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and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations.

Q6: What kind of changes in unit practices have been made based on these study results?

Q7: How does your assessment system reflect your conceptual framework?

2. Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

Q1: How does the UAS provide regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations and candidate performance at each stage of the programs, including the first years of the program completers’ practice?

Q2: Explain the internal and external sources of data that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs.

Q3: Are data disaggregated in the following ways: traditional route, alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs?

Q4: Explain the timeline for regularly and systematically compiling, aggregating, summarizing, analyzing and publicly reporting for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality and unit operations.

Q5: How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?

Q6: To what degree is the unit developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system?

3. Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement

Q1: To what extent has the unit revised its underlying data system and analytic techniques based on evidence from the UAS?

Q2: How does the unit systematically study the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences?
Q3: What is the timeline for candidate and faculty review of data on their performance?

Q4: Explain how plans are developed for improvement of candidate and faculty performance based on data.

I. History of UAS Change Chart

Institution: Ball State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Change</th>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Change Made</th>
<th>Based on this Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/13/02</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The Decision Point 1 Portfolio Assessment Rubric passed.</td>
<td>Inter-departmental task force design and pilot testing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy Approved for Secondary Education—Students either take the final content methods course concurrent with EDSEC 380/385 or right after they have completed 380/385. Students must address seven INTASC principles through reflections and artifacts in their portfolio by Decision Point 3. The committee decided that two separate assessments of Decision Point 3 would occur: one in the content methods course and one in EDSEC 380/385.</td>
<td>PEC action—Need to assure consistency in application of shared collaborative policy design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy Approved for Secondary Education—At Decision Point 2 in secondary education, in the licensure area, and in EDMUL 205 and EDPSY 251, students will develop and submit artifacts and reflections to their portfolio based on INTASC principles 1, 2, and 3, and these would be assessed in the relevant courses.</td>
<td>PEC action—Shared assessment responsibilities with content area and pedagogy faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/19/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Point 4 of the Portfolio Review Policy passed.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/10/03</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>Paper reduction strategy introduced—agenda and minutes distributed electronically.</td>
<td>Ease of access to both current and archived information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Point Documents were approved for Life Sciences, Music (both instrumental</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Institutional Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/12/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Point Document approved for Journalism.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/10/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Point Documents were approved for Earth/Space Sciences, Language Arts, Library/Media, and Theater Arts.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The Teacher Education Handbook placed online.</td>
<td>Ease of access to both current and archived information. Improved communication with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/03</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Point Documents were approved for Foreign Language, Mathematics, Physical Sciences/Physics, Family and Consumer Sciences, Technology Education, Visual Arts, Business Education &amp; Marketing Education, all Exceptional Needs programs, Early Childhood Education, and Elementary Education.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Abbreviated Conceptual Framework document passed.</td>
<td>PEC action—Original Conceptual Framework was too lengthy for easy communication with stakeholders and for use in courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/11/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Unit Operations Plan for Professional Education discussed.</td>
<td>Response to NCATE area for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Institutional Decision Points document passed.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student Teacher Termination Policy passed.</td>
<td>PEC action—Need for institutional policy to assure due process in a five-day plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Points Document approved for Social Studies.</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/21/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Decision Points Document approved for</td>
<td>PEC action—Consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/04</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>Diversity Standards for Professional Education passed.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/04</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Assessing Dispositions in Advanced Candidates passed.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response. Consequences of failure differs from initial licensure programs. Pilot test with select faculty and classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/28/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td><strong>Decision Points Document</strong> approved for Life Sciences.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>PEC recommended that data should be collected on not just the number of terminations of student teachers but also the reasons for the terminations and that PEC would review the data.</td>
<td>Initial reporting format not including disaggregated data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/22/04</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Praxis I Waiver Policy for students with disabilities was approved.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Alignment of institutional Decision Points with state licensing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/21/05</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>The UAS Web site <a href="http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas">http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas</a> was presented, noting its design, structure, and content.</td>
<td>Ease of access to both current and archived information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/05</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs passed.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Response to NCATE Area for Improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/26/05</td>
<td>I</td>
<td><strong>Decision Points Document</strong> approved for Chemistry.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/25/06</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>The revised Assessing Dispositions in Advanced Candidates passed.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Legal review of the process and procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/24/07</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Passed the motion “Disposition Assessment will occur in Decision Point 3 by content faculty within the licensure area.” The change to take effect immediately (Spring 2007 semester).</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Need for consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/07</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>The Praxis II Waiver Policy for students with identified disabilities was approved.</td>
<td><strong>PEC action</strong>—Alignment of institutional Decision Points with state licensing requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/07</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>NCATE Evidence Management System was presented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/20/07</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>The revised Rubric for Decision Point 3 passed. The Policies and Procedures for Portfolio Evaluation for Secondary Education Majors at Decision Point 3 also passed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/25/07</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Passed the proposal to designate dispositions assessment at Decision Point 2 to occur in EDMUL 205 for programs requiring this course, but as an option for all-grade licensure programs. The implementation took effect in Spring 2007.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/7/07</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>The Decision Point Articulation for initial licensure at the graduate level was approved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16/08</td>
<td>I/A</td>
<td>C. Luke, Department of Modern Languages and Classics, made a presentation on systematizing data for program improvement and using data for program change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/19/08</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Policy and Procedures for Appealing a Decision Point 3 Digital Portfolio Unsatisfactory Decision approved. Implementation to begin Spring 2008.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PEC action—Results of a study on inter-rater reliability and rubric revisions. (An inter-departmental summer study group reviewed the results.)

PEC action—Review of disposition data showing need to have consistent course-embedded assessment.

PEC action—Consistent and coherent UAS institutional response.

PEC action—Necessary revision of the process and procedures for due process.

*PEC is the Professional Education Committee composed of elected representatives from all colleges that house teacher education programs.

II. Conceptual Framework Assessment Narrative

Conceptual Framework for Professional Education

Initial

A. Provide a brief explanation (and, if applicable, a graphic) of your conceptual framework that describes the kind of teacher you hope to produce in your program.

Programs to prepare teachers at Ball State University are built around a distinctive set of beliefs and commitments that our faculty hold. In other words, we have a vision that guides us in preparing teachers and that helps us define the qualities we seek to instill.
in the teachers we prepare. As a graduate of a Ball State professional education program, we expect the following distinctive qualities and characteristics as a professional teacher. The conceptual framework revolves around three themes, **expertise, engagement, context**. These themes are mutually implicative, and form a thematic unity that will guide the preparation of training quality educational professionals. The concise formulation of the conceptual framework is this:

*The mission of the professional education unit at Ball State University is to prepare engaged educational experts who are sensitive and responsive to the contextual bases of teaching, learning, and development.*

**Expertise**

Ball State teachers understand that effective teaching requires a high level of professional skill and knowledge. Ball State teachers will

- have a deep and comprehensive knowledge of their subject matter;
- know and use the best practices in their teaching; and
- have a thorough understanding of students and how they develop and learn.

Graduates of the Ball State professional education programs will possess a level of know-how and a constant striving for expertise that will set them apart and mark them as outstanding teachers.

The goal of the professional education unit is to produce the engaged teacher who is committed to developing expertise in subject matter content and pedagogical content knowledge. It does so by organizing preservice coursework and instructional experiences to encourage the characteristic features of expertise. The unit endeavors to prepare preservice teachers in relevant bodies of knowledge using instructional practices likely to encourage mastery and expertise. Ball State’s teacher education unit recognizes levels of expertise in its assessment of preservice teachers. It is evident, for example, in the four decision points that mark the progress of students through the program (*aspirant, pre-candidate, candidate, educator*). It is evident, too, in the levels of expertise (basic, proficient, accomplished) that is indicated in the rubric for evaluating student teaching by field-based clinical teaching supervisors. A developmental approach, then, is provided for the cultivation of knowledge, dispositions, and skills required by candidates to competently influence student learning, adjustment, and development. Moreover, we assert that preservice teacher education results in more significant levels of expertise than certain alternate route programs, and that graduates of Ball State professional education programs will bear the distinctive mark of expertise in relevant bodies of knowledge.

**Engagement**

Ball State teachers understand that quality learning takes place when teachers are involved interactively with students and their environments. Ball State teachers will

- ensure that teachers and learners interact and participate with each other and with objects and ideas;
- promote "hands-on" learning through collaboration, experimentation, and sharing; and
• be engaged with students, parents, and the community in which they teach.

Graduates of the Ball State professional education programs will possess a commitment to a rich, ongoing interaction with all aspects of their personal, intellectual, social, and professional environment that will set them apart and mark them as outstanding teachers.

We intend to graduate the “engaged teacher” whose pedagogy reflects constructivist best practice, so we commit, in Teachers College, and throughout the professional education unit, to use constructivist, engaged instructional practices. It is inconceivable that the dispositions proper to constructivist teaching can be learned in an instructional context that does not practice them.

*There can be no engaged teacher without an engaged university.* Indeed, the commitments and practices of the engaged academy noted earlier are directly connected to the commitments and practices of the engaged teacher. There is a seamless thematic weave that binds the activities of the engaged university with the constructivist best practice of teacher education. Hence, a hallmark of a Ball State educational professional is a committed willingness to be actively engaged in all relevant settings that influence educational outcomes and to be engaged in collaborative partnerships with families, civic organizations, community structures, and political entities to influence the ecology of youth development.

**Context**

Ball State teachers understand that learning takes place in many rich and varied contexts that students bring with them. Ball State teachers will

• appreciate the unique intellectual and cultural characteristics that students possess;
• recognize that students are active learners, capable of bringing their own unique resources into learning; and
• adapt learning experiences to the multiple contexts in which students live and grow.

The unit endorses a contextual-ecological view of education that assumes that the context of education and development is not a simple stimulus environment to which children are merely reactive but instead consists of biological, psychological, social, and cultural processes that dynamically interact throughout the lifecourse. Graduates of the Ball State professional education programs will possess a deep and comprehensive understanding of the contexts in which students develop, interact, grow, and learn that will set them apart and mark them as outstanding teachers.

Each theme entails a set of assumptions about teaching, learning, and professional competence. Each theme implies a set of commitments for professional education at Ball State and provides criteria for ongoing assessment of our efforts.
B. Explain how the assessment system measures each candidate in terms of the conceptual framework outcomes expected.

The conceptual framework stakes out a vision of the prototypic graduate of Ball State University professional education programs. The unit commits to systematic assessment of its efforts to reach this goal.

This assessment takes place at two levels. First, the unit assesses candidate performance at the level of individual classes and coursework in accordance with the content and developmental performance standards articulated by the Indiana Professional Standards Board (which are based on INTASC principles), and, at the unit level, in terms of “decision points” criteria. Ball State’s teacher education unit recognizes levels of expertise in its assessment of preservice teachers. It is evident, for example, in the four decision points that mark the progress of students through the program (aspirant, pre-candidate, candidate, educator). It is evident, too, in the levels of expertise (basic, proficient, accomplished) that is indicated in the rubric for evaluating student teaching by field-based clinical teaching supervisors. It is evident in the post-graduate induction period of internship for beginning teachers. A developmental approach, then, is provided for the cultivation of knowledge, dispositions, and skills required by candidates to competently influence student learning, adjustment, and development.

Second, the unit commits to ongoing assessment of the unit’s ability to prepare competent professional educators by means of a “unit assessment protocol,” which is systematically administered to graduates of unit programs. This dual-level unit assessment system reflects a commitment to continuous improvement of our ability to prepare competent, engaged educational professionals who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote student learning and positive developmental outcomes.

Each course syllabus in the professional education sequence has been articulated to the conceptual framework and this information is shared with candidates. The attached report outlines the program requirements for each licensure area that are tagged to each of the three areas of the conceptual framework.
Aggregate Program Descriptors

This report displays a count of ALL program requirements that are tagged to the corresponding descriptor.

Program Type(s) □ ALL
- □ Advanced Program
- □ Doctoral Degree
- □ FCS Program
- □ Major
- □ Master Program w/ License Addition
- □ Minor
- □ Science (BIO / CHEM / PHYCS / GEOL)
- □ SPA Program Review
- □ State Program Review
- ☑ Undergrad. Licensure AND Degree
- □ All Grade
- □ Elementary Program
- □ License Addition
- □ Master Program w/ Initial Licensure
- □ Masters Degree
- □ Progress Report
- □ Secondary Program
- □ Specialist Degree
- □ Transition to Teaching

Descriptor Set(s) □ ALL
- □ Assessment Type (IPSB)
- □ Concept. Frame. Themes
- □ Foreign Language SPA Assessments
- □ Indiana Performance Assessment Types
- □ ISLLC Performance Categories Emphasized
- □ NCATE Performance Categories
- □ Other School Personnel Candidates assessment elements
- □ SPA Assessments
- □ Response Format

Submit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Concept. Frame. Themes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business Education – INITIAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career/Technical Education: Trade and Industrial</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Major ELED / SPED (Mild Disabilities)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELED: Early and Middle Childhood – INITIAL</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELED: Early Childhood (Pre-K - 3) – INITIAL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Needs – INITIAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA: Instrumental and General Music – INITIAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA: Theater Arts – INITIAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA: Visual Arts – INITIAL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA: Vocal and General Music - INITIAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### II. Conceptual Framework Assessment Narrative

#### Advanced

**A. Provide a brief explanation (and, if applicable, a graphic) of your conceptual framework that describes the kind of teacher you hope to produce in your program.**

All programs at the advanced level to prepare professional educators (teachers, educational leaders, and administrators), and educational professionals (school counselors, psychologists, audiologists, and speech pathologists) are guided by a vision that helps us define the qualities we seek to instill in the professionals we prepare. The programs yield professionals with distinctive qualities. The foundation of these programs is our conceptual framework (CF) that provides a guidepost for program development and benchmarks for program evaluations. The CF has three core themes: expertise, engagement, and context. More specifically:

*The mission of advanced programs at Ball State University is to prepare engaged educational experts who are sensitive and responsive to the contextual bases of teaching, learning, and development.*
Expertise

Advanced programs provide a context for developing the level of expertise required for professional practice as school service personnel and for administrative leadership, as well as providing more extensive training in various content domains relevant to professional practice in schools and classrooms.

Experts and Novices. Our commitment to developing expertise is grounded on well-known findings in the knowledge base. Expert educational professionals and school service personnel differ from novices in significant ways. In contrast to novices, experts have more and better organized content knowledge, which is more easily accessed and more responsive to situational cues. Experts have a greater degree of procedural knowledge that is highly automatized that permits active problem-solving at higher levels of abstraction along a number of fronts simultaneously. Indeed, experts approach problems differently than do novices. Experts focus on abstractions, general principles, and patterns. They focus on the organization and “syntactical” structure of events, its underlying grammar or causal pattern. Experts also notice key features of domain-relevant activity that novices miss.

In turn novices show more deficiencies in planning, less ability to improvise when encountering problems or when called from a scripted lesson or procedure and less inclination to engage in reflective practice, presumably because their cognitive schemata are less elaborate, less interconnected, and less accessible than are the schemata of expert educational professionals and school service personnel.

Developing Expertise. Of course expertise is a relative matter. Graduates of entry-level professional education programs are more expert than are preservice candidates, but active study in advanced programs affords opportunities for increasing expertise in professional practice.

The goal of advanced programs, then, is to engage educational professionals and school service personnel in a project of developing expertise. It does so by organizing post-graduate coursework and instructional experiences in ways that encourage the characteristic features of developing expertise. This is reflected in training models that emphasize

- extended clinical practice, including scaffolded, coached, and supervised instruction in practicum and internship experiences;
- the use of ecologically-valid tasks, case-based instruction, situated learning strategies and realistic applications of content-knowledge;
- extensive study of the scientific literature; and
- original scholarly inquiry and publication in accordance with the scientist-practitioner model.

Distinctive Mark of Excellence. Graduates of the unit’s advanced programs are distinguished by

- a commitment to developing expertise through study, extended practice, and ongoing professional development;
- developing competence in modes of inquiry and scientific practice; and
- expert application of program-specific disciplinary knowledge to problems of educational or clinical practice.
Engagement

It is the intent of advanced programs to train the engaged educational professional and engaged school service personnel; and to adopt a policy of engagement with respect to the communities that we serve.

Hence, in our training models we cultivate a contextual competence that is responsive to overlapping sources of personal and contextual influence; and that encourages collaborative partnerships with families, schools, professional bodies, and community structures in order to influence favorably the ecology of youth development. And the best way to inculcate contextual competence and professional engagement in graduate students is for advanced programs themselves to adopt a policy of engagement with respect to constituencies and stakeholders.

In short, the preparation of engaged educational professionals and school service personnel presupposes a commitment on the part of the unit to the policy and practice of professional engagement.

A policy of professional engagement offers opportunities to build better communities; to integrate the traditional research mission of the university with its teaching and service mission. Consequently, advanced programs of the professional education unit are responsive to the needs of diverse communities and place a premium on collaboration, joint ventures, and shared commitment. It embraces a “hands-on” pedagogy that includes collaborative inquiry, experiential, service, and project-based learning.

Distinctive Mark of Excellence. But a commitment to professional engagement also implies an ongoing commitment to one’s profession. It implies a commitment to scholarship and to reflective practice. It implies a commitment to ongoing professional development. It is incumbent upon candidates in advanced programs to be deeply conversant with the scholarly literatures of one’s discipline. Indeed, it is the encounter with scientific literatures that is the distinctive feature of post-graduate training in education, as opposed to entry-level professional licensure.

Consequently, graduates of Ball State’s advanced programs are distinguished

- by a commitment to active engagement with the scholarship of one’s discipline, including study, reflection, and research publication;
- by active contribution to one’s professional community; and
- by a commitment to developing expertise through professional development.

Context

Advanced programs at Ball State University endorse a contextual systems view of learning, development, and adaptation. The systems perspective underlies a conception of educational leadership and of the place and function of schools in the life of communities and society.

The contextual (or developmental) systems perspective asserts that the individual cannot be understood solely by reference to genetic-maturational factors, to environmental contingencies,
or to psychological structures. Rather, one’s developmental trajectory is influenced by interacting sources of influence that exist at multiple levels, including (a) inner-biological, (b) individual-psychological, (c) outer-physical or social-relational, and (d) social-cultural. Variables at one level are related to and integrated with variables at the other levels. An individual is deeply embedded within a matrix of overlapping systems of influence and no level is necessarily more basic or fundamental than another. The individual is constituted by a system of causal influences. The levels of influence that constitute the “person” (genetic-biological, psychological, social-relational) and the levels of influence that constitute the context (relationships in different settings, family, school, community) interact in dynamic ways.

**Distinctive Mark of Excellence.** These implications are embedded within training goals of advanced programs that lead to a distinctive mark of excellence characteristic of Ball State graduates. Graduates of Ball State’s advanced programs

- are mindful of the systemic components of development, of teaching and learning, of effective school organization and functioning, of diagnosis and treatment, of successful academic and clinical intervention;
- are able to adapt educational and clinical interventions to accommodate individual differences;
- are committed to fostering continuity among levels of contextual influence—among school, family, and community—and utilize the resources, assets, and strengths of a community to support successful matriculation, adaptation, and positive youth development;
- are committed to creating healthy communities in order to maximize educational and adaptational objectives.

One hallmark, then, of a Ball State educational professional or of school service personnel is a committed willingness to be actively engaged in relevant settings that influence educational or adaptational outcomes; to be engaged in collaborative partnerships with families, civic organizations, community structures, and political entities in order to influence favorably the ecology of youth development.

**B. Explain how the assessment system measures each candidate in terms of the conceptual framework outcomes expected.**

**Unit Assessment**

The Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs stakes out a vision of the prototypic graduate of Ball State University’s advanced programs. We intend to prepare students who become engaged experts in the educational and school service professions. The professional education unit commits to systematic assessment of its efforts to reach this goal.

This assessment takes place at two levels. First, as noted previously, the unit assesses candidate performance at the level of individual classes and coursework in accordance with performance standards articulated by special program areas; and, at the program level, in terms of “decision points” criteria. The “decision points” element of the unit assessment system is predicated on the belief that the knowledge, skills, and dispositions required for competent professional practice must be constructed and inculcated through a carefully designed sequence of study, practice, and
reflection. It takes a developmental approach to the cultivation of professional expertise. Moreover, the unit assesses progress in the development of professional expertise through analysis of standards-based learning outcomes, portfolio assessment, and other performance-based artifacts. Through rubrics these artifacts that mirror the novice-to-expert developmental sequence are assessed in terms of Unsatisfactory, Basic, Proficient, and Distinguished levels of competence.

Second, program areas assess the ability of program graduates to influence educational and treatment outcomes in students and clients. This dual-level unit assessment system reflects a commitment to continuous improvement of our ability to prepare competent, engaged educational professionals who have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to promote student learning and positive developmental and therapeutic outcomes.

Third, engagement at the advanced level can be demonstrated and assessed differently dependent on the profession of the advanced candidate. Therefore, candidate engagement is assessed in one or more of the following opportunities provided in the advanced programs:

- to provide site-based and field-based practicum and internship experiences, both to maximize the contextual-relevance and ecological competence of students, and to project university-based clinic services to the community;
- to encourage “hands-on” pedagogy in coursework, including case-based instruction, authentic learning tasks, experiential learning, inquiry and problem-based learning;
- to provide opportunities for continuing professional development and lifelong learning, including the provision of certificate programs, advanced degrees, continuing education credits, alternative licensure options;
- to encourage partnerships and collaboration with community organizations to address public educational and mental health issues;
- to stage colloquia, workshops, panel discussions, conferences, and other opportunities to share the results of research to stakeholder groups;
- to develop the technological resources that would enable advanced programs to deliver educational opportunities to stakeholder communities beyond the immediate Ball State campus;
- to engage in collaborative research that informs policy at any level within the ecological settings of education and development;
- to emphasize “education for pluralism” that treats cultural diversity as a resource.

Alignment with Professional Standards

The advanced programs of the professional education unit range across numerous disciplines, content and special program areas, some of which are governed by standards promulgated by professional associations. Although many of these standards address the circumstances of professional practice unique to specific program areas, the core themes of the Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs are compatible with their general training objectives. Examples of how the professional standards align with the Conceptual Framework for Advanced Programs are included in the appendices.

Each course syllabus in the professional education sequence has been articulated to the conceptual framework and this information is shared with candidates. The attached report
outlines the program requirements for each licensure area that are tagged to each of the three areas of the conceptual framework.

http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/new/INSTITUTION_ADMIN_ANALYSIS_PROGRAM_DESCRIPATORS.asp  6/27/08  2:30 PM

Aggregate Program Descriptors

This report displays a count of all program requirements that are tagged to the corresponding descriptor.

Program Type(s)  □ ALL
- Advanced Program
- Doctoral Degree
- FCS Program
- Major
- Master Program w/ License Addition
- Minor
- Science (BIO / CHEM / PHYCS / GEOL)
- SPA Program Review
- State Program Review
- Undergrad. Licensure AND Degree

Descriptor Set(s)  □ ALL
- Assessment Type (IPSB)
- Foreign Language SPA Assessments
- ISLLC Performance Categories Emphasized
- Other School Personnel Candidates assessment elements
- SPA Assessments
- Concept. Frame. Themes
- Indiana Performance Assessment Types
- NCATE Performance Categories
- Response Format

Submit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Concept. Frame. Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCHIVED Ph.D. in School Psychology (formerly all 3 degrees)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Education (Graduate License)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Curriculum and Instruction – District Level Administrator License</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Exceptional Needs (licensure)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. in Educational Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D. in Special Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S. in School Superintendency</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Spring 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. &amp; Ed.S. in School Psychology</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. &amp; M.A.E. in Special Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Career / Technical Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. un Curriculum &amp; Educational Technology (2003-current roster)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Curriculum &amp; Educational Technology (Spring07 – current)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Mathematics Education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Music</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in School Counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Secondary Education</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Social Science</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Speech Pathology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. in Technology Teacher Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A. or M.S. in Physical Education: Teacher Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.E. in Educational Administration &amp; Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.E. in Elementary Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.E. in Physics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.M. in Music Education</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in Elementary Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. in School Psychology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### III. Rubrics

For rubrics for all Initial and Advanced programs, go to:

http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/new/INSTITUTION_ADMIN_ANALYSIS_RUBRIC_PROGRAM_DP.asp

Click on Professional Education Unit, then either Advanced or Initial and click on View Rubrics.

Use the following authentication:

username: oefe@bsu.edu
password: office1
IV. Elements

Element 1: Assessment System

1. How do the unit and its professional community (stakeholders) regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of the UAS?

The Professional Education Committee (PEC) is composed of elected representatives from each of the five colleges that house licensure programs for the unit, the departmental chairs and Deans of Teachers College, as well as a student representative and a teacher/administrator from the community. As part of the university governance system, this committee is responsible for approving all changes in education programs. Examples of items requiring approval would be changes to decision point requirements, programmatic curricular changes, and policy related to implementation of the unit assessment system. This committee meets monthly during the academic year and convenes annually for a full day retreat in July of each year. This committee is charged with reviewing all of the reports issued by the unit, such as the annual Title II report, and the results of all surveys conducted by the unit. The timeline and list of reports reviewed by the PEC are itemized in Element 2 Question 4. Recommendations from other entities, such as decision point meetings, are considered by this committee for action.

Prior to the 2007-2008 academic year, the unit supported a facilitator and a separate review group for each Decision Point (DP) composed of faculty representatives from all initial licensure areas. The DP 1 group was responsible for determining the common elements of all introductory courses, revision of the DP 1 portfolio assessment rubric, and evaluation of all assessment data collected. Similarly, the DP 2 and DP 3 groups were responsible for similar information for the assessments occurring at those decision points. Recommendations for policy changes based on the review of data were forwarded to the PEC. The agenda and minutes from the meetings of these groups can be found on the UAS Web page (http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/). In the interest of efficiency, beginning with the 2007-2008 academic year, the representatives from each of the decision points and representatives of graduate programs conducted combined meetings, which occurred monthly throughout the academic year (http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/article/0,1371,207381-14203-54366,00.html). These meetings were referred to as Decision Point Dialogue meetings. This change was in response to faculty requests to decrease the number of required meetings because some of them represented more than one decision point group. Subgroups of the larger group were selected to work on identified areas, such as revision of the dispositions rubric, and report back to the entire group.

The Dean, Associate Deans, and the Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services presented at the Council of Dean’s meeting in December at the invitation of the Provost. The purpose of this presentation was to summarize the status of the implementation of the UAS at Ball State. This meeting was then followed by individual meetings with the Dean of each college to evaluate the status of data collection, review and document the implementation of programmatic changes. Although these meetings are not part of the university governance system, they were very useful in communicating the status of the licensing programs housed in other colleges and evaluating the implications of the UAS for the requirements of other accrediting organizations. These meetings are evidence of significant institutional support for the unit assessment system.
The institutional support for the teacher education unit is also demonstrated by the significant commitment by the Associate Provost, who, as a member of the education faculty was involved in the development of the rGrade system for the management of the UAS. In her current role, the Associate Provost reviews all program submissions related to accreditation activities. She reviewed all program reports submitted to the state in February and will be reviewing all submissions for SPA approval this fall.

A critical stakeholder group for the unit is the Professional Development Schools (PDS) Network. In addition to faculty liaisons assigned to each school, the unit has a professional staff member who functions as a liaison to our school partners. This person visits each of the schools annually and also coordinates the meetings of the faculty liaisons assigned to each school and a PDS institute meeting each semester. The institute meetings provide an opportunity to discuss changes being implemented within the unit and also provide an opportunity for dialogue amongst all of the representatives from the university and schools. The agenda and minutes from these meetings can be found on our PDS Web site (http://www.bsu.edu/pds/article/0,,29666--,00.html). The institution relies on the PDS Network to host many of the field experiences for preservice teachers, and this collaboration among stakeholders provides a mechanism for significant feedback regarding programmatic effectiveness.

Presentations and discussions of elements of the UAS have been agenda items for both the Teachers College Alumni Board and the Philanthropy Council. The former group meets 3 to 4 times a year and the latter once a year. The Board is comprised of Indiana school administrators, teachers, and professional personnel; and the Council is comprised of the same types of stakeholders, but come from the state and the nation. At both group meetings, rGrade, assessments, electronic portfolios, and the Professional Growth Plan have been presented with feedback following.

Finally, in November of each year the Educational Testing Service provides a summary report for all test takers who identify Ball State University as their educator preparation institution. In addition to Praxis I and Praxis II results for the initial licensure program, the unit also receives results for the school psychology and speech pathology tests and the School Leaders Licensure Assessment for school administrators. These reports include a breakdown of test takers performance by test specifications as well as the score distribution of individual test takers. These results are shared with the respective departments and program managers, and are discussed at departmental meetings; and these discussions are documented in the minutes of these meetings.

2. **How and when does the unit examine the validity and utility of the data produced by unit assessments and make the modifications necessary to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and professional standards?**

In a certain sense, analysis of the validity and utility of the data produced by the unit assessments is continual. For initial licensure programs, unit level data are examined at the end of DP 2, 3, and 4. Program managers have access to data for their candidates whenever needed. The UAS management system (rGrade) employed by the unit allows immediate access to aggregate program data using reporting tools that have been developed for that purpose. Programs that wish to access data in a different way may request a customized report.
The software (rGrade) employed to manage the UAS is an integrated system that facilitates the integration of assessment data from multiple systems into a uniform format for easy access across the unit. The unit also employs an onsite system technologist to develop applications as necessary and to troubleshoot issues as they arise. During the summer of 2007, this technologist worked with faculty representatives from three of the colleges and the Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services to develop many of the reports now available to program managers. The collaboration of this group also resulted in additional program utilities to evaluate the progress of individual candidates through the decision points. Program managers can access lists of both successful and unsuccessful candidates and the data for each group. The unit is interested in identifying impediments to program completion by examining characteristics of students who do not complete a program.

The rGrade system also manages the alignment of the relevant standards and the conceptual framework to individual courses. The system maintains a library of relevant standards, and this library is updated when standards are revised. Program managers and instructors have easy access to the standards for alignment to courses and assessments. One of the reporting functions available in the rGrade system is the ability to produce the chart showing the standards alignment for each program. In this way, the unit can assure that all of the standards for a particular program are addressed. Representatives to the DP 2 group were responsible for the standards alignment for their respective programs at the initial level and program managers are responsible for the alignment for the advanced level programs.

Assessment data have been analyzed and reported for the state program approval process in the spring of 2008 and are being analyzed in preparation for the SPA submissions in the fall. The availability of the rGrade utilities has facilitated the generation of these reports. Alignment of assessments with standards is a requirement for these submissions.

3. **How are decisions about candidate performance made? Describe the assessments used and points across the program where assessments take place.**

The rGrade software generates a report that details where unit assessments take place across the unit: [http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/new/INSTITUTION_ADMIN_IA_FINDER.asp](http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/new/INSTITUTION_ADMIN_IA_FINDER.asp). This report produces a matrix of assessments across programs.

The unit has approved four decision points for initial licensure programs. These are articulated for each program and students have access to these requirements ([http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/DISPLAY_PROGRAM_REQUIREMENTS.asp?PROGRAM_ID=1325#DP2](http://www.bsu.edu/rgrade_prod/prod/DISPLAY_PROGRAM_REQUIREMENTS.asp?PROGRAM_ID=1325#DP2)). Successful completion of each decision point is based on a combination of course grades and performance assessments. Below is the program from Business Education as an example. The unit assessments are identified and their rubrics have been included at the end of this report.

For the initial licensure programs, performance and disposition assessment are embedded in the introductory course, and the instructor of that course is responsible for determining successful completion of those requirements. The institution also has advisors assigned to regularly check the progress of individual students at various decision points. As part of this formal process, advisors also identify any programmatic issues that arise. For example, an individual faculty member may not have recorded assessments for a class, or a cohort of students may have an
identified problem. Any potential problems identified are referred back to the department chair for resolution. Successful completion of DP 2 requirements is required before official admission to a teacher education program. A Teachers College departmental advisor is responsible for determining successful completion of these requirements before granting permission to enroll in 300 level pedagogy courses. Completion of DP 3 is required prior to beginning a student teaching placement, and the Office of Teacher Education Services verifies this status. Successful completion of DP 4 is required prior to program completion and licensing, and the Office of Teacher Education Services also verifies this. A student cannot receive a passing grade in student teaching without completing all of the DP 4 performance assessment requirements.
Business Education - INITIAL

Decision Point #1

Complete introductory course with C or better

1. Unit Assessment

COMPLETE AT LEAST ONE OF THE FOLLOWING:

- EDEL 100
- EDSEC 150
- FCSED 150
- FL 150
- ITEDU 195
- MATHS 150
- MUSED 100
- MUSED 150
- PEP 161
- SCI 150
- SPCE 201

Decision Point 1: Disposition

1. Unit Assessment

occurs in EDSEC 150

Decision Point 1: Portfolio

1. Unit Assessment

occurs in EDSEC 150

Decision Point #2

C or better in Comm 210 or equivalent

1. Unit Assessment

Overall GPA of 2.5 in at least 45 hours

1. Unit Assessment
C or better in at least two or three content courses

COMPLETE AT LEAST 2 OF THE FOLLOWING:

- C or better in ISOM 112
- C or better in ISOM 125
- C or better in ISOM 135

PRAXIS I score

COMPLETE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:

- PRAXIS I: PPST Mathematics
- PRAXIS I: PPST Reading
- PRAXIS I: PPST Writing

C or better in 100/200 Professional Education Courses

COMPLETE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:

- EDMUL 205
- EDPSY 251

Completion of Phase One of PGP

Decision Point 2: Disposition (BED 383)

Decision Point 2: Portfolio (BED 383)

EDMUL 205 Course-based assessment

Approval of application for admission to teaching curriculum

EDPSY 251 Course-based assessment

Decision Point #3

Decision Point 3: 380/385 Portfolio assessment

Decision Point 3: Portfolio (content)
1 Unit Assessment occurs in BED 384

Decision Point 3: Overall Portfolio Decision EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

Completion of Phase Two of PGP EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

Decision Point 3: Disposition (BED 384) EDIT
1 Unit Assessment occurs in BED 384

GPA of at least 2.5 in content area and sub-areas EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

GPA of at least 2.5 in professional education courses EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

Overall GPA of at least 2.5 in at least 93 hours EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

Within 9 hours of completion of content courses EDIT
1 Unit Assessment

Earned grades of C or better in 300- and 400-level professional education courses EDIT
COMPLETE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING:
- EDSEC 380 EDIT
- EDJHM 385 EDIT
- BED 383 EDIT
- BED 384 EDIT

Electronic portfolio successfully passed in EDSEC 380, EDJHM 385, and BED 300-level courses (BED 383, BED 384) EDIT
- ACC 201 EDIT
- ACC 202 EDIT
- BL 260 EDIT
- ECON 201 EDIT
- ECON 202 EDIT
- ECON 221 EDIT
- FIN 110 EDIT
- FIN 300 EDIT
- ISOM 340 EDIT
Completion of Phase Three of PGP
1 Unit Assessment

Decision Point 4: Disposition
1 Unit Assessment

Overall GPA of at least 2.5 in all courses
1 Unit Assessment

Earned credit in student teaching
Met ISTE at Student Teaching/Internship Level
Maintained clearance from the Office of Student Affairs
At the advanced level, licensing and degree programs also use a similar decision point model. Admission requirements to the individual programs (DP 1) meet or exceed the requirements for admission to the graduate school. Each program is aligned with the appropriate professional standards and incorporates both course grades and performance assessments. Within each program, assessments embedded within courses have been identified to address student learning and dispositions. Program managers are responsible for monitoring student progress through the programs. Within programs, certain courses are identified as requiring permission to enroll and these serve as checks on student progress throughout the program. Additionally, students must maintain their eligibility for the graduate school at all times during their enrollment in the university, and the graduate school exercises oversight regarding academic eligibility.

Below you will find an example program for the M.A. and M.A.E. in Special Education. This example was chosen because it is one of the most complex advanced programs. There are multiple tracks within the degree program depending on the specialty area chosen by the candidate. As shown in this example, the program incorporates the unit level assessment and assessments common to all tracks within the degree.
4. **How do your data show a strong relationship of performance assessments to candidate success throughout the programs and later in classrooms or schools?**

As noted earlier, during the summer of 2007 a group of faculty members worked with the rGrade development staff to create a series of reports looking at the relationship between the assessment data being collected and various indicators of student success. Review of the data for the programs involved in the report development showed that there were significant differences in the patterns of the relationships amongst the various programs. For example, at the unit level students appeared to be struggling with the Reading section of the Praxis I test, and even some individual programs had reported this to be a problem, but perhaps it was not surprising that this was not the case for the English/Language Arts program. Preparation of program reports have served as an impetus for programs to advantage themselves of the reporting capabilities in the UAS as the number of student data points increases.

Annually the unit surveys all of those teacher education candidates enrolled in the Indiana Mentoring and Assessment Program (IMAP) at the end of their first year of teaching. Mentors of these beginning teachers and their principals are also surveyed. The survey instrument is aligned with the conceptual framework and the INTASC principles. During its summer retreat, the PEC reviews the results of the previous year’s survey. Preparation for working with gifted children has been shown as an area in need of improvement in the past survey. In general, however, survey results from all three groups have indicated that our candidates are well prepared for their first year in the classroom. A parallel survey was developed and distributed to graduates of the advanced programs. These candidates were identified through the Alumni Association and the results are scheduled to be reviewed during the 2008 PEC July 14 retreat.

The Office of Institutional Research has assumed responsibility for the distribution of the survey and collation of the results for presentation to the committee and other interested stakeholders.

Annually, the Office of Institutional Research has provided stipends to faculty members who work during the summer on assessment related activities. In the past these funds have supported work on assessment topics such as rubric revision, success in retention indicators, and the development of reporting formats in rGrade.

As required by statute the pass rates for initial licensure candidates are reported annually as part of the Title II report. This report is posted on the Web (http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/article/0,,30026--,00.html) and shared with both internal and external stakeholders. This report is reviewed by the PEC after submission and is included with the information reviewed during the annual retreat. This report is also reviewed and signed by the President of the university prior to submission to the state in April. Annually, the college submits a report to the President in July and the pass rates are included in that report, as an accountability measure for the unit.
5. Describe unit studies conducted to establish fairness, accuracy, and consistency of its assessment procedures and unit operations.

Although students in all programs were required to have a disposition assessment at DP 2, in some programs the assessment was embedded in a course. In others, it was conducted by an advisor outside of a course. In the summer of 2006, we looked at disposition data at DP 2 and discovered that there were differences in the assessments that were made (course embedded vs. outside of a course). In Spring 2007, we inserted the DP 2 disposition assessment in EDMUL 205, a course required of all education majors. Consequently, the dispositions assessment is course embedded for all students and applied by faculty members in a single department. Subsequent review of data generated after this change indicates greater consistency in the assessment.

For all professional education courses, a master syllabus for the course has been developed. These master syllabi are referred to as the NCATE syllabi. Each of these syllabi is aligned with the appropriate standards (INTASC for initial licensure programs) and the BSU conceptual framework. Individual course instructors may customize the NCATE syllabus for their classes. In this way the unit assures that the common elements of each class are covered by different instructors and also that the courses are aligned with the relevant standards. This system assures greater consistency across instructors within a program and assures that appropriate standards are addressed within the designated courses.

In fall 2006, a review of the ongoing data collection of the assessment of portfolios at DP 1 indicated that the overwhelming majority of portfolios were being recorded as Distinguished, which was likely due to the values automatically assigned to the rubric column values. Those values were provided by faculty and entered in rGrade for the DP 1 rubric when it was configured as a unit assessment.

The performance assessment rubric for student teaching is aligned with the conceptual framework and the INTASC principles. During the 2003-2004 academic year, Dr. Holmes Finch of the Department of Educational Psychology conducted an inter-rater reliability study on the instrument. A total of 713 student teachers were evaluated by two independent raters on this instrument. Generalizability Theory was used to calculate a measure of reliability, called the Index of Dependability, or Phi coefficient. Based on the results of this study, it was possible to conclude that the instrument used to rate student teaching performance on the ten INTASC principles had a high reliability for that sample of student teachers. This instrument has continued to be used as the summative student teaching assessment for the unit.

6. What kind of changes in unit practices have been made based on these study results?

In order to facilitate the implementation of performance assessment by faculty members, the rGrade developers designed interactive rubrics that automatically scored for grading and automatically expanded the existing notions of rubric scoring, which traditionally were additive scoring instruments with points increasing evenly (a linear scale) at each column level. With rGrade, row scoring was made into a ratio of points out of points possible (essentially into a percent score) while preserving the ordinal scale used for most rubric column definitions.
The buttons made it easy to submit a value quickly using the column values (although one can put any value into the row score cell). The column values presently serve another purpose and that is to function as the upper bounds of the thresholds for determining the overall (aggregate) assessment result for the rubric. rGrade uses those thresholds to convert the total ratio score back into one of the four ordinal values used in the rubric.

This design in rGrade collapsed about three steps in the assessment/grading process into one facilitating assessment by faculty members. Although very handy, matching the column thresholds to common letter-grade thresholds avoids scenarios where the percent score of the overall row score is converted to an appropriate or desired ordinal value. For example, under the current column values for the DP 1 rubric—0, 5, 10, 15—a student who receives the equivalent of a 67% or higher will convert to "Distinguished." This was probably the source of the inflated assessments for DP 1 portfolio discovered in the review of the DP 1 portfolio data.

Therefore, column values should, by default, match widely held expectations for the overall assessment that are based on percent scores and letter grades. Common letter grade logic for UBPD should be:

- D+ and below = Unsatisfactory
- C-, C, C+ = Basic
- B- to A- = Proficient
- A+ = Distinguished

Within these parameters, the best default values for the columns should be defined as percents:

- U, B, P, D
- 70, 80, 95, 100

These are the upper bounds of the ordinal range. This means that a 70.1% is Basic and, above that, is passing. The small window of 95% - 100% for Distinguished compacts this range to be something matching A+ and enlarges the Proficient range (80 to 95). The result of this change in rubric scoring has been that the distribution of recorded scores is more closely aligned with the expected range of scores.

Also keep in mind that rGrade can permit faculty definition of rubrics for program assessment, if desired. In such cases, even when they are not using a UBPD scale, the instructor can set the translation of their column set with a passing value, so that a given instructor using the program for a course assessment is not tied to the default definitions.

The primary assessment of student learning employed by the unit is the Learning Assessment Model Project (LAMP; http://www.bsu.edu/tcapps/uas/lamp2/default.asp?). This assessment was initially piloted in the Professional Development Schools. Portions of it were incorporated as part of the unit plan requirement during student teaching prior to the fall of 2006, and the entire module was used during the 2006-2007 academic year. After using the module unchanged for one year, additional revisions in the LAMP syllabus and the rubric were made during the summer of 2007. The revision more accurately communicated the expectations for the students and the requirements were consistent across all content areas. Rows were added to the revised
rubric to meet the needs of content areas. The current rubric, which is attached, and module syllabus were used during the 2007-2008 academic year for all student teaching placements.

As noted above, a major change implemented by the unit based on an analysis of the data was to move the assessment of dispositions for all candidates to a specific course within each program. The movement to course-embedded assessment has proven to be more equitable for all candidates.

7. **How does your assessment system reflect your conceptual framework?**

The conceptual framework is reflected on several levels within the UAS. The mechanisms for accomplishing the integration have been outlined elsewhere in this report.

- All master syllabi, referred to as the NCATE syllabi, for core courses are aligned with the themes of the conceptual framework.
- The conceptual framework is introduced to all students as one of the common elements of all introductory classes.
- All unit assessments are aligned with the themes of the conceptual framework.
- Within programs, as referenced in Section II, individual program requirements are aligned with the conceptual framework.
- The rGrade system facilitates the alignment of program assessments with the conceptual framework themes and can generate tables and reports for monitoring the status of the alignment. This utility facilitates monitoring by technical and administrative staff.
- The graphic for the conceptual framework is on the home page of the rGrade system and appears in printed materials used by the students, such as the student teaching evaluation materials.
- The conceptual framework has been a topic of discussion in meeting with stakeholders, such as the Decision Point Dialogue meetings.
- The rubric rows of the disposition assessment were built around the conceptual framework themes and this structure has been preserved in the proposed revisions.

Because the conceptual framework was revisited during the early stages of the development of the UAS on the BSU campus, it has been an integral component of all of the preparation programs on this campus. In the initial development of UAS, the elements of the conceptual framework were aligned with the INTASC principles. This provided a basic framework for the programs to comply with the expectations of the unit assessment system, which were very different from previous accreditation requirements. Beyond this early campus level activity, as the UAS has evolved, the alignment of the conceptual framework with the professional standards for other associations has been documented. Currently, in the documentation in Section II, all programs in the Unit reflect the conceptual framework.
Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis, and Evaluation

1. How does the UAS provide regular and comprehensive data on program quality, unit operations and candidate performance at each stage of the programs, including the first years of the program completers’ practice?

The unit employs the standing governance system on campus regarding teacher education policy as the primary avenue for providing regular information on program quality unit operations and candidate performance. The Professional Education Committee (PEC) (http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/meetings/) consists of elected representatives from teacher education faculty from six of the seven colleges who participate in teacher education on campus at BSU. Faculty representatives from the respective colleges must be designated as Professional Education Faculty Category I and shall be elected according to procedures established by those colleges for staggered three-year terms. PEC has as its chief responsibilities (a) oversight and approval of all curriculum revisions affecting professional education, (b) oversight and evaluation of all academic policies that affect professional education, and (c) review and approval of Professional Education Faculty (PEF) status, and of courses designated as professional education courses. The PEC serves as the central focus of authority for professional education policies and practices.

- Dean of Teachers College, ex officio;
- Associate Dean of Teachers College, ex officio;
- Chairpersons of the Department of Educational Psychology, Department of Educational Studies, Department of Elementary Education, Department of Special Education, ex officio;
- One graduate student elected by the Professional Education Committee;
- One undergraduate student elected by the Professional Education Committee;
- Three faculty from the College of Sciences and Humanities;
- Two faculty from the College of Applied Sciences and Technology;
- One faculty from the College of Fine Arts;
- One faculty from the Miller College of Business;
- Two faculty from Teachers College;
- One faculty from the College of Communication, Information, and Media;
- Three representatives from K-12 public education elected by Professional Education Committee.

This policy committee meets every month and at least once during the summer. Guests are welcome. The unit utilizes the PEC as a systematic venue for sharing data emerging from the UAS. For example, each November, two reports are shared with the PEC from the Office of Teacher Education Services.

The first report contains information regarding all field placements in the schools for any on-site activity. This includes simple observations in the introductory classes, participation by methods classes, student teaching, and internship placements. This report outlines the type of activity, numbers of students participating, and the duration of the activity. These data are aggregated by type of placement and school, with PDS and Burris Laboratory School placements disaggregated.
The second report contains information on the number and **types of licenses** recommended annually. Numbers of license renewals, original licenses, and Emergency Permits are reported by license type (Instructional, School Service, Administrative). Also reported are the numbers of evaluations conducted for individuals, who already have an undergraduate degree and are seeking initial licensure or a license addition. Data on license requests for out-of-state certification are also presented.

In addition, various representatives from licensure areas across campus are invited to attend PEC to share program specific implementation of data collected via the UAS (e.g., see agenda for the Professional Education Committee from January 16, 2008, at [http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/meetings/](http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/meetings/). In addition, the unit coordinates monthly Decision Point Dialogue meetings ([http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/meetings/](http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/meetings/)). Additional licensure area faculty have presented UAS data at monthly Decision Point Dialogue meetings (e.g., see [http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/article/0,,56934--,00.html](http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/article/0,,56934--,00.html)).

UAS progress reports are available in the rGrade system for any program manager or chair at any time. For example, a report developed in Summer 2007 provides pass/fail data for all decision point requirements and an overview of student matriculation through the decision points—available for each program and available at the unit level as well. Licensure area program managers and their respective department chairs all have access to the various reports available in rGrade to use in understanding individual candidate performance as well as aggregate program performance.

2. **Explain the internal and external sources of data that are systematically collected as candidates progress through programs.**

Over the past five years, significant changes have occurred regarding the relationship the unit has with our University Computing Services (UCS) to external sources of data. The move to performance-based assessment requires new relationships and services between UCS and the unit in terms of access to student data that historically were not made available to individual units on campus. Currently, we have systematic data pulls that are imported from UCS regularly to the rGrade system used in the UAS. The second type of data source is generated internally from course-embedded assessments. An abbreviated list of internal and external data sources used in the various licensure programs on campus is shared below followed by the full listing of internal and external data sources.

**Internal**
- DP 1 Dispositions and Portfolio
- DP 2 Dispositions and Portfolio
- EDMUL 205 course assessment
- EDPSY 250/251 course assessment
- DP 3 Dispositions
- DP 3 Portfolio (content + methods)

**External**
- DP 1 intro-course grade
- PGP (DP 2-DP 4)
- EDMUL 205 course grade
EDPSY 250/251 course grade
DP 2 overall GPA
Praxis I scores
EDSEC 380/EDJHM 385 course grades
DP 3 overall GPA
DP 3 GPA 2.5 in professional education courses
DP 4 Student Teaching portfolio
DP 4 Learning Assessment Model Project
Praxis II
DOE data including gender, race, socio-economic (family and community) and various performance parameters (testing, attendance, retention, etc.)
Import Program Assessments

This page details the unit assessments that have been pre-configured for your program. Select the assessments using the checkboxes and click on the "Import Program Assessment(s)" button to insert them into your program.

☐ ALL

Decision Point #1

☐ Complete introductory course with C or better  P/F
☐ Decision Point 1: Disposition
☐ Decision Point 1: Portfolio
☐ Intro. Course: EDEL 100
☐ Intro. Course: EDSEC 150
☐ Intro. Course: FCSED 150
☐ Intro. Course: FL 150
☐ Intro. Course: ITEDU 195
☐ Intro. Course: JOURN 150
☐ Intro. Course: MATHS 150
☐ Intro. Course: MUSED 100
☐ Intro. Course: MUSED 150
☐ Intro. Course: PEP 161
☐ Intro. Course: SCI 150
☐ Intro. Course: SPCED 201

Decision Point #2

☐ Approval of application for admission to teaching curriculum
☐ C or better in 100/200 Professional Education Courses  P/F
☐ C or better in Comm 210 or equivalent
☐ Completion of Phase 1 of PGP  int.
☐ Decision Point 2: Artifact Content (EDEL 200)
☐ Decision Point 2: Disposition
Decision Point 2: Disposition

- Decision Point 2: Portfolio
- Decision Point 2: Portfolio (EDEL 200 - Pre FALL2006)
- Declaration of teaching major via DAPR
- Demonstrate ISTE standards at the general preparation level

- EDMUL 205
- EDMUL 205 Course-based assessment
- EDPSY 250
- EDPSY 250 Course-based assessment
- EDPSY 251
- EDPSY 251 Course-based assessment
- Language & Society Assessment
- MUSED 150 Level 3 Skill Competency
- Overall GPA of 2.5 in at least 45 hours
- PRAXIS I score
- PRAXIS I: PPST Mathematics
- PRAXIS I: PPST Reading
- PRAXIS I: PPST Writing
- SCI 395: 5E Instructional Model Lesson Plan Rubric
- SCI 395: Biographical PowerPoint Presentation

Decision Point #3

- C or better in 300/400 PROF. ED. courses
- C or better in EDJHM 385
- C or better in EDSEC 380
- Completion of Phase 2 of PGP
- Completion of Writing Competency
- Decision Point 3: Artifact Content (EDEL 350)
Decision Point #4
- Completion of all content area courses with at least 2.5 GPA and 2.5 in sub-areas
- Completion of degree requirements
- Completion of Phase 3 of PGP
- Decision Point 4: Disposition
- Decision Point 4: Portfolio
- DP4: Student Teaching Portfolio Rubric (INTASC)
- LAMP
- LAMP Assessment (Fall07-current)
- LAMP Assessment (Fall07-current)
- LAMP assessment (pre-Fall07)
- Overall GPA of at least 2.5 in all courses
- PRAXIS II: Art: Content Knowledge (#0133)
3. Are data disaggregated in the following ways: traditional route, alternate route, off-campus, and distance learning programs?

The unit articulates each program separately.

4. Explain the timeline for regularly and systematically compiling, aggregating, summarizing, analyzing and publicly reporting for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality and unit operations.

Ongoing—The systematic compiling, aggregating, summarizing, and analyzing of UAS related data happens in a variety of ways. As discussed earlier, access to UAS data in rGrade is available to individual faculty, advisors, program managers, department chairs, and administrators. In fact, rGrade allows programs to create their own custom reports. Each program has an “Analysis” tab, which consists of 3 sub-tabs: Alignment reports (provides alignment of descriptors such as NCATE performance categories, standards) to program requirements, Performance reports (provides an overall view of student matriculation across program decision points, average rubric performance), and Audit reports (provides tools for overall maintenance of program). A manual for accessing these reports is available at http://www.rgrade.com/docs/manuals/rG21man-program-analysis.doc. In addition, aggregate student teaching portfolio assessment data is consistently made available at the UAS Web site at http://www.bsu.edu/teachers/uas/.

Departmental meetings—The unit expects that each program area is consistently monitoring relevant UAS data and making program improvement decisions based on these and other relevant data. For example, licensure areas have used UAS data in specific departmental meetings to share the outcomes of student data in relation to curriculum requirements.

Decision Point Dialogue meetings—Aggregate program data is shared at decision point meetings (e.g., DP 3 portfolio data) and more recently at the combined Decision Point Dialogue meetings.

Professional Education Committee—In November, the unit provides the licensing report and field experiences report. Each December, the ETS Praxis II reports are shared with the committee. In April, the unit shared the Title II reports. Finally, an annual daylong summer meeting is held to discuss UAS data.

Council of Dean’s meeting—The Dean, Associate Deans, and the Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services presented at the Council of Dean’s meeting in December at the invitation of the Provost. The purpose of this presentation was to summarize the status of the implementation of the UAS at Ball State. This meeting was then followed by individual meetings with the Dean of each college to evaluate the status of data collection, review and document the implementation of programmatic changes.
5. **How does the unit maintain records of formal candidate complaints and their resolutions?**

The Office of Student Rights and Community Standards provides guidelines for the process that a student should use with both formal and informal academic concerns in a document titled “Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities,” which is available at [http://www.bsu.edu/sa/srcs/](http://www.bsu.edu/sa/srcs/). The first step is to formally speak with relevant course instructors. If after this meeting, a resolution is not found, students should contact the department chair of the course for which there are concerns. After this meeting, if a resolution is not found, the student should contact the respective associate dean who maintains records in Dean’s office.

Regarding student issues with accessing their progress in rGrade, the rGrade team tracks all HelpDesk inquiries and their resolutions.

6. **To what degree is the unit developing and testing different information technologies to improve its assessment system?**

The unit designated a Teachers College Data Team comprised of the Associate Dean for Teacher Education, Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services, Director of Technology, rGrade administrator, and a database programmer. The team meets monthly to discuss issues related to technologies and the UAS. Updates to the technologies used to support our data systems are ongoing. The unit supports the various programmers with the professional development and support needed to stay abreast of the field and provide easy seamless access to the various systems used to support the UAS. When necessary, the unit engages faculty with prototyping new technologies and interface design.

**Element 3: Use of Data for Program Improvement**

1. **To what extent has the unit revised its underlying data system and analytic techniques based on evidence from the UAS?**

Several examples of the data-driven changes to the UAS have been discussed previously.

The software originally identified in the 2003 Institutional Report began as the Competency Data Engine (CDE). As initially envisioned, this software was designed to only manage unit specific information. As the unit moved further into implementation of the UAS, it became obvious that a more comprehensive system was required. The decision was made to develop a comprehensive system that would manage all aspects of the UAS, provide support for individual faculty members, and include reporting capabilities for data aggregation. Review of commercial software packages available at the time found that no single package would meet all of the needs of the unit. The rGrade software that is used to manage the data has continued to evolve to facilitate the data management and analysis of the program specific and unit data. Many utilities included in the software are designed to unify data collection and reporting for the unit. It should be noted that during the early years of the software development the unit supported an rGrade Focus Group composed of developers and users that provided input in the development of the system.
In order to facilitate compliance with data collection, the data and the system have been made more accessible to more faculty members. When a faculty member completes a unit assessment that is course-embedded, the data are automatically available. No data entry on the part of clerical staff is required. Data available from the university system, such as demographic information, Praxis test results, and course grades are automatically imported into the rGrade system and are available to individuals who have been granted access. These functionalities were added in response to user requests for a unified UAS management system.

Finally, because much of the evidence documenting program change and the uses of data resided in the minutes from individual departments, the unit developed the NCATE Evidence Management System (http://www.bsu.edu/tcapps/uas/ncatedb/evidence/default.asp). Individual departments can post the minutes of meetings, and summaries of various activities, and these evidence pieces are tagged to the NCATE standards and the conceptual framework. Faculty members and administrative staff who may be members of multiple entities in the unit have access to post evidence for each group. The Evidence Management System looks very much like an electronic exhibit room and has proven to be invaluable for a unit as large and complex as the one at Ball State University.

2. **How does the unit systematically study the effects of any changes to assure that programs are strengthened without adverse consequences?**

As noted earlier, there are many established procedures to review candidate data both formally and informally. Individual candidates have access to all of their decision point data. Program managers and advisors have access to individual candidate data and also aggregated data for their programs. Reporting mechanisms have been developed to allow more detailed data analysis. Additionally, there is a formal timeline for the review of aggregate unit data.

The Decision Point Dialogue meetings have proven to be a very valuable venue to discuss issues related to the UAS. Because this group is composed of representatives from all areas of the unit, it provides a vehicle to communicate among all university stakeholders. The discussions in this group facilitate cohesion within the unit. The members of this group have been the early adopters as new functionalities have been developed to the rGrade system in response to identified needs, such that review of candidate data has become more frequent.

From discussions at these meetings, subgroups of interested faculty members have been identified to work on specific issues. Most recently a subgroup was tasked to review the dispositions assessment rubric in response to the new guidelines adopted by NCATE. This group developed a revised instrument that was vetted by the group. A subsequent revision will be considered by the PEC for potential revision and pilot testing prior to adoption by the unit. This model has proven to be very effective for implementing change across the unit.

The management team for Teachers College, composed of the Dean, Associate Deans, and Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services, meet on a regular basis to review the status of the unit and the data collection. Several rGrade reports have been developed to monitor progress and changes across the unit. Potential problems with consistency of data collection can be identified and referred to the department for resolution. If problems are identified outside of the college, these are referred to the appropriate administrator in the college. A major review of data collection occurs at the end of each semester.
3. **What is the timeline for candidate and faculty review of data on their performance?**

All candidates have continual access to their own data through the rGrade software. Candidates also have access to the results of their unit assessments and faculty comments on those assessments as soon as they are published in rGrade. Candidates are formally reviewed at the completion of the requirements at each decision point. Failure to complete the requirements at any Decision Point, whether in an initial or advanced program, precludes a candidate from advancing in the program.

Faculty can access any data that they have entered on a candidate through the course management functionalities of the rGrade system. rGrade holds the historical data of any course-based assessment recorded by a faculty member. In some cases a student might not be officially identified as belonging to a specific licensure or degree program until after course completion. This sometimes happens when individuals take courses for license renewal and later enroll in a degree program. Any course-based assessment previously recorded is uploaded with the student into the program. Reports within rGrade allow faculty to view aggregated course-based assessment for their own courses.

4. **Explain how plans are developed for improvement of candidate and faculty performance based on data.**

Several data review systems are currently in place to monitor candidate and faculty performance. Plans for improvement of faculty and candidate performance depend on the identified areas for improvement.

Every faculty member has an annual review at the departmental level. Teachers College has also piloted the Graduate Faculty application process for the institution. Academic requirements for faculty members teaching graduate level courses exceed those for undergraduate courses. This electronic submission process expedites consideration of faculty credentials and approval by the graduate school. The rGrade system allows tracking of student performance back to individual instructors. When a problem or documented complaint has been linked to an individual or instructor or cohort of students, this has been addressed. Contract faculty with weaker evaluations have not been renewed in subsequent years.

Because technology skills have been identified in some cohorts of students who have reached student teaching, the unit has provided substantial technical support in the development of their student teaching portfolios. Instructors of earlier courses were provided more support and professional development so that the use of more technology became a routine expectation for the students earlier in their preparation. As a consequence, most recent student teachers have reached the end of their preparation able to more easily incorporate technology into their practice. This was validated in the results of the recent employer survey conducted by the unit, where the respondents reported that the technology skills of our graduates was one of the reasons they sought out our candidates for employment.
STANDARD 2: PROGRAM ASSESSMENT AND UNIT EVALUATION

At time of the previous visit, considerable effort and resources had been expended on the development and implementation of the Unit Assessment System (UAS) at the Initial Preparation Level. Although the program was on a timeline to meet NCATE requirements for full implementation of the UAS for all programs in the fall of 2005, the advanced level programs were at various stages of implementation during the BOE visit and sufficient evidence for the integration of the new conceptual framework into the UAS was not presented. Because Standard 2 was found to be met at the Initial Preparation Level, the discussion below will focus on the Advanced Level.

Element 1: Assessment System

Ball State’s reform of the assessment system for teacher education began with a study of the standards for each of the professional education programs. Since these standards apply to both the initial and advanced programs, the process incorporated advanced programs from the beginning. The initial focus was on the initial programs because 1) the vast majority of professional education candidates are enrolled in initial programs, and 2) initial programs involve a high level of cross-college collaboration, necessitating negotiation and policy change. Some programs at the advanced level were developing assessment systems which paralleled the initial program development; however, the comprehensive plan for all advanced programs had not been approved at the time of the spring 2003 NCATE visit. At the time of the BOE visit, Dean Weaver had appointed Dr. Betty Gridley, Professor of Educational Psychology to the position of Coordinator of Graduate Studies in the Teachers College. Among Dr. Gridley’s duties was the development of a written assessment system document for the advanced professional education programs. The document was to be similar to the approved "decision points document" developed at the initial level. Because of the diversity of the advanced level programs, the document needed to outline a broad framework that would meet the individual program requirements.

Dr. Gridley’s work was submitted to the appropriate programs for review and discussion. Based on their suggestions, the revised version was submitted to the Professional Education Committee for formal adoption as the mandated plan for all advanced programs. This “Unit Assessment Plan for Advanced Education Programs” was approved by the PEC in February of 2004. This approved document is included in the Appendix.

Following the adoption of the UAS for advanced programs, a reporting format was developed for all advanced programs to document the status of their compliance with the UAS. As noted earlier, all advanced programs were required to report using this format in October 2004 and will do so annually in the future. These reports will be available in the exhibit room and include the following components:

1) Brief program description
2) Standards related to the program
3) Overview of program decision points
4) Analysis of assessment, which includes
   a) type
   b) response format
   c) conceptual framework alignment
   d) alignment with standards
5) Aggregation of program data across decision points
6) Impact on program operations for the previous academic year

The nature of the diverse requirements for the advanced programs, and the requirements for other accrediting organizations impose an additional level of complexity in the UAS for advanced programs. The two charts which appear in the Appendix provide an outline of the Decision Points for advanced programs. The decision points for the UAS for advanced programs involve multiple assessments at each of four points.

- Admission to Graduate Education
- Retention in the Graduate Education Program
- Eligibility for Internship/practicum/student teaching
- Eligibility for Graduation/licensing

There are standardized requirements across all advanced programs that involve the minimum requirements for admission to and retention in the Graduate School. In some cases, admission and retention criteria may exceed these minimums and are identified in each individual program. In most cases, students enrolled in specific programs must receive at least a B in certain courses for each program, in addition to maintaining an overall 3.0 GPA. Additional performance assessments are embedded within each program.

In order to advance in the graduate programs, students must complete portfolio requirements prior to enrolling in internship/practica. Additionally, all of these field experiences have performance assessments required for their successful completion. Programs have submitted their rubrics for the assessment of these experiences, which will be available for review by the BOE team. As part of the UAS management, this rubrics will become part of the rGrade system, allowing direct access to the electronic portfolios and recording of the results in the UAS database.

Finally, in order to be eligible for graduation and licensure, which is Decision Point Four, all candidates must satisfy all departmental and Graduate School requirements, including testing, field experiences and GPA.

It should be noted that licensed educators who choose to enroll in graduate coursework outside of a specific program of study may enroll as a nondegree student. These individuals must meet the Graduate School requirements for admission and retention in the university. If they choose to be admitted to a program, they must meet the program admission criteria and only nine credit hours of work completed in nondegree status may be applied to the degree program. Students in nondegree status who wish to be admitted to a course which is part of the UAS decision points must meet the same criteria as the degree-seeking students in the course. Under the prior state licensing rules educators could obtain a renewed license with six credit hours of coursework and
would not have been required to obtain a Master's degree. This resulted in a significant number of students enrolling under this option. As noted earlier, changes in the Graduate School coding system will allow better tracking of these candidates.

As indicated previously, the document "Assessing Dispositions in Advanced Candidates in Teacher Education" was approved by the PEC on March 2, 2005. Programs will be expected to indicate the specific Decision Points for assessment of dispositions and the rubric will be available through rGrade.

Element 2: Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation

Extensive effort over the last six years has led to the development of a unique web-based software for the integration of data collection and analysis of the UAS data. The prototype of this system was referred to as the Competency Data Engine in the previous Institutional Report. The current software is referred to as rGrade because of its design as an integrated rubric-based assessment tool. This rGrade software allows management of the UAS data for each student, allowing aggregation across instructors, programs, departments and colleges. The software tool manages the assessment rubrics, allowing instructors to use the approved rubrics at specific decision points but also to develop individual rubrics as necessary for their courses. Because the software is integrated with the digital portfolio, instructors can access the performance assessment and apply the rubrics online and the score is automatically recorded in the database for the UAS. In addition, because the software communicates directly with the university computing system, many of the demographic and descriptive data fields required are automatically populated.

SPCED 600, Education of Exceptional Children, is now using rGrade for the evaluation of the Professional Growth Plan project. Rubrics have been created for this project. Rubrics are also being developed for the four visitation projects (visits to special education programs and/or interviews with parents, teachers, etc.).

Because the rGrade software functions as an electronic grade book for the instructor and student, the result is a very efficient model for the collection of the UAS data across decision points. Current efforts are directed to the aggregation of these data across programs to make them more generally accessible to stakeholders. Policy implications related to the publication of these data will be reviewed by the PEC.

The ability to access two databases maintained by the Office of Teacher Education Services will be integrated into the rGrade program. The Student Teaching Database stores and retrieves the field placement information on individual students. The Licensing Database stores the license history information on individuals who have applied for licensure through BSU.

As previously noted, annual reporting for advanced programs was initiated in the fall of 2004. All of these reports were reviewed by the Associate Dean and the Director of the Office of Teacher Education Services. As a minimum each program has now established an internal data collection system to track the progress of their candidates through the Decision Points. Because the enrollment in some programs was so low, these programs had not foreseen the need. With
the implementation of the rGrade software at the advanced level, this reporting will be facilitated.

Some of the data required for UAS management at the Advanced Level, such as GPA, is parallel to that required at the Initial Preparation Level. At the present time, the information required for the Advanced Level Decision Points is being identified from the fall 2004 UAS reports submitted by each program. Subsequently the subset of assessment used for Advanced Level programs will be available to the programs for implementation. The communication between the university computing system, graduate school database and the rGrade software is being addressed concurrently. As noted earlier, some programs have begun to use the rGrade software on a pilot basis for their advanced-level candidate performance assessments.

The duties of the Associate Dean have recently been redefined and beginning July 1, 2005, a second Associate Dean’s position will be created. The position of Associate Dean for Graduate Programs and Assessment was added to the organizational structure of the college. This individual will assume responsibility for the implementation and management of the Unit Assessment System. This organizational change will provide for a more focused approach to the UAS management.