



Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation

The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the unit and its programs.

As a community of professional educators, we believe in meaningful, systematic, continuous assessment of curriculum development, program delivery, faculty performance, and candidate learning and performance. We are committed to using our assessments to promote the professional growth of both our candidates and faculty; to limit candidates' progression, when necessary, in professional education programs; and to revise professional education programs as appropriate. As such, the UNCG Assessment Plan is based on the shared values reflected in the Conceptual Framework and links the performance of the UNCG candidates to national, state, and professional standards. The purposes of the System are:

1. to ensure that all candidates exit the program with the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to be successful professionals, and
2. to evaluate current programs in order to better serve future candidates and our school partners.

2.1. Assessment System

The UNCG Assessment System is operationalized at three levels:

- The Individual Candidate level – These assessments are designed to assure that candidates exit the program with the skills, knowledge and dispositions necessary to be caring, competent, collaborative professionals.
- The Program level – These assessments address program coherence, organization, efficiency and effectiveness.
- The Unit level – These assessments provide an overview of how programs within the Unit are functioning in relation to other programs and to professional standards and Unit goals.

Table 25 depicts the current UNCG Assessment Plan for the Professional Education Programs.

Table 25 UNCG Assessment Plan for the Professional Education Programs		
Focus & Purpose	Data Sources	Use of Data
Individual Candidate	Course grades & GPA SAT, ACT, GRE, MAT	Candidate assessments are used for:

<p>Assessment</p>	<p>PRAXIS I & PRAXIS II Field experience evaluations using the TGAP rubric Portfolio evaluation Disposition rubric Program specific data is housed in TaskStream Teacher Academy & Banner data bases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • feedback to candidate • feedback to faculty for decision making about candidate advancement • curriculum alignment and course modification
<p>Program Evaluation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Aggregated TGAP scores -- Aggregated portfolio evaluations -- Aggregated disposition scores -- Aggregated Praxis II data -- Course evaluations -- Demographic data re: school placements, candidate diversity, faculty diversity -- Student enrollment data -- Graduation rates -- Follow-up data 	<p>Aggregated data are used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • review and revise effectiveness of curriculum and instruction in each program • review and revise assessment tools and scoring criteria for accuracy, consistency, fairness, and avoidance of bias • identify trends and need areas for improvement in programs • identify areas for improvement of field experiences
<p>Unit Evaluation</p>	<p>Annually, the following data are examined across all programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Admission & graduation totals -- FTE & SCH generated by program -- Time to graduation -- % of students applying for license -- External funding -- Faculty publications and presentations -- Diversity of staff and candidates -- Candidate complaints and their resolutions -- Exit and post-graduation and employer surveys -- Bi-annually, the SOE has an Advisory Board that 	<p>These data are used to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor program progress • Increase unit effectiveness • Improve curriculum and instruction • Prepare external, accountability reports

	reviews aspects of the program and provides constructive feedback.	
--	--	--

Background and Development of the Assessment Plan.

The Teachers Academy established an Assessment Subcommittee in 2000 that set goals and a preliminary plan for an Assessment System that was based on the shared values outlined in the School of Education and Teachers Academy Conceptual Framework for Professional Education. The plan was based on the assumption that programs would develop their individual assessment plans and once these were completed, common elements would be used to build the Unit Assessment Plan. Programs developed and implemented their assessment plans, using the data that they collected to improve candidate performance and to make programmatic changes. Program plans had some common elements, including admission requirements (minimum GPA, passing Praxis I scores for undergraduates, and review of prerequisite course requirements), portfolios to demonstrate technology competencies, midterm and final clinical evaluations; however, each program also had its unique approach to assessing its candidates and scores were not aggregated across programs.

In the spring of 2003, the NCATE Coordinator chose not to serve another term and in 2003-2004 a search was undertaken for a new coordinator. Also, during 2003-2004, a new position, Director of Assessment, was created. In response to these developments, unit-level assessment planning was discontinued until the new Coordinator and Director of Assessment arrived in fall, 2004. Programs continued collecting individual candidate data and developing their individual assessment plans. In the fall of 2004, a new Assessment Committee was assembled and, in its oversight capacity, determined that, while assessment plans were progressing at the program level, there was a need for a more systemic, unit-wide approach, with more commonality among program plans and stronger unit level assessment. The subcommittee also determined that development of additional assessment tools would strengthen evaluation at the candidate, program and unit level and would provide data with which to further evaluate and revise curricula. Finally, it determined that an improved data collection and maintenance plan was needed. In response to their mandate, an Assessment System was developed that included:

- data collection and tracking systems,
- the identification of critical assessment points (gates) starting with the candidate's entry into the professional education program and culminating with program completion, and
- the development of rubrics and protocols for assessment.

These were reviewed and revised by the Executive Committee of the Council for Program Coordinators, the Council of Program Coordinators, the Assessment Committee, and the Executive Committee of the School of Education.

2.2. Data Collection, Analysis and Evaluation

Data Collection and Tracking Systems:

Assessment data are being collected, stored and analyzed in several systems: the Teachers Academy Data Base, the UNCG Banner Data Base, TaskStream, SEDONA, and Institutional Research.

Teachers Academy and Banner Databases. Historically, the Teachers Academy collected data regarding candidate demographics and progress through the professional education programs. These data were used to generate state and national reports, and to provide information to individual programs for their assessments and reporting. The data were maintained on a variety of databases, each specific to a task, such as admission to the Teachers Academy, field placements and licensure recommendations. In addition, programs maintained data as needed, including some that overlapped with the unit data. This multiplicity of databases created complexity and increased potential for error.

In 2004-05, the Teachers Academy developed, in collaboration with faculty, a comprehensive database that maintains all Teachers Academy data and includes records that are needed by individual programs. Data entry points include student demographics, test scores (GPA, SAT, GRE, Praxis I and Praxis II), progress through program (entry and exit in various phases of the program), field and employment placements, course and supervisor information, and limited evaluation data (with more extensive evaluation data maintained on TaskStream). The database provides a rich source of data for candidate tracking and advisement, program and unit assessment, and program revision.

TaskStream. The CPC also adopted TaskStream as a platform on which student teaching observations, disposition ratings, portfolios and their evaluations are posted. Again, using a common data collection tool enhances candidate tracking and advisement, program and unit assessment, and program revision. The use of TaskStream allows for easy tracking of communication concerning assignments or portfolios between instructors and candidates and, hence, enhanced candidate learning. Candidates can create their portfolios, post artifacts and reflections, receive instructor feedback, and modify their postings on a schedule that fits their pace of learning and course sequencing. The unit-wide adoption of TaskStream as the platform for posting and evaluating the portfolios also allows for ease of data collection, review for individual programs and the unit, and program revision.

SEDONA. The university has adopted Sedona to collect and maintain faculty demographic and professional data. The School of Education provided funding to expedite data entry. These data provide an overview of the breadth and depth of faculty school involvement, scholarship and teaching.

UNCG Institutional Research. In 2006, the UNC system began working with all campuses to establish common definitions and systems for tracking professional education candidates. The creation of shadow data systems was discouraged, thus we are now in the process of working with UNCG Institutional Research to establish on Banner, the University data system, much of the data needed by the Teachers Academy. Ultimately, most of our required data will be housed on Banner with a specific data base

maintained in the Teachers Academy for data not appropriate for Banner (e.g., individual student performance on Unit-wide assessments, data about school placements and mentor teacher information). When this system is implemented, we will be able to monitor electronically candidates' GPAs each semester.

Data from these databases are used by advisors and the Teachers Academy to advise candidates and to monitor their progress through their programs. Data are also aggregated by the Teachers Academy on several dimensions to assist programs and the unit in self-assessment and program revision. For example, enrollment data are used for planning purposes; and demographic data about our candidates, faculty and partner schools provide information with which to assess diversity of experiences in the teacher education experience. Longitudinal data by program on Praxis II scores provide a measure of candidate knowledge and skills. TaskStream data identify standards that are typically or often not met by students, thus informing the program about potential revisions.

Critical Assessment Points (Assessment Gates)

The Individual Assessment Plan features four critical assessment times or gates starting with entry into a professional education program and culminating with graduation. Using multiple measures, data are available to provide growth-oriented feedback to students, limit progression through the program, and inform programs and the unit about needs for program revision. These assessment gates include:

1. **Admission:** Students must have a GPA of 2.5 or higher and North Carolina passing scores on Praxis I. Programs may establish additional prerequisites for admission to professional education and may require a GPA higher than 2.5.
2. **Early in the program** (varies by program): GPA is checked each semester and students are notified if GPA falls below program minimum. Candidate professional dispositions are evaluated; remedial plans are developed for students for whom evaluations are not acceptable.
3. **Prior to the final field experience:** Students must have a 2.5 GPA or higher if required by their program, must demonstrate acceptable professional dispositions, and must have completed all program prerequisites for student teaching or final internship.
4. **Completion of licensure program:** Candidates must have a 2.5 GPA or higher, as required by their program, and acceptable evaluations of the final field experience, professional dispositions, and the teaching portfolio. Until spring 2005, most candidates were required by NC DPI to earn a qualifying score on PRAXIS II. After April 2005, only Elementary Education and Special Education candidates were required to take this test before initial teaching licensure.

Follow up: Post-graduation data are obtained on and from individual candidates for the purpose of program, not individual candidate, evaluation. The UNCG Office of Institutional Research, offices within the School of Education, the Teachers Academy, and individual programs monitor program satisfaction, licensure and employment status,

as well as employer evaluations of professional preparation and performance. Follow-up observations and conferences have been conducted routinely for Teaching Fellows. In fall, 2005, the Teachers Academy developed instruments and procedures for telephone surveys and focus groups to assess candidate and employer satisfaction and a few focus groups have been conducted.

Gates for Assessing Individual Candidate Progress

Table 26 details the Assessment Gates, Instruments, and when the various assessments listed above are administered.

Table 26: Assessment Gates, Outcomes, Benchmarks, Assessment Tools and Process/ Procedures

Assessment Gate	Standards/ Outcomes	Benchmarks	Assessment Tools	Process
Admission	Content Knowledge	2.50 GPA Standardized test Prerequisite courses completed	Transcripts Praxis 1, SAT, ACT	Applicants are admitted to the Teachers Academy if they meet all criteria for admission. Applicants work with their advisor to ensure that the appropriate program of study is developed.
Midway in Program (usually in first field experience)	Content Knowledge Dispositions	GPA of 2.50+ is maintained Successful completion of assignments in key courses Evaluated by faculty and discussed	Transcripts Course specific rubrics Disposition rubric	Grades are monitored to ensure that candidates maintain required GPA. Candidates with low disposition ratings meet with their program faculty to discuss necessary modifications.
Prior to Final Student Teaching	Content Knowledge	Minimum GPA of 2.50 Satisfactory completion of all program required courses	Transcripts	Candidates are allowed to continue to field experience if they have maintained a 2.50 GPA and completed all program required courses
Completion of Field Experience	Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills Content	Successful completion of field experience	TGAP field experience assessment	Field experience data are aggregated and analyzed by program and the data are shared with program coordinators

	Knowledge			
	Dispositions	Evaluated by UNCG faculty and cooperating field supervisor	Disposition rubric	
Program Completion	Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills	Successful completion of portfolio	Portfolio rubric	Candidates are recommended for licensure if they have the required GPA and PRAXIS scores and have a satisfactory portfolio
	Content Knowledge	PRAXIS II scores, where required	Transcripts	

The Associate Dean for Teacher Education in the School of Education oversees all the activities related to the assessments of candidates. In the academic year 2004-05 a Director of Assessment was added with responsibilities related to the creation of measurement instruments, a Unit-wide data base, as well as collection, aggregation and dissemination of data.

To ensure that all required standards are met, a crosswalk was developed between each of the unit-wide assessments and the standards as shown in **Table 27**.

Table 27: Crosswalk between Evidence and Standards

Evidence	NCATE Standard	NC Core Standard	NC Diversity Standard	NC Technology Standard	Conceptual Framework	INTASC Standard
PRAXIS II	1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4	Core 1				
TGAP						
Planning 1	1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2			Competent 1,6	1,4,7,9
Planning 2	1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2		Technology 3	Competent 1,6	1,7
Planning 3	1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2			Competent 1	1,4,6
Instruction 4	1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3,4.1	Core 2,3	Diversity 1,2,4		Competent 1,6	1,2,3,7
Instruction 5	1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4,1.	Core 2			Competent 1,3,6	1,4,7

	5,3.3					
Instruction 6	1.3,1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3	Core2			Competent 1,2,,3,6	4,7
Instruction 7	1.1,1.2,1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2		Technology 1, 2, 3	Competent 1,4,5	6
Instruction 8	1.3,1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3,4.1	Core 2,3	Diversity 1,2	Technology 1, 2, 3, 4	Competent 1	1,2,3,4
Instruction 9	1.3,1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3,4.1	Core 2,3	Diversity 1,2	Technology 1, 2, 3, 4	Caring 1 Competent 1	3,4
Instruction 10	1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3	Core2			Caring 1 Competent 1,3,4,7	6,8
Assessment 11	1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3	Core 2		Technology 4	Competent 1,7	2,8
Assessment 12	1.3,1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3	Core 2,6			Competent 1,7,9	5,8
Assessment 13	1.4,1.5,1.7,1.8,3.3	Core 2,6			Competent 1,7	6,8
Motivation 14	1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2			Caring 1,2 Competent 1,9	2,5
Motivation 15	1.4,1.5,3.3,4.1	Core 2,6	Diversity 5		Caring 2 Competent 1,9	2,3,5
Motivation 16	1.3,1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2,6			Caring 2,3,4 Competent 1,9	5
Motivation 17	1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 2			Caring 2 Competent 1	5,10
Impact 18	1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 5			Competent 6	4,7,9
Impact 19	1.4,1.5,3.3	Core 4			Caring 5 Collaborate 2,3 Competent 11	9,10
Growth 20	1.4,1.5,3.3		Diversity 3	Technology 5	Collaborate 2	3,8,10

Growth 21	1.4,1.5,3.3			Technology 5		8
Dispositions						
1 Reflective	1.6, 3.3	Core 5	Diversity 6		Competent 8,10	9
2 Ethical	1.6, 3.3, 4.1	Core 6	Diversity 6	Technology 6	Caring 3,6	
3 Inclusive	1.6, 3.3,4.1	Core 3,6	Diversity 1,2		Caring 1,2,3,4 Competent 6	3,4
4 Engaged	1.6,3.3	Core 5,6			Caring 3,4 Collaborate 1,4	10
5 Life Learner	1.6,3.3	Core 5		Technology 1	Collaborate 1	
6 Self-Efficacy	1.6,3.3	Core 5			Competent 8	9
7 Feedback	1.6,3.3				Collaborate 1,4	9
8 Affirms Diversity	1.6,3.3,4.1	Core 3,6	Diversity 1,2		Caring 1,2,3,4	3
9 Responsible	1.6,3.3	Core 2			Caring 4 Collaborate 1	
10 Collaborative	1.6,3.3	Core 4	Diversity 3		Collaborate 2,3 Competent 12	10
Portfolio						
1 Diverse Cultures	1.4,1.5,4.1	Core 3	Diversity 1,2	Technology 6	Caring 1,4 Collaborate 3	3,4
2 High Expectations	4.1	Core 2,4,6		Technology 3	Caring 2,3,4,5	5
3 Reflective	1.4,1.5	Core 2,5			Collaborate 3 Competent 8,10	9
4 Collaboration		Core 5		Technology 5	Collaborate 4 Competent 4,12	10
5 Families	1.4,1.5	Core 4	Diversity	Technology	Collaborate	10

			3	5	5	
6 Assessment- Goals	1.7,1.8	Core 2		Technology 4	Competent 7	8
7 Instruction Adjustments	1.4,1.5,1 .7,1.8	Core 2,3		Technology 2, 3	Competent 7	7,8
8 Monitors Learning	1.7,1.8	Core 2,3		Technology 4	Competent 7,9	8
9 Positive Impact	1.7,1.8,3 .3,4.1	Core 2,3		Technology 2, 3, 5	Competent 7	8
10 Content Depth	1.1,1.2	Core 1			Competent 1,6	1
11 Content Breadth	1.1,1.2	Core 1			Competent 1,6	1
12 Professional Practice	1.3,1.4,1 .5,1.7,1. 8,4.1	Core 2,3		Technology 1, -5	Competent 12	2,4,5,6

Currently, efforts are focused on ensuring that the Assessment Plan is functioning as planned, is being administered consistently, and is providing data that are useful to programs. Some of the graduate and the smaller programs are still in the process of shifting from their previous portfolio assessments to the Unit-wide portfolio assessments, and some programs are still making adjustments to the Unit-level assessments so that they fit and are relevant to their specific program. Plans to implement features of the Assessment Plan were delayed by technology problems and policy changes. In the graduate programs, candidates are given the portfolio expectations at admission and most candidates take two or three years to complete their programs, thus candidates who are using all of the Unit-wide assessments have not graduated yet. Additionally, the Portfolio Rubric needs to be modified to fit the non-teaching programs. Since this has not been done, program-specific rubrics were used by Social Work, CED and ELC. Where relevant, these irregularities are noted throughout this report.

The Development of Rubrics and Protocols for Assessment

The UNCG Assessment Plan uses multiple measures to assess and analyze candidate performance. The plan is based on the belief that assessment should be educational to both the candidate and to the program. Candidates are encouraged to connect the development of their own practice to the development of students. As candidates progress through the program, they engage in multiple assessments that allow both faculty and candidates to reflect on candidates' teaching and learning and to use this information for both improvements of candidate performance and program implementation.

Data Elements in the Individual Candidate Assessments

- **Course grades and grade point averages (GPA).** To qualify for admission, undergraduate degree and licensure-only candidates must have a cumulative, minimum GPA of 2.5. This requirement is set by the State of North Carolina. The following programs have set an admission GPA requirement of 2.7: Art, Birth-Kindergarten, Education of the Deaf, Secondary English, Secondary Social Studies, Elementary, Middle Grades, Special Education, and K-12 Foreign Language require a 2.75 GPA; and Latin and Theatre require a 3.0 GPA.

Candidates pursuing licensure at the graduate level are subject to the rules and regulations of UNCG's Graduate School. Typically, admission criteria include a bachelor's degree from an accredited college or university with a "B" average in the undergraduate major and in coursework relevant to the proposed area of graduate study. Candidates who have taken post-baccalaureate course work may submit their grades on these courses as a means of qualifying for admission. Plans are being developed to monitor candidate progression and to notify both the candidate and the program if a candidate's grades fall below the required GPA.

- **Standardized test scores (PRAXIS I, PRAXIS II, GRE, and SAT).** To be admitted to the Teachers Academy, undergraduate candidates must meet the state-required score on Praxis I or the SAT or ACT. Table 28 shows the admission cut scores for the Praxis I, SAT and ACT.

Table 28: State Mandated Cut Scores on the Required Admission Tests for Undergraduates

Praxis I	State Mandated Passing Score
Reading	176
Writing	173
Mathematics	173
SAT	State Mandated Passing Score
Total (in place of Praxis Reading, Writing &	1100

Mathematics)	
Verbal (in place of Praxis I Reading and Writing)	550
Math (in place of Praxis I Mathematics)	550
ACT	
Composite (in place of Praxis Reading, Writing & Mathematics)	24
English (in place of Praxis I Reading and Writing)	24
Math (in place of Praxis I Mathematics)	24

Graduate candidates are required to take either the GRE or the Miller Analogies Test (Music allows the Praxis II). There are no mandated cut scores for these tests, but scores at the 50 percentile on either the Verbal or Quantitative Test are recommended.

Field experience evaluations using the Preservice Teacher Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP). For evaluation of final field placements (student teaching and final internships) professional education programs previously used an open-ended instrument for midterm formative evaluations and, for summative evaluations, an adaptation of the Teacher Professional Appraisal Instrument (TPAI), a tool that was used by the State of North Carolina to evaluate beginning and career teachers. In 2005, program faculty and the Council of Program Coordinators determined that these instruments were no longer appropriate; they did not reflect newer emphases on outcome or performance data and were not well aligned with current professional standards. In 2003-04, faculty from the Department of Curriculum and Instruction worked with SERVE (formerly the Southeastern Educational Regional Vision for Education) Center at UNCG to adapt the new SERVE teacher assessment instrument for use with preservice teachers. CUI piloted the instrument in 2003-04; additional programs piloted the instrument in 2004-05, and in spring, 2005, final revisions were made for use by all programs. The TGAP was used by all programs for assessing the performance of candidates seeking initial license during the 2005-2006 academic year.

This UNCG Preservice Teacher Growth and Assessment Profile (TGAP) is comprised of 21 performance dimensions, each of which is linked to one or more INTASC standard. The assessment instrument describes what preservice teachers should know and be able to do by the end of their student teaching or final internship experience, and may be used for identifying areas for improvement. Several UNCG programs are using the instrument developmentally, with some indicators assessed in early internships and all 21 performance indicators assessed by the end of the final field experience. Both the school-based educator (cooperating teacher/onsite teacher educator) and the university field supervisor assess the candidate's performance and provide feedback to the candidate. Individual programs may modify the rubric as appropriate to meet program-specific standards and, as with the Candidate Disposition Assessment Process, programs use aggregated data about student performance to identify areas in need of program-wide improvement. **Appendix A** shows the actual rubrics used in the TGAP.

Inter-rater reliabilities for 21 TGAP dimensions run from .32 to .70. While these coefficients are not as high as desired, they are not surprising. The two raters are the classroom-based cooperating/mentor teacher and the university supervisor. They have different perspectives on the candidate's performance with their own unique biases. Additionally, each dimension is measured with a single 6-point scale. Reader reliability estimates of a total TGAP score based on summing the scores across the 21 dimension are in the mid .80s. (See detailed discussion of this analysis in article by Klaric, Morgan & Norman in the Evidence Box). During this first year of administering the instrument across programs, very little attention was given to creating systems of consistent rating so that individual biases were minimized. In the 2006-2007 academic year, more attention needs to be given to establishing reliability among raters.

Final Portfolio. Since the last accreditation visit, programs have been revising their systems of assessing and monitoring candidate performance. In 2000 the Teachers Academy began requiring candidates to complete a technology portfolio. The Technology Portfolio assessed the basic and advanced technology competencies as defined by the Department of Public Instruction and in alignment with International Society for Technology in Education/National Educational Technology Standards (ISTE/NETS). LIS/CUI 120, a one-hour course, was offered to teach the basic technology skills that were expected from pre-service teachers. Students submitted at least one artifact for each indicator of the technology standards, and then wrote a reflection for each artifact explaining how the artifact demonstrated their competence. The instructor of the course evaluated each artifact and reflection, and provided feedback as the portfolio was being assembled. Students continued assembling artifacts and reflections, and these were submitted periodically for review and feedback. The final portfolio was reviewed by their Program Coordinator and, when complete, the portfolios were reviewed by at least one other faculty member and by a school-based clinical instructor.

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction expanded the portfolio to include demonstrations of technology *and* teaching competencies. With this portfolio, students not only reflected on their technical skills, but also on their teaching skills and P-12 student learning. In 2005, the Teachers Academy Council of Program Coordinators (CPC) adopted the concept of a "teaching portfolio" for all programs. In addition, a portfolio rubric was developed that is aligned with the School of Education Conceptual Framework, state and national standards for professional education, and ISTE/NETS. Currently, all programs are using or are planning to use the rubric. Individual programs may also modify the rubric as appropriate to meet their program-specific standards. **Appendix B** contains the UNCG Portfolio Rubric Assessment.

Dispositions. Since 2003, the Teachers Academy, programs and individual faculty members have been actively involved in learning about and developing rubrics to assess dispositions. Faculty members attended national meetings related to dispositions and the Council of Program Coordinators (CPC) studied and evaluated underlying concepts and assessment instruments. While faculty became conversant with evaluations

of dispositions, they did not find a model that they felt met their needs. During a series of meetings in 2004-05, members of the CPC, the Dean of the School of Education (SOE), and an external advisory committee of school principals, teachers and community leaders examined the Conceptual Framework of the Teachers Academy in relationship to dispositions. The SOE Director of Assessment, with faculty from across licensure programs, then developed the UNCG Candidate Assessment of Dispositions Process. This instrument is used to measure candidate dispositions at least three times: early in the candidate's professional program, as determined by the program; before the final field placement; and by the end of the final field placement. Candidates whose evaluations are not acceptable meet with program faculty to discuss plans for candidate development and improvement. These candidates are counseled and a growth plan is developed in accordance with the Professional Behavior Intervention Policy. Candidates who do not receive an acceptable rating by the end of student teaching/final internship may not be recommended for licensure. (*See the Professional Behavior Intervention Policy in Evidence Box*). Programs may also use aggregated data about dispositions to identify areas in need of program-wide improvement. In past years, faculty have voiced feeling powerless when dealing with challenging candidates, particularly candidates whose progression in the program should be limited. This policy enables faculty to systematically and fairly provide candidates with corrective feedback. It also enables faculty to stop candidate's progression in the program, when candidates do not improve. **Appendix C** contains the UNCG Candidate Assessment of Dispositions Process.

Table 29 shows the inter-rater reliability coefficients computed for the Candidate Dispositions Assessment Process.

Table 29: Inter-rater reliability coefficients for the Candidate Dispositions Assessment Process

Reflective	Ethical	Inclusive	Engaged	Lifelong Learner
.73	.45	.57	.51	.64
Self-Efficacious	Receptive to feedback	Affirming of diversity	Professionally responsible	Collaborative
.23	.62	.45	.64	.54

Program specific data housed in TaskStream. In addition to the core assessments that all programs administer, individual programs have added assessments specific to their programs. These data are monitored within the program and reported as part of the program reports.

Surveys administered by the UNCG Office of Institutional Research. Several useful surveys are administered annually by the Office of Institutional Research. These are:

- **Senior Survey.** The target group for this survey is graduating seniors. The survey is administered prior to graduation and typically has had a return rate around 75%. The focus of this survey is on students' satisfaction with UNCG and their degree program. Specific items are added that target licensure students.

- Spartan Experience Questionnaire. Targeted at all undergraduates, this survey focuses on the seven principles of undergraduate education. Typically, the return rate has averaged close to 50%.
- Undergraduate Degree Recipient Survey. This survey is administered 1 year and 3 years after students graduate. It targets completers of all undergraduate programs and is focused on their satisfaction with their programs and advisement, current employment status, and professional activities. Specific items are added for the School of Education programs. Return rates for the 1-year survey have ranged from 19% to 46%. For the 3-year surveys, the return rates have ranged from 17% to 44%.
- Graduate Degree Recipient Survey. Targeted on completers on all graduate programs, this survey focuses on perceptions of program quality, current employment status, and professional activities. Return rates have been fairly consistent, ranging from 44% to 48%.
- Experience Questionnaire. Students currently enrolled in graduate programs are targeted and the survey addresses their perceptions of program quality and suggestions for improvements/changes. The return rate of this survey has been around 67%.

Additional Program Data. At the program and unit level, data are routinely gathered about enrollment, external funding, and scholarly activity. Additionally, candidates in all courses have the opportunity to evaluate their instructors. These evaluations are reviewed by department chairs for instructional improvement. These data are also used for promotion and retention personnel decisions. Data from all evaluations are provided to the instructors, and should problems exist, issues are discussed with the program chair. Each semester programs review and discuss their program data, and starting in the 2006-2007, minutes from these meetings will be kept on-file in the Teachers Academy. In addition, programs collect information from graduates through either formal surveys or informally by talking to graduates at forums such as professional meetings.

2.3. Use of Data for Program Improvement

The current Assessment Plan was adopted in 2004-2005 and is still in the early implementation stage and already, the data have been useful.

Individual Candidate Assessment Data

Data from the individual candidate assessments have already been used in a variety of ways that include:

1. As evidence that UNCG graduates possess the required content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to be proficient teachers and professional educators. The few candidates who had difficulty on any one of the required assessments have been counseled and remedial plans developed.
2. As program evaluation data providing programs with information about their relative strengths and weaknesses. Individual programs are discussing strategies for addressing identified weaknesses.

3. As measures of candidate's development through the program. It is expected and it is the case that early ratings of candidates are not as high as ratings at the end of programs. This finding provides evidence that candidates are growing and learning and that our measures are sensitive to their changes over time.

In addition to the above uses, data have been gathered in the Unit evaluations that have generated questions about program features which will be considered during the 2006-2007 academic year at the Council for Program Coordinators.

Illustrations of these various uses are detailed below:

- ***Evidence that UNCG graduates possess the required content and pedagogical knowledge and skills to be proficient teachers.*** These data, presented in the discussion of Standard I, document our candidates' accomplishments, but they also stimulated additional questions. For example, a few undergraduate candidates received a disposition rating of 1 or 2, which are considered unacceptable. In 2006-2007, we plan to study how candidates and programs responded to those ratings and whether our Professional Behavior Intervention Policy is working effectively.
- ***As program evaluation data providing programs with information about their relative strengths and weaknesses.*** Perhaps the best example of how individual candidate assessment data are also helpful program evaluation data is found in the Math Praxis II findings. On the Praxis II, 80% of the graduates earned a passing score, which is an acceptable level but it is lower than their UNCG colleagues in other content areas. This raises questions about the quality of our candidates in math, quality of our program, and the match between our program and the test. To address these questions, several analyses were done.
 1. Math candidates' admission scores were examined. Entering SAT and GRE scores for the secondary math teachers were similar to their peers in other content areas.
 2. Our math curriculum was also examined in light of what is known about the Praxis II math exam and it appears that our courses correspond with the content tested on Praxis II.
 3. Praxis II scores were then correlated with candidates' GPAs to determine alignment between faculty evaluation of candidate performance and candidate performance on the Praxis II.

As seen in **Table 30**, the expected relationship existed between course performance and scores on the total Praxis II and on the Knowledge subtest; however, between GPAs and scores on the Pedagogy subtest, a weaker relationship was found. Because the sample is so small, these findings must be treated with caution; however, these findings stimulated discussion about why our students are having trouble in that area. Examination of the Pedagogy subtest indicates that considerable emphasis is placed on candidates being able to present material and concepts in multiple ways. These preliminary findings correspond to informal observations by faculty regarding why our candidates were having

difficulty. Briefly stated, some candidates memorize mathematical formulas so they can perform on tests but they do not acquire a deep understanding of the content. There does not appear to be an emphasis within the program on presenting and examining content and ideas from multiple perspectives. New resources plus retirements and resignations in the math education program are creating an opportunity for rebuilding the program. In 2006-2007, we will search for four new math education faculty, two of whom will be senior faculty. We are searching for faculty who have the philosophy and pedagogical skills to address our needs.

Table 30: Correlations of Candidates' GPAs in Math with the Praxis II Scores

Scores that were correlated	Coefficient	Significance level
Total Praxis II score & GPA	.47	p<.02
Praxis II Knowledge score & GPA	.574	p<.005
Praxis II Pedagogy score & GPA	.275	

- As measures of candidate's development through the program.* Average disposition ratings increased as candidates progressed through their programs. One example comes from special education candidates. Disposition ratings for candidates in SES 350 averaged nearly 4.0 points with a low of 3.46 for the Reflective measure. Following SES 465, the Reflective measure averaged 5.09 (still the lowest of the 10 measures, but an improvement of over 1.50 scale points). The Ethical measure, the highest measure following SES 465, increased from 4.39 to 5.61. On the average the scores were 1.1 scale points higher following SES 465 than when measured following SES 350. A second example is from Elementary Education where the average disposition rating is at 4.46 for juniors and 5.43 for seniors. As with SES, the lowest average rating in the junior year was Reflection. This rating improved from 4.32 to 5.33, while the Ethical measure, once again the highest measure, increased from 4.60 to 5.61.

Average ratings on the TGAP measure of student teaching also showed dramatic improvements from internships to the completion of student teaching. For example, in Elementary Education, the average ratings increased from 4.32 to 5.18 from the last internship to the completion of student teaching. The lowest rated dimension at the completion of the internship was Analysis of Student Assessment Results (Mean= 4.02). This dimension, while still the lowest of the student teaching dimensions, averaged 4.91 following student teaching. The highest rated dimension at the time of the internship was Classroom Climate, which showed an improvement from 4.56 to 5.39.

Unit Evaluations.

Follow-up data have also provided helpful insights into program areas that could be improved.

Focus group with graduates. In February, 2006, 12 UNCG graduates in their first three years of teaching and currently teaching in Guilford County and one 8th year teacher met to discuss their perspectives concerning their teacher education program. Prior to the event the teachers were asked to consider the questions listed below.

- a. If you could make up to 3 improvements to your preparation for being a teacher, what would they be?
- b. What 3 aspects of your teacher education best prepared you for becoming a teacher?
- c. What 3 aspects of the job were you least prepared to handle as you began your teaching career?
- d. What recommendations would you make for improving your field experiences?

These questions were used to guide a discussion about the UNCG program, with particular emphasis on areas for which they did not feel that they were adequately prepared and areas in which they would recommend some change, such as additional coursework, seminars, or decreased emphases.

As a group, the teachers were very positive about their UNCG experiences. Unsolicited, they expressed very positive comments concerning the quality of UNCG faculty (with some faculty and staff members singled out with very high praise), the ability to build a strong professional relationship with at least one professor, the development of cohorts with cohort members supporting one another into the first years of teaching, their methods courses, their field experiences and student teaching. While nearly all expressed high levels of anxiety when they began preparing for their first classes, they found that their teacher preparation gave them the knowledge and skills to be successful.

They were most enthusiastic about the diversity of their field experiences. Several commented that having field experiences in several types of schools allowed them to better determine the level of student and the student demographics with which they wanted to teach. They also expressed increased comfort with leading a classroom as they gained additional field experiences. Several also mentioned the Diverse Learners class as being very helpful in their development as a professional.

As far as improvement areas, two topics sparked extensive discussion: 1) The importance of writing across the curriculum and therefore the need to be better prepared to evaluate writing and 2) Concerns about the utility of the seminar part of CUI 250. (The SES students indicated that their 250 course and IEP preparation were not areas of concern.) For the first topic, the students recommended that the Reading course become a reading/writing course. For the second topic, the students had comments related to the material being too theoretical, too broad, covering topics that they learned later in their curriculum and a turn off for many prospective teachers. CUI 250 has been revised since these teachers were in the program, a revision stimulated by feedback similar to this feedback and the revisions are in accord with the recommendations from this group. The suggestions re: reading/writing will be discussed at the CPC meeting in the fall, 2006.

Several additional topics were mentioned as suggestions for inclusion in the curriculum: the need for first-aid training, working with IEPs, budgeting tips, differentiated instruction (how to best implement), more practical classroom management training, and time management.

Exit survey data: The UNCG Office of Institutional Research samples graduating seniors in all majors. In Spring, 2006, 234 graduating seniors who majored in education were sent questionnaires. Some of these data were reported in **Table 23**. Additional data are shown in **Table 31**. These data are generally positive about the teacher preparation programs. Item 3 was the only question to which respondents were not overwhelmingly positive. In response to this question, 22% of the respondents reported feeling only somewhat prepared to work with students with disabilities. While not clearly problematic, responses to this item do suggest that programs should include more information about and more experiences working with students who have disabilities. This finding will be discussed with the Curriculum Committee of the Council of Program Coordinators. Because similar questions had been asked in a prior survey, the Executive CPC decided that a new set of items would provide fresh insights into program strengths and needs, the items have been changed for the 2006-2007 year.

Table 31: Responses to the Office of Institutional Research Survey of Graduating Seniors.

Question (# of missing responses)	Possible Responses	Frequency	Percent
3. How prepared are you for meeting the needs of students with disabilities?	Very prepared	71	33.18
	Adequately prepared	90	42.06
	Somewhat prepared	47	21.96
	Not prepared	6	2.80
4. How prepared are you for meeting the needs of students from cultures different than your own?	Very prepared	105	49.07
	Adequately prepared	81	37.85
	Somewhat prepared	25	11.68
	Not prepared	3	1.40
10. Are prepared are you to actively seek out professional growth opportunities, such as workshops, professional literature, and collaboration with colleagues?	Very prepared	134	62.91
	Adequately prepared	67	31.46
	Somewhat prepared	10	4.69
	Not prepared	2	0.94
11. How prepared are you to actively seek out and foster relationships with school colleagues, families, and the community to support student learning and well-being?	Very prepared	147	69.01
	Adequately prepared	56	26.29
	Somewhat prepared	6	2.82
	Not prepared	4	1.88
12. How prepared are you for your profession based on your field experiences?	Very prepared	148	69.16
	Adequately prepared	58	27.10
	Somewhat prepared	7	3.27
	Not prepared	1	0.47

Previous: Standard 1	Next: Standard 3	UNC-G NCATE / DPI Home Page	Program Reports	School of Education Home Page	Teachers Academy Home Page
-------------------------------------	---------------------------------	--	----------------------------	--	---

Copyright© 2005, 2006
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Teachers Academy, 318 Curry Building;
Phone: (336) 334-3414;
Fax: (336) 334-4120