

## PEF Annual Assessment Report 2010

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 2009 Unit Action Plans, (III.A) 2009 – 2010 reports of Committee findings, and (III.B) 2010 – 2011 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) Professional Development Ad-Hoc; 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. As indicated in the PEF Annual Assessment Report 2009, the Standards & Accreditation committee recommended the development of an ad-hoc committee to review the current GSU PEF Conceptual Framework, considering BOR changes and defining the unique vision and mission of the Unit at Georgia State University. The committee named the new committee the Ad Hoc Committee- Conceptual Framework (CF) and identified members and a committee chair. The committee made plans for an Educator Preparation Retreat where faculty and P-12 partners would participate in various sessions to give input regarding the re-articulation of the current conceptual framework.
- II. General Overview of 2009 Unit Action Plans. In review of the implementation and evaluation of Unit Action Plans listed in the PEF Annual Assessment Report for 2009, the committee summary is as follows:

- A. **Standards & Accreditation Committee** work follow-up:

The S & A Committee met with the Assessment Committee to provide guidance regarding the content in need of assessment across programs and the unit. The committee also discussed plans for work toward an assessment system that is transparent and meaningful. An electronic system, such as LiveText, was proposed as a course and assessment management system. The S & A Committee proposed the development of new unit learning outcomes aligned to the current knowledge base, INTASC and NBPT Standards, so that faculty would gain meaningful data from program and unit level reports created in LiveText. Additionally, the committees recommended that LiveText be adopted as the unit assessment management system.

**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 part 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 2008 - spring 2009 and the recommendations/priorities set for the following unit action plan items for the spring 2010 report are listed in relation to the relevant PEF committee responsible.

**A. 2009 – 2010 report of Committee findings. (Analysis of 08-09 data):**

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

*Pedagogical Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates*

- One year out: ninety-five percent (95%) of employers and one hundred percent (100%) of candidates noted candidate strength in this area (BOR Surveys).

*Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates*

- One year out: ninety-four and seven tenths (94.7%) of employers and one hundred percent (100 %) of candidates noted candidate strength in using research-based strategies to support learning (BOR Surveys).

*Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Other School Personnel*

- End of program faculty ratings indicated that the majority of candidates met the target (INTASC Assessment).

*Dispositions for all Candidates*

- GSU candidates rated significantly above (approximately 10%) the USG ratings for “strongly agree” in regard to playing a leadership role in the school and community and actively participating in and contributing to school wide improvement efforts (BOR Surveys – Professionalism).
- In all other categories, candidates rated higher in the “strongly agree” category.

*Student Learning for Initial Teacher Candidates*

- Ninety-three percent (93%) of program completers and employers “agreed or strongly agreed” that our candidates were effective in all categories; GSU completers had consistently higher combined percentages of “agree/strongly agree” ratings in all categories than those from other USG institutions (BOR Surveys).

- End of program ratings: eighty-six percent (86%) faculty and eighty-seven percent (87%) completers rated completers at or above target (INTASC Assessment)

*Student Learning for Advanced Teacher Programs & Other Professional School Personnel*

- End of program ratings for Advanced Teacher Programs: Ninety-five percent (95%) faculty and eighty-eight percent (88%) completers rated completers at or above target (INTASC)
- End of program ratings for Other Professional School Personnel: Seventy-one percent (71%) faculty and seventy-eight percent (78%) completers rated completers at or above target (INTASC)

*Technology in the assessment of student learning*

- Candidates self rated at or above the state average on knowledge and use of technology (BOR Survey).
- Ninety percent (90%) of candidates responded end of program that they did not need help with technology (BTNA Survey).
- Area for Improvement: Employers rated candidates slightly below the state average for knowledge and use of technology (BOR Survey).

*Diversity*

- The majority of employers and candidates “strongly agree” that candidates communicate effectively with students of diverse cultures and use knowledge of students’ unique cultures to sustain culturally responsive classrooms (BOR Surveys).
- The majority of candidates are confident in their ability to work with students identified as needing special education services. GSU ratings falling in the “strongly agree” category: 5- 17 percentage points above the state average (BOR Surveys).
- Area for Improvement: Ten percent (10.5%) of candidates compared to the state average of seventeen percent (17%) (BOR Surveys) responded as “did not agree” in the area of having confidence in their ability to work with students identified as needing special education.
- Area for Improvement: Thirty-two percent (32%) of our candidates responded on the Beginning Teacher Needs Assessment (BTNA) that they needed help in this area.
- Due to differences in the data, this area needs continued monitoring to best understand our candidates’ needs.

The **Content Knowledge Committee** reported on the following data: Pass rates on GACE/Praxis content exams, BOR data, and INTASC/STARS data. Findings indicated a passing rate of 97.26% on GACE content exams, with 426 scores exceeding findings on the GACE exams 2007-2008. No areas of concern were noted as the results exceeded goals. Thirty-one (31) of thirty-nine (39) programs had a 100% pass rate. Additionally, GSE data were commensurate with or exceeded the University System of Georgia data. In regard to the INTASC/STARS evaluation of faculty ratings end of program, data indicated that 94% of the candidates met or exceeded the target level (proficient) for content knowledge. The data from principal evaluations for the first and second year follow-up indicated that 74% and 77% of the candidates, respectively, met or exceeded the target level (proficient) for content knowledge. No areas for improvement were noted.

The **Diversity Committee** reported on the unit's effectiveness in recruiting and retaining a diverse body of faculty and students. The committee reviewed data identified on the PEF Diversity Committee Assessment of Progress Survey and found the following:

- In regard to faculty recruitment, varied recruitment strategies were utilized; however, the number of underrepresented faculty hired decreased in comparison with previous years.
- In regard to faculty retention, a decrease in the number of underrepresented faculty who have left GSU was noted as strength.
- In regard to student recruitment, strength was noted by an increased number of students enrolled in education degrees as follows: Undergraduate – Black males from 5 (2008) to 6 (2009); Black females from 45 (2008) to 67 (2009); Hispanic females from 4 (2008) to 9 (2009). Graduate – Black males from 36 (2008) to 47 (2009); Black females from 138 (2008) to 149 (2009); Hispanic males from 2 (2008) to 9 (2009); Hispanic females from 5 (2008) to 12 (2009).
- The following area for improvement was noted: to increase the number of Black and Hispanic males participating in and completing education degrees.
- In reviewing the effectiveness of the unit regarding the learning climate, additional data is needed.

The **Induction Committee** found that the data from the BOR Workforce Rates, PDS (Professional Development Schools) Hire Data of GSU Graduates (2003-2009), GSU PDS Data Brief (Curlette, 2008), and Cross Career Learning Communities (CCLC) Executive Summary (Black & Neel, 2007) provided information for evaluating program impact on teacher retention. The findings are as follows:

- Ninety-five percent (95%) of all GSU undergraduate initial teacher certification completers (05-06) and ninety-three percent (93%) of GSU graduate initial teacher certification completers (05-06) remained employed in Georgia public K-12 schools two years post graduation.
- PDS K-12 grant schools hired ninety-three (93) GSU graduates over the past five years.
- PDSs hired GSU initially certified teachers at more than three times the rate of those hired in comparison schools.

- A significant difference was found in teacher retention at PDSs operating 50 CCLCs and led by 150 trained teacher facilitators. Specifically, eighty-six (86%) of new teachers who participated in CCLC's returned for a second year of teaching.

In regard to the effectiveness of GSU teacher preparation programs in terms of teacher performance, the findings are as follows:

- INTASC STARS data, ratings by principals 1<sup>st</sup> year and 2<sup>nd</sup> year follow up were seventy-three (73%) and seventy-five (75%), respectively, for our initial certification program graduates at or above target level on items related to professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills.
- PDS2 data indicated teacher skills analyzed on teacher portfolios from the K-12 PDSs showed an increase in depth and in scope in each domain of the Georgia Framework for Accomplished Teaching (2008).
- From the BOR survey self ratings, 100% of GSU graduates agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in domains related to teacher performance with the exception of Domain II, Indicator 9: "ability to work with students identified as needing special education services." Eighty-nine and five tenths percent (89.5%) of candidates agreed or strongly agreed that they were effective in this area. While the majority of candidates believe they are effective in this area, 10.5% did not express this level of confidence. Additionally, the Beginning Teacher Needs Assessment (BTNA) indicated that 32.7% of candidates were less confident in this area.
- Data from the BTNA also indicated that 27.7% of graduates responded that they need more help with classroom management (a slight increase from the previous year) and 25% responded that they need more help with classroom discipline and motivation.

In summary of induction initiatives in support of novice teachers, the committee reviewed feedback from the following induction activities: the Professional Educator Induction Seminar (PEIS) 2009, Evaluation Summary Report, the New Teacher Educator Induction Conference (NEIC) 2008 evaluation forms, and the Freshman Learning Community (FLC): Teaching in Today's Society, enrollment. The findings are as follows:

- Approximately two hundred and sixty (260) GSU candidates from teacher preparation programs attended the fall 2009 PEIS. Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the candidates agreed that the seminar was helpful to their professional development as an educator.
- For NEIC 2008, eighty-five percent (85%) of the participants were new teachers (1-4 years) and represented seven (7) school districts between Atlanta and Athens. One hundred percent (100%) of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the conference was relevant and helpful to them as a new teacher (see the committee report for details).
- The FLC typically fills to capacity during the first few weeks of registration. Early induction initiatives such as identifying and mentoring potential teacher education candidates are critical for recruitment and retention.
- Information on induction activities currently taking place in GSU educator preparation programs is needed.

The **PDS Ad-Hoc Committee** reported on the strength of field experience in educator preparation programs based on the following data: GSU Professional Education Programs K-12 School Placement Charts 2009, GA DOE FTE 2009 School Count data report, PDS Hire Data of GSU Graduates (2003 – 2009). The findings are as follows:

- Program candidates were placed in one hundred-eighty-eight public schools across fifteen (15) Georgia school districts.
- Programs provided diverse field-based experiences (59% free and reduced lunch, 69% diverse populations).

In regard to the effectiveness of the Unit in involving P-12 partners in design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences, the following strengths were noted:

- The Mentor Teacher Feedback Survey on GSU Educator Preparation Programs was created spring 2009 by the GSU PEF and PEF P-12 Advisory Board.
- The PDS Field Experience Handbook was provided as a resource to all partner schools to inform schools of the many types and varied criteria for field-based experiences required in GSU educator preparation programs.
- The PDS Advisory Board meets at least twice per year to provide advice on improving placement decisions and partnership activities, reviewing data from the unit assessment reports, providing input on findings, and reviewing instruments used to evaluate programs and candidates.

In regard to the effectiveness of the Unit in impacting student achievement in Professional Development Schools, the committee found the following:

- At least ninety-one percent (91%) of employers and ninety percent (90%) of program completers agreed or strongly agreed that our teachers were effective in all domains related to impact on student achievement (BOR Employer Survey 2008 data).
- From the INTASC Assessment ratings 1<sup>st</sup> year follow up, principals rated sixty-nine percent (69%) of initial certification program completers and 2<sup>nd</sup> year follow up, seventy-four percent (74%) of completers at target or above on items relevant to student learning.
- Anchor Action Research (AAR) data indicates significant differences in classrooms where the TIP (Teacher/Intern/Professor) Model focuses on instructional changes based on collaborative inquiry. Change scores in constructed response (CR) exercises indicated positive differences in math achievement at grades 4, 8, 11 and language arts/English at grades 8 and 11.
- The passing rates on criterion-reference tests for elementary, middle, and high school treatment schools with CCLCs were higher than rates in comparison schools (AYP data for PDS 2008-2009).

The **Student Affairs Committee (SAC)** found that data from reports kept by the COE Dean's Office Administrator, as discussed at every SAC meeting, and the 2007- 2008 and 2008-2009 university exit surveys provided information for evaluating the effectiveness of the student appeals process, student advising services program academic advising, program completer satisfaction, student groups, and student awards/scholarships. The findings are as follows:

- Mean scores on a 4-point scale on undergraduate advisement in the college increased from 2.84 (2007-2008) to 2.95 (2008-2009), as did the mean average of major department advisement, an increase from 2.84 (2007-2008) to 2.98 (2008-2009). These means are slightly below the university mean for this time period; however undergraduate students' satisfaction with the university Student Advisement Center improved.
- Mean scores on a 4-point scale on graduate advisement in the college increased from 2.89 (2007-2008) to 3.07 (2008-2009), as did the mean scores of major department advisement, an increase from 2.95 (2007-2008) to 3.11 (2008-2009). These means are higher than the mean of other majors in the university for this time period.
- Mean scores on a 4-point scale on graduate and undergraduate advisement in the college over five years (2005 – 2009) increased from 2.93 to 3.07 (graduate) and increased from 2.55 to 2.95 (undergraduate).
- Undergraduate education students note that their programs have prepared them for advanced study (07-08: 3.4; 08-09:3.56) at a higher mean than indicated by undergraduates in other majors (07-08; 3.3; 08-09: 3.33). Additionally, they are more satisfied regarding preparation for their careers (07-08: 3.43; 08-09: 3.65) than are undergraduates in other majors (07-08: 3.14; 08-09: 3.16).
- Graduate education students also feel prepared for advanced work as a result of their programs (07-08: 3.6; 08-09: 3.57) at a higher mean than indicated by other graduate program completers (07-08: 3.47; 08-09: 3.48). Additionally, they are more satisfied regarding preparation for their careers (07-08: 3.67; 08-09: 3.59) than are other university majors (07-08: 3.46; 08-09: 3.47).
- The student groups prove to be a very positive experience. Seven COE groups requested funding for 2009-2010 and were awarded \$7, 284.00. SAC also dispersed \$11,504.00 in travel funds to COE students.
- Strength was noted that in 2009, SAC voted to award 3 scholarships (undergraduate, masters/specialist, and doctorate) instead of 2 (undergraduate/graduate). Also, the awards were changed to once per year, to allow for more money per student. The award amount increased from \$500 to \$650.

**B. 2010 – 2011 Priorities. Priorities set for the 2010 report are grouped by recommendations for specific committees:**

**Consider the following Bylaw changes:**

- 1) To change the name of the PDS Ad-Hoc Committee to the Field Experiences & Clinical Practice Committee to more clearly reflect the work of the committee. Additionally, to propose that the newly named Clinical Field Experience Committee is identified as a standing committee rather than an ad-hoc committee.
- 2) To propose changes, as indicated by committee priority, in the committee responsibilities for reviewing data and reporting on data analysis. The Standards & Accreditation Committee proposed these changes in an effort to eliminate

overlap in reporting and to match the charges of each committee with reporting duties which need to be addressed within the NCATE Standards. Specific recommendations as related to the charges for each committee can be found in the action items below. The Report of Unit Level Assessment Data templates will be revised by committee to include these changes.

**Standards & Accreditation Committee:**

- 1) To consider other ways to increase the response rate of our graduates, year one and year two post graduation, due to a low response rate from our graduates, first and second year follow up.
- 2) To monitor areas identified for follow up (i.e., technology ratings from principals, candidates confidence in working with students identified as having special needs, candidate ratings on classroom management and discipline skills), pending the new assessment system and revised PEF Conceptual Framework.
- 3) To review course syllabi requirements to ensure that syllabi reflect the conceptual framework and required standards.
- 4) To assume responsibility for reviewing unit level assessment data reports in the following areas:
  - Professional and Pedagogical Knowledge and Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial & Advanced
  - Knowledge and Skills for Other School Professionals
  - Professional Dispositions for all Candidates

The Report of Unit Level Assessment Data template will be revised to include these areas and delete the areas assumed by other standing committees.

- 5) ***P-12 Advisory Council feedback:*** In response to NCATE Element/PSC Domain: *Degree to which candidates effectively use **technology** in the assessment of student learning*, the following was noted:
  - Mentor teachers should give interns experience using data warehouses where data is extracted, analyzed, and used for data-driven decisions.
  - The teachers may be knowledgeable about technology but principals may not observe them using it.
  - Students (GSU interns) may not be using technology because classroom teachers do not have access to technology/do not use it.
  - Students don't have access to up-to-date technology.
  - Identify specific areas of technology that are effectively used to assess student learning.

**Assessment Committee:**

- 1) To follow up on the revised plan to review program reports (e.g., WEAVE, PAAR, Program Level Assessment Report Template) including analysis of program strengths and areas for improvement, as submitted each fall by each educator preparation program.

- 2) To follow up on use of LiveText as a technological mechanism to consistently disseminate and accurately aggregate program and unit level data.

**Content Knowledge Committee:**

- 1) To make policy recommendations to the PEF regarding means of assessing content knowledge of education students, as stated in the 2009 bylaws of the PEF GSU.
- 2) To advise on integrating content, pedagogy and technology knowledge in teacher education programs, as stated in the 2009 bylaws of the PEF GSU.
- 3) To strengthen candidates' understanding of content within the context of teaching, the following actions were proposed: Team teaching of major and content faculty; Collaboration of major and content faculty in redeveloping syllabi for content courses, promoting pedagogical content knowledge.
- 4) To assume responsibility for reviewing unit level assessment data reports in the following areas:
  - Content Knowledge for Teacher Candidates – Initial & Advanced
  - Pedagogical Content Knowledge & Skills for Teacher Candidates – Initial & Advanced
  - Candidates' effective use of technology in the assessment of student learning.

The Report of Unit Level Assessment Data template will be revised to include these areas.

- 5) ***P-12 Advisory Council feedback; specific comments are as follows:***
  - "I am in several PDS schools and administrators frequently share that content knowledge (of GSU interns, student teachers, graduates) stands out as an exemplar! They (GSU students) also strengthen veterans at placement sites with new expanded skill sets."
  - "Content knowledge of student teachers sent to Bunch Middle School is adequate. This (content knowledge) is reflected in the teachers that we have hired as GSU graduates."

**Diversity Committee:**

- 1) To recommend the annual procurement of data regarding faculty hires and retention be obtained from the College of Education Dean's Office and the College of Arts and Sciences Dean's Office, as the number of respondents to the survey was limited.
- 2) To determine effective ways of retaining faculty by initiating an exit interview.
- 3) To recommend the annual procurement of data regarding the race and gender of program completers by academic year, as only a single source of data was reviewed.
- 4) To work with the Professional Education Council to develop a task force to develop an appropriate survey to obtain additional data from graduates regarding their perceptions of preparedness to work in multicultural settings and regarding the learning climate. This information will be given to department chairs.
- 5) To assume responsibility for analysis of data related to diversity for our Unit:

- a) Design, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum and experiences.
- b) Experiences working with diverse faculty (i.e., faculty are knowledgeable about and sensitive to preparing candidates to work with diverse students, including students with exceptionalities); maintaining recruitment and retention of faculty diversity.
- c) Experiences working with diverse candidates; maintaining recruitment and retention of candidate diversity.
- d) Effectiveness of the unit in preparing educators to work in P-12 schools with diverse learners.

**Induction Committee:**

- 1) To review BOR Workforce Rates Report 2008-2009 when available to analyze current retention rates of GSU initial certification program graduates and to disseminate and discuss data by program with designated program faculty.
- 2) To collaborate with NET-Q Design Team to support CCLC training provided to partner school systems through grant funding.
- 3) To include focused topic seminars on teaching children with special needs, classroom management strategies, and student motivation strategies as part of the agenda for PEIS and NEIC.
- 4) To devise plans to improve response rates from completers and employers first and second year follow up regarding candidate teaching performance.
- 5) To find clarity regarding the rating scales used by principals for INTASC in order to determine discrepancies when comparing scores to BOR employer ratings.
- 6) To survey GSU educator preparation programs to identify current induction initiatives.
- 7) To consider the expansion of FLC: Teaching in Today's Society to two more sections each fall semester. Collect data and monitor the % of students enrolled in FLC who enter GSU teacher education programs.
- 8) To examine STEM initiatives such as Facilitating Our Communities Understanding of Science (FOCUS) as a model for early induction/service learning experiences in education.
- 9) ***P-12 Advisory Council feedback:***
  - Have on-going professional learning (i.e. webcasts, webinars);
  - Increase the social networking opportunities ... with a focus;
  - Have evaluation feedback based on above opportunities.

**PDS Ad-Hoc Committee:**

- 1) To support the recommendation for an Office of Field Experiences designed to facilitate the process of field placement requests with school districts, collect data regarding placement of field internships in diverse experiences, and to handle legal protocols (e.g., criminal background checks).
- 2) To complete the process of updating the PDS Field Experience Handbook.
- 3) To monitor the use and effectiveness of the Mentor Teacher Feedback Survey on GSU educator preparation programs.
- 4) To collaborate with the NET-Q Design Team via shared membership to support NET-Q activities in P-12 schools such as expanding the TIP model, supporting CCLC training, networking and implementing the Coaches in Residence model.

- 5) To assume responsibilities for reviewing unit level assessment data reports in the following areas:
  - a) Collaboration between Unit and School Partners (i.e. placement of candidates in high needs urban schools, involvement of P-12 partners)
  - b) Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Field Experiences & Clinical Practice (e.g. application of entry and exit requirements; placement of candidates in a variety of settings for application of knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; extension of the unit's conceptual framework into practice, observations of candidates)
  - c) Candidates' Development and Demonstration of Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions to Help All Children Learn
    - Student Learning for Teacher Candidates (Initial & Advanced)
    - Student Learning for Other School Professionals

The Report of Unit Level Assessment Data template will be revised to include these areas.

- 6) ***P-12 Advisory Council feedback:*** One participant submitted the following comment in response to the charge "How effective is the Unit in involving P-12 partners in design, delivery, and evaluation of field experiences?" – *continue meeting with the mentor teachers and the university professors to review handbook and expectations.*

**Student Affairs Committee:**

- 1) To recommend that a SAC member, as a non-voting member, attend academic dishonesty hearings to observe and take note of any feedback that comes out of the hearings. The member can then report back to the committee to see if any action is needed.
- 2) To recommend the examination of the student appeal information/hearing process and to meet with faculty who have been involved in the hearings to better assess the process.
- 3) To begin an in-depth review of advising services at other colleges and universities to see how their practices and services are applicable to the College of Education.
- 4) To recommend orientation and advising services at the program level across the college.
- 5) To continually examine the award/scholarship application process, including deadlines, to ensure ease for students.

## Section II

The Assessment Committee reviewed the unit assessment processes implemented for 2009-2010 and the specific analyses of 2008-2009 data and the resulting recommendations of committees as presented to the PEF. Below is a summary of that review and recommendations for 2010-2011 year.

Changes to Assessment Flow Chart in 2009-2010. With the adoption of the 2009 Unit Assessment report, the PEF changed the assessment flow chart to incorporate the yearly review of program reports by the PEF Assessment Committee. A template was adopted for use by programs in submitting those program reports. In fall 2009, at the requests of program coordinators and chairs, the Assessment Committee agreed to accept program reports in any format (ie. Weave Online Reports, program minutes, or the recommended template). This allowed programs additional flexibility in documenting their yearly analysis of data and process of making data-based program improvement. The Assessment Committee reviewed the submitted documents using a program review worksheet. The program review worksheet focused attention on identification of the program's key assessments, identification of strengths and weaknesses, and identification of specific action plans linked to analyses. The feedback on the worksheets was sent to programs as well as to the department chairs. After reviewing all of the data, the Assessment Committee noted that it would be beneficial to develop a chart to help faculty think through the linkages between their key assessments and the conceptual framework, and the transition points at which each assessment occurs. They developed this chart and distributed it to Assessment Committee representatives to share with their programs.

Streamline the Assessment Process to Make it More Meaningful in 2009-2010. The PEF adopted Livetext as the new platform for the unit assessment system, with all programs moving to the use of Livetext in 2010-2011. This will enable programs to focus on program specific data. Rubrics used at the program level can be tagged in light of the revised Conceptual Framework learning outcomes. To ensure continuity of analysis of conceptual framework data at the unit level, rubrics will also be tagged in light of the INTASC and NBPTS summary statements for Knowledge, Performance, and Dispositions as listed in our traditional unit STARS assessment. This will ensure that the Unit assessment can show continuity across data collected prior to Livetext using the STARS surveys. To coordinate the transition to Livetext unit-wide, the Assessment Committee recommends a taskforce be established to oversee the process.

Review of Committee Work. Review of the committee work submitted to the PEF for review in 2009-2010, indicated that for the most part the process of reviewing of data by the committees is functioning well. The Assessment Committee agrees with the recommendations in Section II related to the clarification of the charges of each committee in that these changes will ensure that committees' analyses are not redundant with multiple committees looking at the same data. One area of concern that did service was the realization that the examination of data related to student services involves the COE student affairs committee and focuses on only data related to those PEF programs housed in the COE. A recommendation related to this process will be found in the section below.

Recommendations for 2010-2011:

Selection of Standard for Continuous Improvement for NCATE Review 2013. GSU's PEF programs will be reviewed by NCATE in 2013. In light of the recent NCATE changes, this will mean that program reports should be reviewed by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission 2-3 years earlier. At the unit level, GSU will need to identify one of the NCATE standards on which to focus to submit for a Continuous Improvement review. In light of our ongoing attention to our unit level

assessment , the Assessment Committee recommends that we focus on Standard 2: The Assessment System.

Program Reviews by the Assessment Committee. In spring 2011, each program will be preparing and submitting program reports to the PSC. In light of this reporting requirement, the fall 2010 requirement of programs submitted a program report the Assessment Committee will be suspended. The dean's offices in COE and A&S will support program faculty as they develop their program reports and copies of the program reports will be sent to the Assessment Committee in spring when they are submitted to the PSC.

Transition to Livetext as a Unit Assessment Platform. The Assessment Committee recommends the establishment of an ad-hoc committee to serve as a Livetext Transition Task Force for the PEF. This team should coordinate the Unit's transition to Livetext, and identify and recommend ways to address faculty professional development needs and assessment reporting needs at the program and unit levels during the transition. The dean's offices in each college should work with this committee to ensure programs have the faculty professional development support and the administrative support necessary to ensure a successful transition.

Review of Student Services Data for A&S PEF Programs. The dean's office in A&S will be asked to coordinate the review of student services data for A&S using same template currently completed by the COE Student Affairs committee. The results from both committees will then be shared at the November PEF meeting and incorporated into the yearly assessment report.