analysis/Action** |
|  | What | Source | Where | When | Who | Knowledge, Skills, Dispositions | Who | Type of Analysis | Who | Type of Action |
| Unit Assessment | Employer Survey | Employer | LiveText | First 2 years post grad  | AADOTE | K,S,D | AADOTE | Monitor Performance  | PC | Program/ Educator Preparation Program Performance Improvement |
| Alumni Survey | Alumni | LiveText | First 2 years post grad  | AADOTE | K,S,D | AADOTE | Monitor Performance | PC | Program/ Educator Preparation Program Performance Improvement |

# Procedures for Evaluation of Graduate Competencies

CUA tracks graduate performance for two years following completion of program in order to analyze their performance. Graduates complete the alumni survey to provide a quantitative and qualitative assessment of their knowledge, skills, dispositions, and other proficiencies as well as the quality of CUA’s teacher preparation.

Principals who employ CUA graduates are asked to assess CUA graduates’ proficiencies quantitatively and qualitatively. Employers are encouraged to address areas of improvement so that CUA education faculty can incorporate those recommendations in their program renewal efforts.

As described in Section 7, data from these sources are discussed at the following committees: Teacher Education Committee, Secondary Education Committee, Council on Teacher Education, education faculty meetings, where faculty members provide recommendations for revision of the survey and program improvement based on alumni and employer feedback. The Chair’s Advisory Committee has the authority to approve recommendations that require additional resources.

CUA’s EPP also compiles the Title II report and the Educator Preparation Providers (EPP) Annual report, which include data on recent graduates’ performance. All these data sources are folded in the discussion about program improvement and strategic planning.

# Procedures for Assessment of Program Quality and Educator Preparation Program Operations

Each program is coordinated by a Program Coordinator who is responsible for:

* Reviewing applications and recommending applicants to Chair and Dean for admission
* Advising candidates in their program
* Holding orientation sessions with the Director of Teacher Education
* Monitoring the administration of key assessments
* Revising key assessments and aligning them with SPA, InTASC, and CUA conceptual framework standards
* Analyzing data on all key assessments to ensure candidates meet expectations
* Reviewing programmatic data and making recommendations for program improvement
* Reporting to the Teacher Education Committee
* Completing or contributing to the preparation of reports

Throughout the academic year the Office of the Director of Teacher Education in collaboration with Program Coordinators and the Chair of the Department of Education authors multiple reports to both internal and external audiences. The purpose of these reports is to provide data on candidate performance and unit operations and describe curricular improvements based on analyzed data. Program Coordinators assist in the preparations of these documents, and the Director of Teacher Education compiles these reports, which are then approved by the Chair. The finalized reports are discussed with internal and external stakeholders (see Section 7). These reports are the following:

* Semester Report: Program Coordinators prepare this report in the spring analyzing data on candidate performance from the previous fall semester. This report includes a section on curricular improvements listing recommendations stakeholders deem important for the continuous improvement of each program and EPP operations.
* Annual Key Assessment Findings Report (AKAFR): Program Coordinators complete this report each September analyzing data on candidate performance and self-reported technology skills from the previous academic year including fall, spring, and summer semesters. This report also contains data from the alumni and employer surveys. This report includes a section on curricular improvements listing recommendations stakeholders find important for the continuous improvement of each program and EPP operations. In essence, this report is a more comprehensive, academic year version of the Semester Report. This document is submitted to the University and data from this report are shared with internal and external stakeholders at all committees (detailed in Section 7) each semester. This report is also posted for the University community (on the website of the Office of *Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment*) and is continuously updated in the repository for the EPP’s review.
* Major Assessment Findings Report (MAFR): This report is a comprehensive, 5-year review building on data from the Annual Key Assessment Findings Report including data on candidate performance-based assessment and self-reported technology skills data and comprising of data on enrollment and progression, course grades, course and faculty evaluations, as well as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). This report also contains data on graduate performance using data from the alumni and employer surveys. It includes a section on curricular improvements listing recommendations stakeholders consider important for the continuous improvement of each program and EPP operations. This report is posted for the University community (on the website of the Office of *Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes* *Assessment*) and is continuously updated in the repository for the EPP’s review.
* Program Review Reports to Specialized Professional Associations (SPA): Program Coordinators complete a SPA report in each accreditation cycle including analyzed data on candidate performance from the previous three academic years. Results of these reports and the status of national recognition are listed on CAEP’s website.
* Title II Report to ETS: This report includes a list of program completers and current candidates who have taken licensure tests (both CORE/CASE and PRAXIS II) in all initial licensure programs. During several matching cycles, universities and ETS finalize a list of candidates who are considered program completers for each university. Licensure exam pass rates are reported by ETS based on this roster of candidates, and the pass rates are posted on the Department of Education website.
* Title II Report to the State: A narrative report is submitted to the District of Columbia each April to detail program specifics and curricular improvements. It includes information on admissions requirements, enrollment, and supervised clinical experiences; licensing requirements; pass rates on each assessment, and other pertinent information.
* Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) Annual report to AACTE: Parts A and B of this report are completed every January. The Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment provide data for this report. It contains information on enrollment, degree, program completion, faculty, and resources.
* Educator Preparation Providers (EPPs) Annual report to CAEP: Part C of the EPP Annual Report includes information on activities, assessments, and outcomes toward correcting areas of improvement cited in the last Accreditation Action Report. All Program Coordinators assist in the preparation of this report in February.
* U.S. News and World Report Survey: This survey is completed every October with the assistance of the Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment. Results are posted on the U.S. News website, and stakeholders can view ranking information based on these results.
* NCTQ Report: CUA’s teacher education programs submit requested documents to NCTQ and consider feedback from NCTQ for program improvement.

CUA’s EPP also reviews data from the alumni, employer, and technology surveys for the purposes of program improvement. These three surveys are the following:

* Alumni Survey: This survey is aligned with SPA and CUA conceptual framework standards. This survey is completed by all teacher education candidates upon completing their education courses and field experiences. The alumni survey is then resent to CUA graduates when they are employed as teachers.
* Employer Survey: This survey is aligned with SPA and CUA conceptual framework standards. Principals employing CUA graduates are asked to complete this survey.
* Technology Survey: This survey is based on ISTE technology standards and asks questions in the areas of technology operations and concepts. Candidates complete the technology survey at the beginning of their program.

Along with candidate and graduate performance data, the following documents and data are reviewed in order to assess the quality of EPP operations:

* The Chair of the Department of Education reviews each faculty member’s teaching, supervisory and advising load, research, and service as well as junior faculty members’ tenure progress;
* The Director of Teacher Education and the Director of Field Experiences review student teaching evaluations;
* The Director of Field Experiences reviews student teachers’ evaluations of their cooperating teachers, cooperating teachers’ diversity data, and field experience diversity data; and discusses concerns with the DOTE when issues arise
* Program Coordinators review course syllabi and various cohorts’ performance on shared key assessments, PRAXIS II data (report completed by Director of Teacher Education and Program Coordinators);
* The Advisory Council reviews enrollment data and graduation rates; and

As stated in Section 7, these survey data are also discussed at all committees, which provide recommendations for revision of the surveys and program improvement.

EPP operations are monitored and evaluated at the Department’s Advisory Committee and at the Council on Teacher Education, which examine and discuss governance, planning, facilities, and ongoing and possible future collaboration among the Department of Library and Information Science, the Benjamin T. Rome School of Music, and the Department of Education. These two supervisory committees are also responsible for discussing accreditation preparation and resources that are needed to enhance the EPP operations and support candidates’ success. In addition to the above mentioned activities, the Advisory Committee examines and makes decisions regarding departmental planning, budget, personnel, program offerings, departmental facilities, and procedures related to advising, data collection, and data reporting. A more detailed description of these committees’ areas of review and tasks are included in Section 6.

As stated before, data analyses are presented on all key assessments in all programs, and committee members have multiple opportunities to examine the data, ask questions about candidate performance, suggest and discuss program improvement plans, and follow up on previously recommended changes.

The Chair of the Department of Education examines all faculty members’ quantitative and qualitative course evaluations completed by candidates in all courses at the end of each semester. The resulting data are analyzed and uploaded for each course at the University’s Student Course Evaluation website at <https://evaluations.cua.edu>. Data sources to examine EPP quality also include candidate performance on licensure tests, alumni and employer surveys, student teaching evaluations, and Action Research Project data.

Program Coordinators complete the Annual Key Assessment Findings Report and the Major Assessment Findings Report, components of CUA’s Student Learning Assessment Plan. These university-wide assessment reports analyze candidate performance and describe how these assessment results are used for programmatic improvement in each program and across the Educator Preparation Program.

Section 7 includes a detailed description of committees that review data in order to provide suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the EPP.

# Procedure for Assessment of Faculty Performance

Faculty and staff are responsible for fulfilling the mission of the University and the EPP. Because their shared work contributes to the high quality of education that CUA offers to its teacher education candidates, faculty and staff performance must be evaluated systematically.

Staff evaluation occurs as part of CUA’s annual institutional performance appraisal process. The Chair and the Director of Teacher Education regularly communicate with staff members to provide detailed feedback, brainstorm about possible solutions to issues, and explore ways of making the workflow more efficient. Staff members also meet with the Chair and the Director of Teacher Education for an annual performance appraisal session, which is documented to CUA.

Tenured, tenure-track, clinical and research faculty members prepare an Out-of-Classroom Activity Report each year to detail their faculty activity and submit their paperwork to the Chair. The Chair meets with each faculty member individually and evaluates his or her performance annually by rating his or her research, teaching, and service on a scale of 10. Teaching evaluation data are also part of the packet reviewed by departmental faculty and university review committees for reappointment, promotion, and tenure. The Chair of the Department of Education also reviews adjunct faculty members’ teaching performance. This faculty information is submitted to the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Candidates also evaluate faculty members in two ways. Candidates complete a survey to provide feedback on the student teacher supervisors’ quality of supervision and mentoring performance. (Student teachers also provide feedback on their cooperating teachers’ mentoring performance as well as their view of the Action Research Paper completed during the student teaching semester.) Student teachers submit their supervisors’ evaluation data to the Director of Field Experiences who shares the feedback with faculty members and the Director of Teacher Education. Cooperating teachers also provide feedback on the quality of supervision provided by CUA faculty. When necessary, the Director of Field Experiences and the Director of Teacher Education discuss areas for improvement with faculty members who need additional support.

Teacher education candidates also complete for each course in each semester a course evaluation form that has a quantitative and qualitative component. The Office of Planning, Institutional Research, and Student Learning Outcomes Assessment analyzes the quantitative course evaluation data and publishes the results on the University’s website for all CUA faculty members. The qualitative evaluations in forms of a narrative are also submitted to the Dean’s office. Once the grades are entered, faculty are allowed to review their qualitative and qualitative course evaluations.

# Procedures for Evaluation and Revision of Assessment System

The EPP assessment system (detailed in Section 13) is regularly reviewed and revised by the Director of Teacher Education and Program Coordinators as requirements change for applicants, candidates, and graduates. The revisions are discussed at and approved by the Teacher Education Committee, and the changes are submitted to the Advisory Committee for final approval. Key assessment templates and scoring guides are revised and uploaded onto LiveText noting the semester in which the assessment instruments were revised. The assessment matrices (prepared by Program Coordinators and uploaded on the Teacher Education Shared Drive (O: drive) also reflect the latest changes.

The Director of Teacher Education evaluates, using input from faculty, the effectiveness of LiveText and regularly updates CUA’s LiveText implementation specialist on requested changes and new functions.

# Procedure for Revision of Key Assessments

Once a key assessment is created or revised, faculty teaching a particular course where the key assessment is administered pilot the evaluation tool for one semester. At the end of the semester Program Coordinators and the Office of the Director of Teacher Education analyze the assessment results. Program Coordinators, faculty, and committees where performance-based assessment data are presented (see Section 7) examine the data analyses of the assessment results and recommend changes for improving the assessment instruments. Once faculty and appropriate committees approve the changes, the assessment templates and scoring guides are revised and implemented in the next assessment cycle. This is an ongoing process, and many CUA key assessments have seen several revisions documented in LiveText.

# Use of Results

The use of assessment instruments regarding all aspects of candidate performance and unit operations provide invaluable data for improvement in terms of the curriculum, EPP operations, and candidate support. Teacher education faculty consider major and minor changes in order to increase the effectiveness of each program and further strengthen candidates’ preparation. Each year program- and EPP-level data are shared with internal stakeholders, such as the Teacher Education Committee, Secondary Education Committee, the Advisory Council for the Special Education and Early Childhood Special Education Programs, Education Faculty as well as external stakeholders, such as the Council on Teacher Education that includes representatives from the professional community, such as principals, cooperating teachers, alumni, and representatives from school districts (See Section 6 for a complete list of members). The regular sharing of aggregated and disaggregated data has resulted in a culture of a continuous cycle of improvement that takes into consideration recommendations from a wide audience of stakeholders. Data-based discussions and decisions have resulted in the following changes in CUA’s teacher education programs since our last visit:

* Modification in program requirements at various gates
* Development of new courses
* Reorganization of existing courses
* Refinement of course content
* Alignment of content in courses and standards
* Changes in instructional delivery method
* Revision of all key assessment templates and scoring guides
* Restructuring of evaluation of capstone experiences
* Modification of course schedules
* Revision of course syllabi
* Realignment of programs and key assessments with newly published professional standards
* Provision of additional technology facilities and support for candidates and faculty

# Fairness, Accuracy, Consistency, and Elimination of Bias

Fairness, accuracy, consistency, and the avoidance of bias are essential aspects of CUA’s EPP operations. CUA faculty have taken steps to increase fairness, accuracy, and consistency while reducing or eliminating sources of bias in key assessments that are used to evaluate candidates’ performance.

**Fairness** is established when candidates have sufficient opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills, and dispositions delineated in the curriculum; assessment instruments measure the identified and taught knowledge, skills, and dispositions; and candidates are informed of expectations prior to being evaluated.

In order to ensure fairness, CUA Program Coordinators have reviewed their program curricula and aligned their program assessments and syllabi with SPA, InTASC, and CUA conceptual framework standards and content categories included in the Test at a Glance document for each PRAXIS II content and pedagogy test on the ETS website. This alignment among course content, SPA, conceptual framework, and InTASC standards, and licensure tests is to ensure that candidates are given ample opportunities to learn the knowledge, skills, and dispositions assessed throughout their program. Education faculty share all assessment templates and scoring guides as well as survey questions (dispositions, etc.) with candidates prior to administering the assessments to inform candidates of expectations. Faculty also explain to candidates how assignments are scored and how they count toward program completion.

The Director of Field Experiences holds a student teaching orientation session for all student teachers, University supervisors, and cooperating teachers at the beginning of each semester. The Director discusses and shares key assessments (such as the student teaching evaluation, Action Research Project, and Electronic Portfolio) and faculty’s performance expectations for each assessment.

The evaluation sessions during the student teaching experiences are conducted through a triad of the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and University supervisor, and together they discuss the ratings on each item in each area. The cooperating teacher together with the University supervisor discuss the candidate’s performance with the candidate, and they all reach consensus on the final evaluation with input from the candidate. The student teaching evaluation form is given to the student teacher at the beginning of his or her student teaching semester.

The Director of Teacher Education and Program Coordinators regularly hold orientation sessions for each cohort of candidates in all programs every year. These orientation sessions include information on admission, continuance, and graduation requirements; the assessment system, key assessments, field experiences, licensure application procedures, LiveText, policies for teacher education candidates, conceptual framework, dispositional expectations, Disability Support Services and other support structures for candidates. All this information is confirmed and repeated at individual advising sessions with faculty. Candidates also receive their handbooks that are downloadable together with all orientation handouts at <http://education.cua.edu/Current%20Students/students.cfm> (Handbooks tab and Orientation Materials tab respectively).

New or revised assessments are always piloted first, and faculty and candidates (as well as other stakeholders) are given opportunities for feedback based on which assessments continue to be refined. An assignment is of passing quality if the following criteria are met:

* 80% of the items meet expectations (2 points) on the scoring guide,
* The mean is at least 2.00, and
* Critical elements (identified on each scoring guide) meet expectations.

If these conditions are not met, the candidate needs to revise the assignment, and the original scores will remain in the LiveText database. For those who do not pass the assessment the first time, the first grade is recorded for determining the grade in the course, and the candidate works with the course instructor to revise the assessment until the assignment is of passing quality.

Program Coordinators and faculty members teaching courses in which programmatic key assessments are given discuss candidate performance data focusing on struggling candidates’ academic performance. If assessment instruments seem to have deficiencies in measuring candidate knowledge, skills, or dispositions, Program Coordinators revise the assignment template or scoring guide based on data from faculty. Program Coordinators are scheduled in the Fall of 2014 to revise their curriculum maps to show when and where knowledge, skills, and dispositions identified in the newly published SPA and InTASC standards are covered.

CUA faculty use a standard template to create syllabi for all their courses. This template includes a clear description of performance expectations and grading policy and includes all sets of standards appropriate for that particular course to clarify course requirements and operations.

Each education course includes a discussion of the conceptual framework or a component of it. For instance, the sophomore foundation classes each discuss a component of the conceptual framework and ensure that all sophomores are very familiar with the entire conceptual framework by the time they apply for admission at the end of the sophomore year.

Candidates are given opportunities to remediate deficiencies by resubmitting work for a second review.

**Accuracy** is ascertained when assessment instruments measure what they are intended to measure. Therefore, they should be aligned with the standards they are designed to measure.

In order to increaseaccuracy, faculty closely examine assessments to ensure that they measure for what they are designed. Each key assessment is aligned with SPA, InTASC and CUA conceptual framework standards, and three levels of performance are delineated for each area. Scoring guides include specific language from the standards to which they are aligned. Program Coordinators aligned each area of the assessment scoring guides with only one SPA standard, included coherent categories of content in the assessments, and ensured that the minimum expectations are compatible with the knowledge and skills defined in standards in terms of their complexity and comprehensiveness. CUA faculty have realistic expectations based on a level at which a 1st year teacher is supposed to perform.

Education faculty and Program Coordinators also discuss at various committees candidate performance across multiple assessments, such as student teaching evaluation, course grades, and licensure tests.

**Consistency** is attained when assessment instruments produce reliable and trustworthy results that would remain constant across multiple administrations of the assessment.

In order to ensure consistency, Program Coordinators examine data from key assessments across multiple administrations within a course or across multiple cohorts. Faculty members expect to see that without an intervention data from multiple administrations stay constant. When data patterns show a difference, Program Coordinators discuss with program faculty, the Director of Teacher Education, and committee members when they present their program data why the differences may have occurred. Most often the differences are due to some intervention when the key assessment is administered multiple times in one course (e.g., lesson plans, scoring guide, and student teaching evaluation) or in several courses in subsequent semesters (e.g., lesson plans in the first professional semester to the second). It is also possible that candidate qualifications in various cohorts may explain less or more success on certain key assessments. Program Coordinators ponder these questions and when necessary, revise key assessments to ensure that they produce more dependable and consistent results on repeated measures.

Several key assessments are also evaluated by multiple raters. For example, the integrated junior thematic units are evaluated by two faculty members whose classes include these key assessments. During the senior year (or last semester for graduate students), the student teaching capstone evaluation is completed by the cooperating teacher and the University supervisor. The Action Research Project is evaluated by the Director of Field Experiences who teaches the student teaching seminar as well as the candidate’s University supervisor. The Electronic Portfolio is presented to three faculty members, who come to a consensus regarding the evaluation results. Disposition surveys are completed by multiple faculty members who have the same candidates in their classes. Members of the Teacher Education Committee review the teacher education admission packets and come to a consensus on whom to admit fully or provisionally, and which candidate to dismiss.

Data are also triangulated whenever possible. For instance, the practicum evaluation, the student teaching evaluation, the alumni survey, and the employer survey share similar questions.

The Office of the Director of Teacher Education is able to run inter-rater reliability analyses (with means and standard deviation) on all key assessments in LiveText. When necessary, she initiates discussion among faculty members whose scores are very different. The grading expectations regarding the three levels of performance (exceeding expectations [3], meeting expectations [2], and acquiring skill [1]) are regularly discussed at the Teacher Education Committee, education faculty meeting, and new faculty orientation sessions.

**Avoidance and elimination of bias** is achieved when assessment results provide clear evidence for candidate knowledge and proficiencies. To this end, faculty members need to eliminate racial and ethnic stereotypes, cultural insensitivity, poorly written language, unclear task situations, other distractions, confusion, and ambiguity in assessment instruments that may present bias and negatively influence candidate performance. Furthermore, assessments must be scored consistently to ensure that no candidate or groups of candidates are favored or discriminated against inadvertently.

In order to avoid or eliminate bias, Program Coordinators and education faculty regularly examine assignment templates and scoring guides to remove any ambiguous and distracting information. CUA’s assessment instruments are free of culturally insensitive wording, and racial and ethnic stereotypes, and poorly written and vague directions and expectations. CUA faculty also grade and vote on comprehensive exams using student ID numbers rather than names. It is very important for CUA faculty to ensure that all candidates are given equal opportunity to perform well and no one is discriminated against with any assessment instrument.

Faculty provide learning and assessment accommodations for candidates who are registered at the office of the Disability Support Services. Candidates are also informed of CUA’s due and appeal processes.

# Procedure for Handling Candidate Complaints: Appeal Process

In addition to the Teacher Education Committee meetings, EPP faculty have the opportunity any time to express their concern about a teacher education candidate’s low academic achievement, including knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Letters need to be sent to the Director of Teacher Education detailing the deficiencies in knowledge, skills, and dispositions. These faculty concerns as well as other deficiencies determined by assessments are used by faculty to support candidates and by the Teacher Education Committee to (1) put candidates on a probationary semester (2) deny acceptance to CUA’s teacher education programs, or 3) dismiss a candidate. Once a decision for a denial or dismissal is made, a candidate has the right to appeal the decision.

**21.a. Appeal Process**

Once the candidate is informed that the Teacher Education Committee has made a decision to deny or dismiss her/him from the teacher education program, the candidate must complete a *Request for Appeal Form*\* and submit it to her/his advisor and the Chair of the Department of Education **within 7 days of notification.**

**Within 14 days of receiving the appeal**, the Chair of the Department of Education meets with the candidate to hear the special circumstances of the appeal. Before this meeting the Chair may request from other faculty members additional information that might be relevant to the case. The Chair may also ask the candidate’s Program Coordinator and/or advisor to attend the meeting.

The Chair reviews the appeal and the submitted documentation and makes one of the following decisions **within a 7-day period** in the case of denials: (1) full admission with no provisions, 2) admission on a provisional status, and (3) denial of admission. In the case of dismissals, the Chair makes one of the following decisions **within a 7-day period**: (1) continuance in the program without conditions, 2) continuance on a probationary status, and (3) dismissal from the program. The Chair will notify in writing the candidate, academic advisor, Program Coordinator, Director of Teacher Education and Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs in the School of Arts and Sciences of the decision and any conditions that apply.

If the candidate is placed on a provisional or probationary semester, by the end of the semester following the decision, the candidate must meet any condition(s) or other Department requirements that apply. If the decision is to deny acceptance to the program or dismiss the candidate from the program, the candidate will be referred to the Office of the Dean of Arts and Sciences for academic advising.

*\*Appeals must be written within one week of notification and may not be made orally. The form is included at the end of this document. A candidate may request an interview with the Assistant or Associate Dean in Arts & Sciences to discuss the academic situation prior to the written appeal.*

**21.b. Request for Appeal Form**

\*\*Please note that the Request for Appeal Form is available in LiveText.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date of request submitted** |  |
| **First name** |  |
| **Last name** |  |
| **Student ID #** |  |
| **E-mail address** |  |
| **Mailing address** |  |
| **Major** |  |
| **Expected date of graduation** |  |
| **Academic difficulty appealed** |  |
| **Semester in which difficulty is noted** |  |
| **Explanation for appeal** | Please provide a detailed explanation about the extenuating circumstances that prevented you from making satisfactory progress in your Teacher Education program. Be as specific as possible and provide supporting evidence by attaching documentation if possible. |

**21.c. Candidate Appeal Checklist**

Name of Candidate: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ID # \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Major \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

This checklist is used to document that the appeal process is conducted in a timely manner according to CUA’s guidelines.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Appeal Action Sequence** | **Signature** | **Date** |
| Candidate receives notification that s/he has not met the requirements to continue in the Teacher Education Program. | Candidate |  |
| Candidate completes and submits *Request for Appeal Form* to her/his advisor and the Chair of the Department of Education **within 7 days of notification.** | AdvisorChair |  |
| **Within 14 days of receiving the appeal**, the Chair of the Department of Education meets with the candidate to hear the special circumstances of the appeal. | Chair |  |
| The Chair makes one of the following decisions **within a 7-day period** in the case of denials: (1) full admission with no provisions, 2) admission on a provisional status, and (3) denial of admission. In the case of dismissals, the Chair makes one of the following decisions **within a 7-day period**: (1) continuance in the program without conditions, 2) continuance in probationary status, and (3) dismissal from the program. | Chair |  |
| The Chair will notify in writing the candidate, academic advisor, Program Coordinator, Director of Teacher Education and Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs in the School of Arts and Sciences of the decision and any conditions that apply. | Chair |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Chair’s Decision** |
| **Decision** |  | Date |
| **Condition(s) to be met, additional requirement(s) to be fulfilled** |  |  |
| **Deadline for meeting requirements** |  |  |
| **Chair** | Sign | Date |
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**Appendix A: Educator Preparation Program Assessment Contacts:**

**Educator Preparation Program Head (Chair of Department of Education)**

 Merylann “Mimi” Schuttloffel, Ph.D. (Schuttloffel@cua.edu)

**Director of Teacher Education**

 Liliana Maggioni, Ph.D. (maggioni@cua.edu)

**Program Coordinators**

**Early Childhood Education**

 Kathryn Bojczyk, Ph.D. (bojczyk@cua.edu)

**Elementary Education**

Agnes Cave, Ph.D. (cave@cua.edu)

**Secondary English Education**

Liliana Maggioni, Ph.D. (maggioni@cua.edu)

**Secondary Math Education**

 John Convey, Ph.D. (convey@cua.edu)

**Secondary Social Studies Education**

Liliana Maggioni, Ph.D. (maggioni@cua.edu)

**Special Education**

Advisors: Agnes Cave, Ph.D. (cave@cua.edu);

 Rona Frederick, Ph.D. (frederick@cua.edu)

**Early Childhood Special Education**

Carole Brown, Ph.D. (brownc@cua.edu)

**Appendix B**

**Inventory of Key Assessments in Each Program**

**Key Assessments - Early Childhood Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Numbers Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Licensure tests
 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. Tutoring
 | 271 | HaverbackCave |  | *T:* [*Tutoring Journal Template F1*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/202246)*3*SC: [ELE Tutoring Journal Scoring Guide, KA #6](https://www.livetext.com/doc/7928869) |
| 1. Lesson Plans
 | a. EDUC 312b. EDUC 320c. EDUC 321d. EDUC 323e. EDUC 324f. MUS 460 | McRaeMcRaeMcRaeConveyHaverbackBattersby | FSSSSF | * *T:* [*CUA Lesson Plan Template F13*](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8684293)
* SC.a. [ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - General, KA #3 F13](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8684248)

SC.b. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Science, Health Education, Physical Education, KA #3SC.c. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Social Studies, KA #3SC.[d. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Mathematics, KA #3](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917889)SC.e. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Reading, Writing, Oral Language, KA #3SC.f. [ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - The Arts, KA #3](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917942) |
| 1. Student Teaching Evaluation
 | 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | ECE STE Fall 14Early Childhood Student Teaching Evaluation, KA #4 |
| 1. Action Research Paper
 | 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | *T:* [*ELE Action Research Paper (ARP) Template-F13*](https://www.livetext.com/doc/5373792)SC: [ELE Action Research Paper Scoring Guide, KA #5 F13](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8822733) |
| 1. Electronic Portfolio
 | 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | *T:* [*CUA Electronic Portfolio Template*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1189651)*F13*SC: CUA Electronic Portfolio Scoring Guide F12 |
| 1. Observation Assignment
 | 261 | Bojczyk | F,S | EDUC 261 Observation Scoring Rubric F14*T:* [*CUA Observation Template*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1189651)KA#7 |
| 1. Child Portfolio
 | 342 | Bojczyk | FF | Child Portfolio Scoring Guide (Early Childhood) F13[Child Portfolio Scoring Guide, KA #8](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7929921) |

Legend:

T: template

SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments - Elementary Program - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Licensure tests
 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. Grades
 | All courses in Education and Distribution Requirements (excluding TRS and Philosophy) | N/A |  | Grades from each semester |
| 1. Lesson Plans
 | a. EDUC 312b. EDUC 320c. EDUC 321d. EDUC 323e. EDUC 324f. MUS 460 | McRaeMcRaeMcRaeConveyHaverbackBattersby | FSSSSF | * *T:* [*CUA Lesson Plan Template F13*](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8684293)
* SC.a. [ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - General, KA #3 F13](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8684248)

SC.b. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Science, Health Education, Physical Education, KA #3SC.c. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Social Studies, KA #3SC.[d. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Mathematics, KA #3](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917889)SC.e. ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - Reading, Writing, Oral Language, KA #3SC.f. [ELE Lesson Plan Scoring Guide - The Arts, KA #3](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917942) |
| 1. Student Teaching Evaluation
 | EDUC 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | [Student Teaching Evaluation - Elementary Education F13](https://www.livetext.com/misk5/formz/fields/1022/) |
| 1. Action Research Paper
 | EDUC 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | *T:* [*ELE Action Research Paper (ARP) Template-F13*](https://www.livetext.com/doc/5373792)SC: [ELE Action Research Paper Scoring Guide, KA #5 F13](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8822733) |
| 1. Tutoring
 | EDUC 271 | Cave, Haverback |  | *T:* [*Tutoring Journal Template F1*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/202246)*3** SC: [ELE Tutoring Journal Scoring Guide, KA #6](https://www.livetext.com/doc/7928869)
 |
| 1. Electronic Portfolio
 | EDUC 400 | Cave, Supervisors | F, S | *T:* [*CUA Electronic Portfolio Template*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1189651)*F13*SC: CUA Electronic Portfolio Scoring Guide F12 |
| 1. Thematic Unit
 | EDUC 321 & EDUC 323EDUC 320 & EDUC 324 | McRae & ConveyMcRae & Haverback | SS | * *T:* [*ELE Thematic Unit Template-F13*](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8958372)
* [SC:](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7929921) [ELE Thematic Unit Scoring Guide, KA #8 F13](https://www.livetext.com/doc/8958390)
 |

Legend:

T: template

SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments - Secondary English Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Numbers Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Licensure assessment, or other content-based assessment: **Praxis II**
 | N/A | N/A | Prior to student teaching | N/A |
| 1. Assessment of Content knowledge in English: **Transcript Analysis**
 | Content Area (English)  | (the reviewer is the Coordinator of Secondary Education + faculty member in English department, if required)  | Upon entrance into program and prior to student teaching | Review of Coursework |
| 1. Candidate ability to plan instruction: **Unit Plan**
 | EDUC 480/580 | Andrusik | Fall | T: NCTE CUA Unit Plan F13 KA #3SC: SEC ENGLISH Unit Plan Scoring Guide, KA#3 |
| 1. Student teaching or internship: **Student Teaching Evaluation**
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | CaveAssessed by Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher | Upon completion of student teaching | T/SC: SEC ENGLISH Student Teaching Evaluation SEC STE GeneralSEC ENGLISH Student Teaching Evaluation NCTE STE Addendum |
| 1. Candidate effect on student learning: **Action Research Project**
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 |  Cave | Student teaching semester | T: SEC ENGLISH Action Research Project Scoring Guide, KA#5 SC: SEC ENGLISH Action Research Project Template, KA#5, F13 |
| 1. Additional assessment addressing NCTE standards: **Instructional Framework Project**
 | EDUC 382/582 | Haverback | Spring | T: SEC ENGLISH Instructional Framework Project Template, KA#6, F13SC: SEC ENGLISH Instructional Framework Project Scoring Guide, KA#6, F13 |
| 1. Additional assessment that addressing NCTE standards (optional): **Electronic Portfolio**
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Cave | End of student teaching semester | T: SEC ENGLISH Electronic Portfolio Template, KA#7, F13SC: SEC ENGLISH Electronic Portfolio Scoring Guide, KA#7, F13 |
| 1. Additional assessment that addressing NCTE standards (optional): **Annotated Bibliography**
 | EDUC 480/580 | Andrusik | Fall | T: SEC ENGLISH Annotated Adolescent Literature Bibliography Template, KA#8, F13SC: SEC ENGLISH Annotated Adolescent Literature Bibliography Scoring Guide, KA#8, F13 |

Legend:

T: template

SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments – Undergraduate Secondary Mathematics Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Praxis II
 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. GPA
 | Math Courses and Overall | N/A |  | Grades from each semester |
| 1. Lesson Plans
 | 386, 479 | Haverback, Convey | S | *T:* [*CUA Lesson Plan Template F12*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7929991)CUA Secondary/ Elementary/ECE Lesson Plan Rubric |
| 1. Student Teaching Evaluation
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Neely, Supervisors | S | Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Generic and Content Specific |
| 1. Action Research Paper
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Neely, Supervisors | S | *T:* [*Action Research Paper (ARP) ECE/ELE/SEC Template-F12*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/5373792)[ARP](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917975) Assessment Rubric |
| 1. Electronic Portfolio
 | EDUC 561/562/563 EDUC 461/462/463 | Neely, Supervisors | S | *T:* [*CUA Electronic Portfolio Template*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1189651)[CUA Electronic Portfolio Scoring Guide F12](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1067389) |
| 1. Teaching & Learning Project
 | Consortium Methods Course, 479 | Consortium Faculty, Convey | F | *Scope and Sequence Scoring Guide (Consortium, Micro-Teaching Rubric* |
| 1. Comprehensive Exams
 | Math Department | Math Department | Junior-Senior Year | Part 1: 4 Questions; Scale 1-10Part 2: 8 Questions; Oral optional |

Legend-T: template, SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments – Graduate Secondary Mathematics Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Praxis II
 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. GPA
 | Math Courses and Overall | Transcript Analysis |  | Grades  |
| 1. Lesson Plans
 | 586, 579 | Montanaro, Convey | S | *T:* [*CUA Lesson Plan Template F12*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7929991)CUA Secondary/ Elementary/ECE Lesson Plan Rubric |
| 1. Student Teaching Evaluation
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Cave, Supervisors | S | Student Teaching Evaluation Rubric: Generic and Content Specific |
| 1. Action Research Paper
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Cave, Supervisors | S | *T:* [*Action Research Paper (ARP) ECE/ELE/SEC Template-F12*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/5373792)[ARP](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/7917975) Assessment Rubric |
| 1. Electronic Portfolio
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Cave, Supervisors | S | *T:* [*CUA Electronic Portfolio Template*](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1189651)[CUA Electronic Portfolio Scoring Guide F12](https://c1.livetext.com/doc/1067389) |
| 1. Teaching & Learning Project
 | Consortium Methods Course, 579 | Consortium Faculty, Convey | F | *Scope and Sequence Scoring Guide (Consortium), Micro-Teaching Rubric* |

Legend: T: template, SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments – Secondary Social Studies Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Numbers Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Licensure tests
 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1. Grades/Transcript Analysis
 | Content Area GPA + GPA by NCSS Standards | N/A |  | Grades from each semester |
| 1. Unit Plan
 | EDUC 485/585 | Liliana Maggioni | F | Unit Plan Template/Scoring Guide |
| 1. Student Teaching Evaluation
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Elsie NeelyAssessed by Supervisor and Cooperating Teacher | F, S | Key 4: Student Teaching Evaluation with link to NCSS Evaluation |
| 1. Action Research Paper
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Elsie NeelyAssessed by Supervisor | F, S | Action Research Project Template and Scoring Guide (revised for NCSS) |
| 1. Electronic Portfolio
 | EDUC 561/562/563EDUC 461/462/463 | Elsie NeelyAssessed by 3 faculty members | F, S | EP Template and Scoring Guide (revised for NCSS) |

Legend - T: template, SC: scoring guide

**Key Assessments - Early Childhood Special Education - F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Numbers Where KA Administered** | **Faculty Teaching Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Praxis II, Contents: Special Education, Pre-school (0691) Early Childhood (0022) Pedagogy: EC (5621)
 | N/A | N/A | Required before graduation | Praxis II scores – KA #1 |
| 1. Child Portfolio
2. Language Development
3. Cognition, Behavioral, Learning, and Academic Areas
 |  EDUC 639, Part I); | Stites, Michelle | 639: Spring  | Child Porfolios, Part I, Part II – KA #2 |
| EDUC 525, Part II | Cave, Agnes | 525: Fall, Summer |
| 1. Environmental

observation andanalysis and Planning for all learners | EDUC 532 | Brown, Carole |  | Environmental Observation and Planning for all Learners – KA #3 |
|  | Summer 2015 |
| 1. Student Teaching Observation - Early

Childhood Education | EDUC 532; | Brown, Carole | Summer 2015 | Student Observation Teaching – KA #4 |
|  |  |
| EDUC 575 | Sobel, Andrea | Summer, 2015 |
| 1. Action Research Paper (Project)
 | EDUC 575 | Sobel, Andrea | Summer, 2015 | Action Research Paper Rubric – KA #5 |
| 1. Creating and Managing Effective Learning Environments to Support All Learners through Integrated Curriculum
 | EDUC 575 | Sobel, Andrea | Summer, 2018 | Creating and Managing Effective Learning Environments to Support All Learners Through Integrated Curriculum – KA #10 |
| 1. Family Systems Performance Assessment
 | EDUC 573 | Mayer, Lynne | Summer, 2014 \* (Course next offered in Summer 2017) | Home/School Communications, Family Interview and Collaboration Skills – KA #6 |
| 1. Functional Behavior Assessment
 | EDUC 635 | Wall, Shavaun  | Spring, 2015 | Functional Behavior Assessment – KA #7 |
| 1. Formal Assessment
 | EDUC 533 | Ringenberg , Lynn | Summer, 2015 | KA #8 |
| 1. Language and Literacy (ECSE) Case Study
 | EDUC 531 | Montanaro, Elizabeth | Summer | Case Study – KA #9 |

Legend - T: template, SC: scoring guide **Key Assessments - Special Education – F14**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Key Assessment (KA)** | **Course Numbers Where KA is Administered** | **Faculty Member Teaching the Course with KA** | **Semester Course Offered** | **Name of Template/Scoring Guide** |
| 1. Licensure Tests Special Education Content: 0354

/ Principles of Learning, 0622, 623 or 624 | N/A | N/A | N/A | Praxis II Scores – KA #1 |
| 1. Planning For All Learners/Environmental Analysis
 | 532 | Stites | Summer | Environmental Observation and Planning for All Learners – KA#2 |
| 1. Case Study: Language and Literacy Development
 | 531 | Montanaro | Spring | Language and Literacy Development Case Study – KA #3 |
| 1. Evaluation of Field Placement
 | EDUC 534 | Brown, Sanchez | Fall | Student Teacher Teaching Evaluation – KA #4 |
| 1. Action Research Project
 | EDUC 534 | Brown, Sanchez | Fall | Action Research Project – KA #5 |
| 1. Functional Behavior Analysis
 | EDUC 635 | Wall | Spring | Functional Behavior Analysis – KA #6 |
| 1. Case Law
 | EDUC 535 | Joan Christopher, Esq. | Fall 2014 | Case Law – KA #7 |
| 1. Formal Assessment
 | EDUC 635 | Wall | Spring | Woodcock Johnson Report KA #8 |

Legend: T: template, SC: scoring guide

**Appendix C**

**Alphabetical Inventory of All Key Assessments at Each Gate**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessments/Document** | **Gates**  |
| Action Research Project | 4 |
| Alumni Survey  | 6 |
| Annotated Bibliography | 3 |
| Application for Capstone Experience | 3 |
| Application to Teacher Education  | 1 |
| Candidate Profile Form | 1, 2 |
| Case Law Project | 4 |
| Case Study | 2, 3 |
| Comprehensive Exam | 4 |
| Consultative Video Performance Assessment | 4 |
| PRAXIS Core Academic Skills for Educators (CORE/CASE) | 1 |
| DispositionSurvey | 1, 2, 3, 4 |
| Electronic Portfolio  | 4 |
| Employer’s Evaluation  | 6 |
| Functional Behavior Analysis | 3 |
| GPA and/or C- Policy | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 |
| Graduation Audit | 4 |
| GRE/MAT (G) | 1 |
| Instructional Framework | 3 |
| Interview (G) | 1 |
| Junior Audit (UG: A&S) | 3 |
| Letters of Recommendation  | 1 |
| License Application | 5 |
| Lesson Plan | 2, 3  |
| Observation Paper | 1, 2 |
| Practicum Evaluation | 2, 3 |
| PRAXIS II  | 3, 5 |
| Program of Study (G) | 2 |
| Research Paper | 4 |
| Security Clearance | 1, 2, 3 |
| Student Teaching Evaluation | 4 |
| TB Test | 2, 3 |
| Technology Survey  | 1, 2, 4 |
| Thematic Unit | 3 |
| Transcript Review (G)  | 1 |
| Tutoring Journal | 1 |
| Unit Plan  | 3 |
| Woodcock-Johnson Assessment | 3, 4 |

**Appendix D: Glossary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Abbreviation** | **Explanation** |
| AAC | Administrative Assistant to the Chair |
| AKAFR | Annual Key Assessment Findings Report |
| ARP | Action Research Paper |
| CK | Content Knowledge |
| CTE | Council on Teacher Education |
| CUA | The Catholic University of America |
| DOFE | Director of Field Experiences |
| DOTE | Director of Teacher Education |
| ECE | Early Childhood Education |
| ECSE | Early Childhood Special Education |
| ELE | Elementary Education |
| EP | Electronic Portfolio |
| G | Graduate |
| EPP | Educator Preparation Program |
| GPA | Grade Point Average |
| GTCP | Graduate Teacher Certification Program |
| K, S, D | Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Dispositions |
| LP | Lesson Plan |
| LT | LiveText |
| MA | Master’s Program |
| MAFR | Major Assessment Findings Report |
| OSSE | Office of the State Superintendent of Education |
| PBA | Performance-Based Assessment |
| PC | Program Coordinator |
| PF | Program Faculty |
| SEC | Secondary Education |
| SPA | Specialized Professional Association |
| SPED | Special Education |
| TE | Teacher Education |
| TEC | Teacher Education Committee |
| UG | Undergraduate |
| US | University Supervisor |