

PEF Annual Assessment Report 2012

(Report submitted Spring 2012 ~ To be approved Fall 2012 meeting)

The following report was developed by the Standards and Accreditation Committee and the Assessment Committee. This was done in accordance with the overall assessment flowchart for the PEF.

The *Standards and Accreditation Committee* focuses on content issues related to Unit level assessment. Section I addresses the Standards and Accreditation Committee report with respect to the following: (I.) Ongoing review of the conceptual framework, (II.) General overview of the 2011 Unit Action Plans, (III.A) 2011 – 2012 reports of Committee findings, and (III.B) 2012 – 2013 Priorities.

The *Assessment Committee* focuses on process issues related to Unit level assessment. The Assessment Committee reviewed the Annual Assessment Reports from the following committees (a) Content Knowledge; (b) Diversity; (c) Induction; (d) Field Experiences & Clinical Practices; and (e) Standards and Accreditation. This information was forwarded to the Assessment Committee via the Standards and Accreditation Committee who sets the priorities for the unit action plan items, makes recommendations for revisions in the program and unit assessment goals/plans, and oversees implementation and evaluation of the action plans. The second section addresses the Assessment Committee suggestions.

Section I

- I. Ongoing review of the Conceptual Framework. The newly revised framework was presented at the PEF meeting in April 2010, voted on, passed, and implemented fall 2010. Faculty shared their research at PEF meetings as it related to the learning outcomes of the PEF Conceptual Framework, Domain 1: Informed and empowered (spring 2011) and Domain 2: Committed (fall 2011). Faculty will continue sharing research on Domain 3: Engaged, focusing on learner interaction in global communities. Research articles have been and will continue to be distributed via email every 3 – 4 weeks from spring 2011 forward. Guest speakers at COE Research Wednesdays included presentations on topics related to the PEF Conceptual Framework. Moving forward, topics will address diversity topics in alignment with the framework.
- II. General Overview of 2010 Unit Action Plans. In review of the implementation and evaluation of Unit Action Plans listed in the PEF Annual Assessment Report for 2011, the committee summary is as follows:
 - A. **Standards & Accreditation Committee** follow-up on previous action plans:

The S & A Committee continued collaborations with the Assessment Committee to provide guidance regarding the assessment of knowledge, performance and dispositions across programs and the unit.

As we moved to a new assessment system, key assessment targets pertaining to knowledge and performance and aligned to the PEF Conceptual Framework were identified by programs to allow us to summarize data at the Unit level. As recommended, a new unit assessment specific to dispositions was developed and implemented. For Other School Professionals, the process of collecting the data via LiveText is still in progress.

B. Follow-up on other committee work:

As recommended by the S & A Committee, each PEF committee monitored the implementation and reporting of previous action plans as identified in the committee reporting template (Please refer to detailed committee reports and summary information in section III).

- III. All committees created reports using the standardized reporting template, summarizing data reviewed, establishing action plans, and following up on the implementation of previous action plans. The findings for analysis of data from fall 2010 - spring 2011 and the recommendations/priorities set for the following unit action plan items for the spring 2012 report are listed in relation to the relevant PEF committee responsible.

A. 2011 – 2012 report of Committee findings. (Analysis of 10-11 data):

The **Standards & Accreditation Committee** reported on the following areas:

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates- Initial & Advanced

(Data Sources: Knowledge & Performance Assessments-Initial & Advanced – CF 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.3; GPA Core Courses – Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, and Diversity – CF 1.1; Summary of Student Feedback Survey on Program Effectiveness).

Initial Programs:

1. *Strength:* The GPA in the Learning Theory courses indicate that a majority of candidates in our initial preparation programs achieve grades of B or better in their professional knowledge and skills coursework related to these areas. (EDUC 2130: Exploring Learning and Teaching provides an overview of educational psychology for undergraduate initial preparation candidates.)

2. Knowledge & Performance Key Assessments:

Strength: Data for initial preparation programs show strength in candidates meeting CF outcomes 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, and 3.3. Scores indicate that the percentage of candidates exceeding target is greater than the percentage meeting target and less than 5% do not meet target. Combined percentages by CF outcome for initial programs meeting and exceeding targets on key assessments are as follows: 1.1 = 98%; 1.4 = 96%; 2.3 = 97%; 3.3 = 99%.

3. Candidate Feedback Mid & End Program:

Strength: Assessments addressing the Conceptual Framework standards regarding program effectiveness show growth as initial program candidates move through the program.

Areas to Monitor: Quantitative ratings for CF 1.4 and 3.3 were the two lowest ranked of the 10 conceptual framework learning outcomes. Combined percentages by CF outcome for initial programs meeting and exceeding targets according to candidate self ratings are as follows: 1.1 = 93%; 1.4 = 77%; 2.3 = 88%; 3.3 = 76%.

Advanced Programs:

1. *Strength:* The GPA in the Research courses indicate that a majority of candidates in our advanced programs achieve grades of B or better in their professional knowledge and skills coursework related to these areas. (The EPY and EPRS courses are part of the core requirement for Master's degrees in the College of Education)

2. *Area for Improvement:* More complete data is needed for advanced programs on Knowledge & Performance Key Assessments. Combined percentages by CF outcome for advanced programs (i.e., ECE and HPE) meeting and exceeding targets on key assessments are as follows: 1.1 = 99%; 1.4 = 95%; 2.3 = 87%; 3.3 = 99%.

3. Candidate Feedback Mid & End Program:

Strength: Assessments addressing the Conceptual Framework standards regarding program effectiveness show growth as advanced program candidates move through the program.

Areas to Monitor: Quantitative ratings for CF 1.4 and 3.3 were the two lowest ranked of the 10 conceptual framework learning outcomes. Combined percentages by CF outcome for advanced programs meeting and exceeding targets according to candidate self-ratings are as follows: 1.1 = 97%; 1.4 = 71%; 2.3 = 83%; 3.3 = 62%.

Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel

(Data Sources: Knowledge & Performance Assessments-Other School Professionals – CF 1.1, 1.4, 2.3, 3.3; GPA Core Courses – Learning Theory, Research, Social Foundations, and Diversity – CF 1.1; Summary of Student Feedback Survey on Program Effectiveness).

1. *Strength:* The GPA in the Research courses indicate that a majority of other school professionals achieve grades of B or better in their professional knowledge and skills coursework related to these areas.
(The EPY and EPRS courses are part of the core requirement for Master’s degrees in the College of Education)
2. *Area for Improvement:* More complete data is needed for Other School Professionals on Knowledge & Performance Key Assessments and candidate feedback.

Professional Dispositions for all Candidates

(Data Source: Five Effective Dispositions of Education Professionals Assessment).

The 2010 – 2011 Summary Table for Dispositions outlines the overall results for all candidates at all stages of their programs.

Strength: With a target of level 3 or “acceptable” on the assessment, the mean scores for each dimension range from a high of 3.53 for “positive view of others” to a low of 3.44 for “authenticity” showing strength across programs.

The **Content Knowledge Committee** reported on the following areas:

Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial

(Data Sources: Knowledge & Performance Assessments CF 1.2, GACE Content Assessments; GSU Completer Data Sets)

- Strengths :
 1. GACE: The average pass rate for the GACE exam was 99% for all certification programs in the unit (ranges from 94-100 %).

2. GSU Completer Data: At one year out, GSU completers rated 5% above the USG scores on content knowledge/ pedagogy/ technology items. At two years out GSU rated slightly below USG scores.
3. GSU Completer Data: At one year out, GSU completers rated 5% above the USG scores on content knowledge/ pedagogy/ technology items. At two years out GSU rated slightly below USG scores.
4. A larger percentage of COE faculty than A&S faculty indicated they were interacting with A&S colleagues.

Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial

(Data Sources: Knowledge & Performance Assessments CF 1.2, GACE Content Assessments; GSU Completer Data Sets)

- Strengths (scored above USG):
 1. The 2009 GSU Completers data (1-year out) on 8 of 8 content knowledge/pedagogy/technology related items, more than 5% of GSU respondents chose “Strongly Agree” than did USG respondents.
 2. GSU pre-service teachers feel more confident demonstrating broad, current, and specialized knowledge in their field(s).
 3. GSU pre-service teachers report greater ability to connect field to other areas of school and everyday life.
 4. GSU pre-service teachers report greater ability to manage time, space, activities, technology, and other resources to provide active and equitable engagement of diverse students and adults in productive tasks.
- Areas for Improvement:
 1. The 2008 GSU Completers data (2-years out) shows GSU respondents did not rate items on the BOR survey as highly as did GSU 1-year out completers.
 2. The 2008 GSU Completers data (2-years out) shows respondents rated less confidence in: understanding and using content and pedagogical knowledge appropriate for diverse learners; ability to stay current in field(s) of expertise; ability to interpret and construct curricula that reflect content area standards; use of available resources including technology.

Candidates’ effective use of technology in the assessment of P-12 learning

(Data Source: Knowledge & Performance Assessments CF 3.2, GSU Completer Data Sets)

- Strengths :
 1. BOR Graduate Surveys: At the time of completing their programs, 84% of students in initial preparation programs considered this skill to be “strength” or “developing,” however response rates on the survey were low.
 2. In addition, although response rates were low, mean responses from graduates and employers (1 to 2 years after graduation) were generally commensurate with or above the mean for USG surveys, with most respondents stating that they “agree” or “strongly agree” with the survey items (means ranged from 89% to 100%).

The **Induction Committee** reported on the following areas:

Follow-up on previous action plans pertaining to the effectiveness of programs in terms of teacher performance, the committee noted the following:

Induction programming at the 2011 NET-Q Summer Institute included the following:

1. Keynote Presentation: Teacher Inquiry: The Gift of a Professional Lifetime by Dr. Nancy Dana, Professor of Education University of Florida.
2. Induction strand break-out sessions included “Kid Talk” with Dr. Wayne Pettett, CST – Mimosa ES, Fulton County ; “CCLC’s: Much More Than Just Another Meeting” with Chris Diffley, Assistant Principal – Meadowcreek HS, Gwinnett County School; and “What to Do About the Kid Who...” with Dr. DaShaunda Patterson, EPSE – GSU. These sessions addressed specific topics that were noted as action items for 2011.

Effectiveness of programs in leading to teacher retention

(Data Sources: BOR/PSC Workforce Rates 2009-2010; GSU COE Yield and Retention Rates for Completers from 2006-2008; GSU Teacher Education Programs Retention – 1 year and 2 years out (Logistic Regression Teacher Retention Graduation Years 2006, 2008, 2009)

- Strengths:
 1. Of the 2009 GSU graduates who took jobs in Georgia public schools, 91% were still employed one year later.
 2. A majority of GSU graduates who are employed in Georgia public schools are employed in the Metro-Atlanta area.
 3. Overall, of all the GSU graduates from the year 2006 who accepted jobs in public schools, 76% were still teaching in public schools, as

compared to the 67% retention state wide for teachers at the end of their fourth year in the teaching profession.

4. GSU prepares a more diverse teaching workforce than is currently employed in Georgia public schools. (32% of completers were minority teachers as compared to 21% of the state's teaching workforce in 2006)
5. GSU is successful in preparing teachers who accept employment in high-needs urban schools (92% of 2006 completers who took jobs in public schools were teaching in high needs urban schools)
6. **65%** of completers who took jobs in public schools were retained in high needs urban schools after four years.
7. A data analysis was conducted to find the components of teacher education programs that were significantly associated with retention of graduates 1 year and 2 years post graduation. Results indicated 2 variables were statistically related to teacher retention: exit GPA and race .
8. Teachers with higher exit GPA had higher retention and were 2.06 times (one year out) and 2.34 times (two years out) more likely to be teaching in public schools.
9. Black teachers were 1.62 times (one year out) and 1.83 times (two years out) more likely to remain teaching in public schools than white teachers.
10. Retention of other minority ethnicity teachers was 1.30 times more than white teachers (two years out).

Effectiveness of programs in terms of teacher performance

*(Data Sources: Board of Regents (BOR) Graduate Survey of 2008 & 2009 **GSU Completers– Self Ratings**; Board of Regents (BOR) **Employer Survey** of 2008 - 2009 GSU Graduates)*

- Strengths:
 1. At one year out GSU completers tend to rate their preparation programs more highly than do completers from USG institutions overall.
 2. At least 98% of graduates (1 year out) and 100% of graduates (2 years out) indicated that they are well trained/prepared in their field(s) and use content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge that is appropriate for diverse learners.
 3. At least 98% of graduates (1 year out) and at least 97% of graduates (2 years out) are confident in their ability to reflect and adjust their teaching methods to improve practice.

4. Over 93% of the GSU graduates (2 years out) indicated agreed or strongly agreed that they are confident in their ability to work with students identified as needing special services, as compared with 86 % of USG respondents. This is an area that GSU graduates have tended to rate lower in past years.
 5. 88% of GSU graduates (1 year out) indicated that they are involved in leadership roles during their first year of teaching.
 6. Across all of the survey items, at one and two years out, between 92% and 100% of employers agree or strongly agree on the strength of GSU candidates and programs.
 7. On survey items related to adjusting/refining teaching methods to work with diverse learners, GSU graduates were rated at least 5% above USG graduates.
 8. At one year out, on 17 of 27 items, GSU had a larger % of responses at the highest rating (strongly agree) than the number of overall USG completers with similar ratings.
 9. At two years out, GSU completers outscored the USG average on all areas except in relation to one item: —Actively participating and contributing to school wide improvement efforts.
- Areas for Improvement:
 1. Overall, at 2 years out GSU completers did not rate items on the BOR survey as highly as did GSU 1 year out completers.
 2. On 14 items, the GSU percentage of respondents (2 years out) choosing strongly agree were lower by 5% or more than USG ratings of strongly agree.

Effectiveness of induction initiatives in leading to teacher retention

(Data Source: CCLC NET-Q Activities Report 2010- 2011; NET-Q Summer Institute and Induction Conference (Summer 2011) attendance roster; general survey feedback; Professional Educator Induction Seminar (PEIS) 2011 Attendance Rosters and Evaluation Summary Report)

- Strengths:
 1. The CCLCs positively affect teacher satisfaction, thus increasing teacher retention. During the 2010 – 2011 academic year, **50** CCLC groups were established and supported through NET-Q partnerships, serving a total of **385** certified teachers, administrators and support personnel at the elementary, middle and secondary levels across 7 metro-Atlanta school districts and with Columbus State University.

2. Five 5-day CCLC Institutes were held during summer 2011 with 4 Metro Atlanta school systems and Columbus State University.
3. Additional induction and networking has been successfully implemented through the NET-Q Summer Institute. During the Summer 2011 Institute, participants included **115** educators from five K-12 school districts, **two** universities (Albany State U, Georgia State U), and NET-Q new teacher residents, the mentors and school administrators. **80%** of the participants who completed evaluations agreed or strongly agreed that the Institute contributed to their professional development.
4. 177 GSU educator candidates attended the fall 2011 Professional Educator Induction Seminar. The Seminar consisted of 2 components. Part I of the seminar focused on the PSC Code of Ethics for Educators and the Georgia Frameworks. 93% agreed or strongly agreed that “participation in PEIS was helpful to my professional development as an educator”. PEIS Part II: Human Resource directors from 9 metro counties served on a panel to discuss application and hiring procedures for new educators. 95% agreed or strongly agreed that “*Choosing a district, Finding Employment*” seminar effectively introduced me to local school systems and informed me of what each has to offer.” The GSU Career Center also presented resources available to students for developing resumes and portfolios.

The **Field Experience & Clinical Practice Committee** reported on the following areas:

Follow-up on previous action plans:

- The Office of Field Placement in the Office of Academic Assistance monitored district changes in policies in the following areas: (a) criminal background checks, (b) the acquisition of placements for students practicum experiences, and (c) our MOUs with participating districts and schools for all PEF programs. Existing policies and changes to those policies have been communicated to department level placement coordinators regularly.
- A version of the Teacher Mentor Survey was utilized by 10 programs in ECE and MSIT. The data based on the results of cooperating teachers’ submissions can be found in the Field Experiences and Clinical Practice: Data Summary regarding these programs. Revisions to the Teacher Mentor Survey that will make it usable at the unit level have been undertaken by the PEF Assessment Committee. These revisions are currently underway.
- Forms, entry and exit requirements, documentation of diverse experiences, and data regarding candidate observations are currently uploaded to Livetext and are available in Livetext exhibit rooms.

- Data from P-12 Pupil Change projects from all PEF programs have been compiled and are available on Livetext.
- The PDS application process is currently published and available online for interested parties.

(Data Sources: OAA-Office of Field Placement report, Field Experience meeting notes, new policies and procedures for field placements and criminal background check -Field Experience data folder; Placement Summary Table and data for 10-11 -Field Experience data folder; Mentor Teacher Feedback survey; PSC policies on certification, PSC/NCATE standards for field experiences and work with diverse learners; Knowledge & Performance Assessments CF 2.1, 1.3; Review of PDS definition and process established in 2009)

- Strengths:
 1. The Office of Field Placement in the OAA is maintaining a website that describes existing GSU policies on placement requirements related to criminal background checks and TORT liability coverage. The committee noted that the website directly links students to Student Check.
 2. The unit was successful in placing student teachers in high needs schools, with 59% of our student teacher placements occurring in schools with 50% or more students on free and reduced lunch and 72% of our placements occurring in schools where under-represented populations made up 60% or more of the student population. These figures represent a 3% and 6% increase respectively in these areas from last year.
 3. While several programs use the Teacher Mentor survey to get feedback from cooperating teachers and the form is available via a Livetext link, a common survey is not yet used on a unit-wide basis using Livetext. When the final version of the survey is made available, all programs should provide electronic access to it by sending an email link to Livetext to cooperating teachers.
 4. The committee noted that the procedures that programs follow in identifying mentors for interns who are on non-renewable certificates vary greatly across departments. To better understand current practices, the committee feels it would be appropriate to survey programs regarding their practices. The committee further noted that the characteristics that are identified as desirable in mentor teachers should be communicated to P-12 partners so that they can be considered during district placement procedures.
 5. The committee noted that the variance in mentor teacher quality across programs in initial preparation and endorsement programs can have a significant impact on the training experiences of teacher

candidates. It was observed that such variance could be exacerbated by the lack of a centralized field experiences office with common standards that are in line with PSC/NCATE requirements.

- Area for Improvement:
 1. Despite the fact that the application procedure is now available online, the process is still in need of heightened visibility. P-12 potential partners should be made more aware of the benefits of becoming a PDS school in affiliation with GSU.

The **Diversity Committee** reported on the following areas:

(Data Sources: Knowledge & Performance Assessments CF 2.2, 3.1; Diversity Committee Data Summary; Faculty by Race and Gender Report; Faculty Hires and Retention – Dean’s Office; Unit-Ethnicity of Completers by Academic Year)

- Strengths:
 1. Experiences working with diverse candidates and P-12 teachers: Diversity is positively highlighted at GSU in the student population and graduation of teachers of color, etc. Additionally, GSU candidates work with a high percent of teachers of color (35%) in P-12 schools.
 2. Professional development for faculty: Various department and faculty members provide and engage in professional development in this area. Consider how it might be replicated and provided for others.
- Areas for Improvement:
 1. Review data which indicates a decrease in the second year of teachers’ ratings of their capability to work with diverse learners to see if these ratings continue.
 2. Recommend a working definition of diversity that adequately describes exceptionalities: The Committee raised the point that NCATE seems to be driving much of what we do regarding diversity, placing the focus on faculty and teachers’ preparation to teach diverse students. However, the underlying problem rests within issues of unequal power, e.g. sexism, racism, heterosexism, ableism, etc. Perhaps, in order to make a real difference, we should be focusing on bringing such issues to the forefront and addressing them in the way we prepare ourselves and teachers to work within these contexts.

3. Consider adding a diversity assessment component to faculty evaluations, including Promotion and Tenure, for faculty to examine their attention to and development of issues of diversity in their research, teaching, and service.
4. Search for a Latino/Latina scholar.
5. Increase the percent of students of color recruited for teaching.

The **Student Affairs Committee (SAC)** reported on the following areas:

(Data Sources: Student Affairs COE Survey on Assessment; University Exit Survey of Graduates and Undergraduates; COE Appeal Process Policy)

The Dean's Office submitted the following information to the Students Affairs Committee for 2010-2011.

- *A student grade appeal report and academic dishonesty report.* For this academic year, seven students submitted grade appeals and seven students had academic dishonesty charges brought against them.
- *University reports on exit surveys given to undergraduates and graduates.* Both undergraduates and graduates in the COE rated academic advising in their major departments more highly than did undergraduates from GSU as a whole.
- *Data from the National Survey on Student Engagement.* COE undergraduates in their freshman year rated advising services lower than did students in other GSU colleges. By the senior year COE undergraduates rated advising slightly higher than did undergraduates from other colleges but these ratings are still low (2.72 on a 6 point scale). State averages are 2.99 for advising and average ratings at peer institutions nationally are 2.86.

The committee awarded six COE scholarships: 2 undergraduate, 2 graduate (master and Ed.S.), and 2 Ph.D.

B.

C. 2012 – 2013 Priorities. Priorities set for the 2012 report are grouped by recommendations for specific committees:

All Committees: Specific recommendations as related to the priorities set for each committee and the alignment to the PEF Conceptual Framework can be found in the attached charts: *Georgia State University PEF Unit Level Assessment System Committee Priorities* and *Conceptual Framework Alignment by Committee.*

Standards & Accreditation Committee:

- 1) Review Summary of Student Feedback Survey on Program Effectiveness; specifically, to follow up on initial program candidate self ratings for CF indicators 1.4 and 3.3.
- 2) Review Summary of Student Feedback Survey on Program Effectiveness, specifically to follow up on advanced program candidate self ratings for CF indicators 1.4 and 3.3.
- 3) Schedule a faculty member to present research at the PEF meetings on Domain 3 to facilitate open discussion regarding global perspectives.
- 4) Recommend attendance at conferences that support faculty professional development around the PEF Conceptual Framework.

Assessment Committee:

- 1) Re-evaluate data collection process via LiveText for Advanced programs - Knowledge & Performance Key Assessments
- 2) Re-evaluate data collection process via LiveText for Other School Professionals - Knowledge & Performance Key Assessments
- 3) Delineate mid and end program dispositions data for the following academic year in order to compare data sets.

Content Knowledge Committee:

- 1) Continue to strengthen ties between COE and CAS faculty teaching prospective teachers. Schedule time during the PEF meeting for open discussion between COE and A&S faculty to discuss content and pedagogy in the curriculum. The Dean's office will facilitate the implementation of this item.
- 2) Consider data from the BOR surveys (via the Board of Regents new task force at the state-level) and ways to increase response rates. Information gained from these surveys will continue to provide a richer account of candidate's effective use of technology in the field.

Induction Committee:

- 1) Disseminate and discuss BOR/PSC Workforce Rates data with designated program faculty.
- 2) Publish the high retention rate data on COE website.
- 3) Seek opportunities to stay informed and provide input regarding the BOR Graduate Survey and distribution process.
- 4) Collaborate with the NET-Q 50/50 representatives and with the administration of the NET-Q partnership schools to ensure completion of the BOR Employer Survey on GSU graduates.
- 5) Invite NET-Q District Coordinators, NET-Q 50/50 representatives and the NET-Q Grant/Project Director to attend all PEF Induction Committee meetings and to serve as advisory guests.

- 6) Collaborate with NET-Q Grant/Project Director and NET-Q representatives: to support CCLC training provided to partner school systems through grant funding specifically through NET-Q Summer Institute and to provide input for focus topics for the NET-Q Summer Institute.
- 7) Continue to develop and implement PEIS Fall 2012.

Field Experience & Clinical Practice Committee:

- 1) Coordinate a luncheon for metro area district level placement coordinators in the upcoming semester. This working luncheon will also serve as a venue to communicate any procedures that we have developed to better identify mentor teachers.
- 2) Create a survey to send to MAT and post-bac programs regarding their policy and procedures regarding identification of mentors for interns who are on non-renewable certificates.
- 3) Sponsor a team of committee members to visit two other regional universities with centralized field experiences offices to examine their practices.
- 4) Examine the resulting data from the NET-Q Anchor Action Research projects to determine the interns' impact on student achievement.
- 5) Present the benefits and process of becoming a PDS school at the next PEF Advisory Committee meeting so that district representatives can disseminate the information within their organizations.

Diversity Committee:

- 1) Create a new survey that will be approved by legal/human resources to collect data from PEF faculty regarding their experience and development in the area of diversity.
- 2) Create a new survey to collect data from each department chair regarding professional development offered to faculty in the area of diversity.
- 3) Recommend increasing presentations with diversity as a focus, e.g. Research Wednesdays, Prof. Ed. Induction seminar, etc.
- 4) Plan and implement activities/events to support our graduates, e.g. workshops or conferences that bring teacher graduates back to collaborate, problem-solve, share ideas, listen to speakers, etc.
- 5) Include Birth to Five along with P-12 learning; that is, B-12 learning.

Student Affairs Committee:

- 1) To provide input into and monitor the implementation of the COE's advising plan to be submitted to GSU for the upcoming year.

- 2) To coordinate the effort with department chairs and faculty, along with the COE Office of Academic Assistance regarding the implementation of orientation and advising services at the program level across the college.
- 3) To continue to monitor the student appeal/hearing process to determine if further changes should be made.
- 4) To review the student travel and budget allocations award process to examine equity of allocations among groups/departments to determine if all eligible student groups are served with the current application procedure.
- 5) To continue to monitor the COE scholarship award process to ensure ease of application for students.

Section II

The following section was developed by the Assessment Committee. The task of the Assessment Committee during Spring semester is to review the Annual Assessment Report drafts, review the unit system process, add proposed changes to the Annual Assessment Report drafts, and send the Annual Assessment Reports to the PEF. The Assessment Committee reviewed the unit assessment processes implemented for 2011-2012 and the specific analyses of the 2010-2011 data and the resulting recommendations of committees as presented to the PEF. Below is a summary of that review and recommendations for 2012-2013 year:

Review of the committee work submitted to the PEF for review in 2011-2012 indicated that the process of reviewing of data by the committees is functioning well overall. For some of the learning outcomes, however, committees noted that there was a limited amount of data from advanced programs or from some of the programs focusing on “other school professionals.” The Assessment Committee explored the issues raised and noted that some of the programs using portfolio assessments, rather than course-based assessments in LiveText, had encountered challenges in trying to have their data aggregated into the unit analysis. The assessment committee will focus on possible solutions to this issue in the upcoming year.

For our NCATE Self-Study, the PEF has elected to focus on NCATE Standard 2 related to the unit assessment system. The goal is to move from a rating of *Acceptable* to a rating of *Target*. For a *Target* rating, units are expected to “regularly evaluate the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards.”¹ Therefore, during the 2011-2012 year, as in the year before, the Assessment Committee has focused its efforts on examining elements related to NCATE Standard 2. The committee made significant progress toward meeting all of the recommendations from the previous year. Specific accomplishments include the following:

¹ From the website for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
<http://ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd2>

1. *Created a unit-wide assessment of mentors/cooperating teachers.* Recognizing the need for more feedback from P-12 partners, the Assessment Committee created a survey in LiveText for the purpose of obtaining perspectives from mentors/cooperating teachers. The survey was used for the first time in Fall 2011. To view the survey: <https://c1.livetext.com/misk5/formz/public/56716/Y284ZFFGJ5>
2. *Created program templates to document program reports.* NCATE Standard 2 states that for a *Target* rating, units should ensure the following: “Data are regularly and systematically compiled, aggregated, summarized, analyzed, and reported publicly for the purpose of improving candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.”² To address this section of the standard, the committee agreed to create templates in LiveText for faculty to enter data. Because the requirements vary for different kinds of programs, three versions of the template were created: (1) [initial](#) programs, (2) [endorsement](#) programs, and (3) [advanced](#) programs. Program narratives and reports of student performance on key assessments are entered in special sections of the document, separated by academic year, which can be archived and retrieved as needed.
3. *Developed a method for ensuring that programs systematically add data to the data reports each year and analyze the data.* In order to ensure that the templates provide a means for ongoing data entry and analysis, the committee agreed to revise the program templates to include update sections for faculty to complete at the end of each academic year.
4. *Checked reports for completion.* Reports for initial and endorsement programs were checked by the Dean’s office and data were uploaded to the PRS system. Members of the Assessment Committee used a checklist developed by the Associate Dean to review the advanced programs and reported the status of each program in LiveText.
5. *Set up website to report unit data publicly.* The Associate Dean oversaw the creation of a website in which unit data are reported publicly. To access the website: <http://education.gsu.edu/main/7104.html>

Assessment Committee Goals for 2012-2013

1. Further develop information on COE website; develop more direct pathway to access data.
2. Revisit Unit Dispositions rubrics for [midpoint](#) and [endpoint](#) assessments to determine whether the instruments are meeting program needs for assessing dispositions.

² From the website for the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)
<http://ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect2008/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd2>

3. Continue to examine and refine the process for managing the flow of information for the mentor teacher/supervisor.
4. Improve the ability of the unit to make connections to portfolio assessment data collected in the older version of Livetext in ways that allow aggregation of learning outcome data at the Unit Level for these programs.
5. Continue to work with programs for “other school professionals” that have not yet fully migrated to Livetext to help those faculty do so. This will maximize our ability to examine the conceptual learning outcomes across programs in the Unit in a consistent manner.
6. Develop an improved plan for the Unit to access post-graduate contact information.